



Resident Communities and Agriculture in National Parks: An Assessment and Prospectus

Douglas Deur and Stephen R. Mark

2011

Resident Communities and Agriculture in National Parks: An Assessment and Prospectus

Douglas Deur and Stephen R. Mark

2011

Douglas Deur, Ph.D.,
College of Forest Resources, University of Washington and
Pacific Northwest Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit,
Pacific West Region, National Park Service, Seattle, Washington

Stephen R. Mark, M.S.,
Historian, National Park Service,
Crater Lake National Park,
Crater Lake, Oregon

Research and report production completed under Cooperative Agreement between the Pacific West Region, National Park Service and the College of Forest Resources, University of Washington: Cooperative Agreement No. CA9088A0008; and, Task Agreement No. J9W88040030.

Cover photo description and credit: Photo shows cows grazing in the Leidig Meadow of Yosemite Valley, circa 1918. Photograph number 6293, courtesy of Yosemite Research Library, Yosemite National Park, California.

Pacific West Region: Social Science Series
Publication Number 2011-01
Frederick F. York, Ph.D.
Regional Anthropologist and
Social Science Series Editor

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|---------|
| The Question of Agricultural Users in Western National Parks | 1 |
| Relationships between National Parks and Agricultural Users: Historical Overview | 5 |
| Early Experiments in Park-Grazer Relations: Yosemite National Park Grazing, the Organic Act, and the Beginnings of the National Park Service | 7 11 |
| Lines in the Sand: Agricultural Interests and Challenges to Park Creation in the early Years of the NPS | 17 |
| Striking a Balance: Compromises and New Models of Park Agriculture in the Post-War Period | 24 |
| Awkward Balances: Mechanisms for Grandfathering Agriculture into the National Parks of the West | 30 |
| Whither Agriculture? Interpretation and the Historicization of Grazing in Parks | 43 |
| Alternative Models for Agriculture in Parks: Four Case Studies | 46 |
| Point Reyes National Seashore | 46 |
| Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve | 49 |
| John Day Fossil Beds National Monument | 51 |
| Mojave National Preserve | 54 |
| Opportunities for Future Research | 56 |
| Sources | 63 |
| Notes | 73 |

The Question of Agricultural Users in Western National Parks

The issue of agricultural uses of park lands represents one of the most enduring challenges facing the National Park Service, and a theme that is inextricably tied to the genesis of the agency and its earliest parks. If the “preservation” of natural landscapes was a central objective of the early National Park Service, the removal of those activities that were understood to be introduced by humans, anthropogenic in origin, or destructive of the natural landscape was embedded in most aspects of park policy. These values and objectives have been manifested explicitly in a variety of NPS policy statements through the years, but also were reflected in innumerable everyday management decisions made at the park level. In this context, the extinguishment of “resident uses” such as mining, lumbering, and agriculture, has been a recurring, fundamental theme, and even a *raison d’être* for park establishment, from the beginnings of the national parks into the present day.

The tendency to perceive the purpose of national parks, in part, as the protection of distinctive natural areas from potentially destructive resource uses by area residents can be seen in the story of the earliest parks. It is important to recall that, by the time that the National Park Service was established in 1916, there was already nearly four and half decades of national park experience at addressing the agricultural question. Most of this experience had centered on attempting to repel relatively recent agricultural practices from newly established park lands. Prior to the establishment of such parks as Yosemite and Yellowstone, national park creation movements were spawned by efforts to restrict grazing and other consumptive uses of natural resources by peoples living within and proximate to these parks. Once established, park managers often had to rely on nothing less than military intervention to expel sheep and cattle grazers from park boundaries. Resulting relationships between park staff and surrounding communities in some instances remained adversarial, often for decades after the expulsion of these resource users.

In these cases and many others, national parks had introduced competing claims into what was a rapidly changing and contested Western landscape, where early conservationists arrived more or less concurrently with early resource users. In these early years, the objectives and aesthetic preferences of a generally affluent national constituency were juxtaposed with competing economic aspirations operating at state and local

levels – often, but not always, revolving around the interests of resource laborers of modest economic means. In this context, national interests commonly prevailed. The involvement of the U.S. Army in early park management was a potent indicator of national interests being asserted within the context of contested natural resources in the waning years of the Western frontier. Experiences in these large and prominent parks set the stage for later developments within the fledgling agency – not the development of a cohesive NPS policy on the matter of agriculture, which would never fully materialize – but in establishing the convention of navigating competing agricultural interests in park lands and resources on a park-by-park basis (Cramton 1932). As such, the experiences in these early parks established precedents that would shape NPS policy and, arguably, perceptions of that policy outside of the agency into the present day.

Yet, over time, the extinguishment of agricultural activities within new or expanding parks became increasingly untenable. Western interests continued to gain political, social, and economic clout through the late-19th and early 20th centuries, while a number of Western agricultural communities became more fixed, enduring, and multi-generational. Beginning shortly after the passage of its organic act in 1916, the National Park Service found that ranching communities and their congressional representatives could be very effective in stalling or killing proposals for new parks and national monuments; such keystone parks as Grand Canyon and Grand Teton were nearly undone by such pressures from grazing interests. Over time, NPS policy adapted, allowing for grazing and other agricultural activities to persist in myriad ways within various park units.

In almost every case, park policies allowing for the continuation of agricultural have embodied a variety of compromises between the NPS and preexisting agricultural communities, each made to facilitate park creation and expansion in the context of opposition, real or anticipated, from rural interests. In some parks, agricultural practices persist into the present day, still adhering to the terms of the compromise agreements. Agriculture takes various forms and varies considerably among parks. It generally reflects the historical and administrative idiosyncrasies of individual parks rather than a single unified national policy. As such, there is considerable innovation embodied in these policies, and considerable variety in their outcomes.

The document that follows is an effort to achieve three basic objectives related to this aspect of NPS history: first, this paper summarizes major developments in this history of NPS relationships with agricultural users in the West; second, the document reviews

the various ways in which agricultural activities have been accommodated in various parks, and; third, it provides an initial assessment of NPS research needs that are suggested by these findings. As a prospectus, it is understood that the treatment of each of these topics is addressed in preliminary, rather than comprehensive, form in the current document. The topical scope of this work has also shaped by the realities of Western parks; in this region, most of the lands that have become national parks were unsuitable for agriculture, other than grazing of cattle and sheep, and for that reason grazing occupies a central position in the discussion that follows (O'Brien 1999).

While past investigations have illuminated fragments of this history, such as the in-house reports produced Westmancott (1998), Davis (2006), and Fiege et al. (2008), an integrated overview of the relationships between grazing interests and the National Park Service has yet to be written. With this in mind, the current study was designed to produce a new and original overview, synthesized from a diverse range of sources, including unpublished national park histories, published works in public history and environmental history, and a selection of archival materials relating to those parks that played a key role in the development of NPS agricultural policy. This new synthesis has been organized in such a way that it might illuminate persisting policy and research questions facing the NPS, and might suggest avenues for their investigation using the methods of environmental history, cultural anthropology, cultural geography, and other social sciences.

The history of agriculture in parks has resulted in a strong mandate to document this history, to understand its social and economic dimensions, and to identify its physical traces on the contemporary landscape. Certainly, many Western parks have a history of grazing and other agricultural enterprises – often poorly documented – that must be understood to guide even routine NPS interpretive development, cultural resource management, and certain aspects of natural resource management (such as ecological restoration planning and vegetation change modeling) as well (e.g., Bachelet et al. 2000). It is perhaps safe to say that most NPS units in the American West have some history of livestock grazing or other agricultural uses, even if these activities were not always widespread or enduring. Many parks that will receive little mention elsewhere in this document, from Olympic National Park to Joshua Tree National Park to Rocky Mountain National Park have some history of grazing which is important to understanding the park's heritage. This is true even if grazing is no longer occurring on the landscape, nor is it a central element in the interpretive and resource management agendas of those parks today. In many other Western parks, agriculture is paramount – whether it is

part of a park's history, or part of its contemporary management. The documentation of past agricultural uses in parks remains, and will continue to remain for the foreseeable future, integral to the interpretive and resource management missions of each of these parks.

In parks where agriculture has persisted into recent times, the documentation of uses and views of parks by current, or recently displaced, agricultural users are also of the utmost concern. Clearly, continued political and administrative frictions between certain parks and their past or present agricultural users continue to create challenges to resource managers throughout the agency. By documenting the agricultural community's perceptions, knowledge, and concerns – with research that goes beyond the more limited contexts of planning and consultation – park managers might come to know more about their own parks, perceive shared concerns with the community of agricultural users, and identify opportunities for cooperation. It is in this spirit that the current prospectus has been developed.

Moreover, the question of NPS relationships with agriculturalists will certainly be of concern as the agency continues to develop and refine its mission. Not only will agricultural users be an enduring part of certain parks, but these communities may also have considerable influence on the establishment of the NPS units of the future. At this point in time, the opportunities for park creation in truly “pristine” and unoccupied areas are severely limited. The addition of new units to the NPS system now commonly involves the incorporation of preexisting federal lands with a history of mixed resource use. Other mechanisms for the expansion of the NPS mandate, such as the creation of National Heritage Areas, encompass lands in mixed uses, typically including public and private agricultural lands. Opposition to federal proposals for the development of parks and monuments has proven a barrier to these initiatives throughout the West in recent times, such as at Great Basin National Park and the more recently established Staircase Escalante National Monument. However, by documenting the views and concerns of agricultural communities, and perhaps developing coherent policy responses to these concerns, these obstacles need not be so formidable. For over a century, national parks have attempted to address the agricultural question in ways that are experimental, varied, often adversarial, and have yielded mixed results. The success of the agency in the next century demands that the role of agricultural users, and their relationships with the NPS, be carefully rethought and retooled as needed. This will benefit the agency, future generations of park visitors, and the rural communities living alongside America's national parks.

Relationships Between National Parks and Agricultural Users: A Historical Overview

Since the founding of the earliest national parks, National Park Service managers have frequently been required to strike a balance between their agency's strong preservation mandates and a variety of potentially competing land uses, especially those land uses that predate park creation and those land uses that are required to host park visitors. Loomis (2002: 467 ff.) refers to this as the National Park Service's principal "balancing act," which has defined the agency's land management policies and its institutional culture from the very inception of the NPS to the present day.

Of those "balances" that the agency must strike, few have been as challenging or as enduring as those between NPS conservation mandates and the needs, values, and expectations of agricultural users of the landscape. Certainly, the NPS and agricultural users often have found themselves in direct competition for access to specific places and resources, as will be discussed in the pages that follow. Yet, this relationship had added layers of complexity. A vast cultural schism often divided early park promoters - relatively patrician luminaries of Northeastern origin with names like Rockefeller, Mather, and Roosevelt - and Western agriculturalists, including laborers and frontier businessmen who often defined their identities in sharp and proud contradistinction to all things elite and Eastern.

There has always been an awkward balance between the stated democratic goals of the agency and its roots in the agendas of the educated and mobile "leisure class" (Veblen 1899). Reflecting the relative affluence and urbanity of early park boosters, early national park managers often were not aware of, or especially attentive to, the values and needs of the relatively poor agricultural laborers who utilized lands placed in park status in the rural West. Meanwhile, mistrust of Eastern elites and the extent of their influence only amplified Westerners' fears of exclusion from federal lands, resulting in various challenges to the creation of individual parks and to the authority of the fledgling National Park Service. While the NPS has become more egalitarian in its objectives and this schism has narrowed in the years since, these divisions persist and confound communication regarding even the most basic aspects of park land and resource management. That so many parks have successfully coexisted with agricultural communities over the decades is testament to much patience, perseverance, and enduring attachments to the landscape in both camps (Albright 1985).

Other schisms complicated communication between national park managers and agriculturalists in the early years of the agency. The early NPS mission was in many respects an extension of Progressive era ideals, developed in response to the destructive exploitation of some of America's most important and stunning places – Yosemite and Yellowstone prominently among them. Yet, as has been argued elsewhere, this movement had its roots in a Victorian era worldview that saw “nature” and society as sharply separated domains, and perceived much of the West as uninhabited and natural “wilderness” despite its long history of human occupation and use (Nash 1967). In contrast, a growing literature reminds us that even the wildest places in North America were, in some manner, occupied, utilized, and ascribed meaning by past peoples – Native Americans, non-Native resource users, and others.¹ Early park boosters often tended to view the lands they sought in the West as uncontested; the residents of these regions, even those only recently established in these places, perceived things very differently.

In a similar vein, especially during the early years of the national parks, park managers and park promoters displayed a preoccupation with the management of resources for their aesthetic values, sometimes without equal regard for other resource values within parks. Agriculture that was deemed “unsightly” was more imminently threatened than those agricultural occupations that might be more ecologically deleterious. For a time, certain factions in the early NPS believed that agriculture was acceptable, provided that it was invisible to visitors (Sellars 1997).

Simultaneously, ranching has presented some of the most imposing challenges to NPS management, owing in part to the mobility of the agricultural “footprint” and the relatively large amounts of land required to support grazing enterprises. As NPS managers have come to appreciate, the presence of livestock has the potential to accelerate soil erosion or soil compaction, and can disturb fragile habitats such as wetlands; the grazing of cattle clearly can alter plant communities and their composition, and has the potential to hasten erosion especially in devegetated sites; cattle waste can affect water quality; livestock and other agricultural operations tend to increase chances of the introduction of alien plant species, and so on. This is only a selective list of effects presented in a sizeable literature (e.g., Belsky et al. 1997; Belsky and Blumenthal 1997).

In addition, the presence of cattle has often created sharp dissonance with the expectations of park visitors, being antithetical in the minds of many visitors to the kind of “pristine” natural experience anticipated within national parks. These impacts of graz-

ing within, and at the margins of, national parks are widespread, and are not unique to the United States, vexing park managers throughout the Americas, Asia, Africa, Europe, and Oceania (Igoe 2003). The ways that national park managers have attempted to address, combat, contain, or accommodate agricultural users in almost 140 years of park management have been diverse, but have followed certain trajectories that are outlined below. These changing solutions provide a revealing portrait of broader changes in American values over that period, and may yet yield lessons that are of value to future park managers in the United States and beyond.

EARLY EXPERIMENTS IN PARK-GRAZER RELATIONS: YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK

Yosemite National Park perhaps set the standard for early park efforts to grapple with the agricultural question. Indeed, the historical record suggests that the genesis of Yosemite can be traced in no small part to efforts to restrict agricultural uses where those uses were seen to be at odds with the ecological and aesthetic integrity of a nationally significant natural landscape. Yosemite's earliest non-Native occupation was by grazers, moving from California's interior valleys to the high Sierra in search of summer-time forage.

Beginning in the 1860s, sheepherders began following and improving Indian trails into the mountainous region to summertime grazing areas in Yosemite Valley, Tuolumne Meadows, and elsewhere in what would later become Yosemite National Park. By the mid-1860s, ranchers from the valleys below were hiring young men to make this annual ascent, with some ranches sending multiple flocks of sheep to circulate between high mountain meadows, grazing in the high country until fall snows pushed the flocks back down to the valleys. Fatefully, in 1869, a young John Muir accepted a position as shepherd in the high Sierras – it was as a shepherd ascending with his flock to Tuolumne Meadows that summer that Muir had his first introduction to the Yosemite region.² While there, Muir witnessed first-hand the deleterious effects of overgrazing in these fragile subalpine meadows.

And sheep grazing was not the only form of agriculture that Muir witnessed in the years that followed. A growing number of families, such as those of Hugh Mundy and Louis and Ed Goblin, established cattle operations in and around Yosemite Valley during this period, running their cattle and sheep seasonally in Crane Flat, Tuolumne Meadows, and many other meadows in what would soon become the park.³ A number of others, such as the Hutchins and Lamon families, established farmsteads on the floor of

Yosemite Valley and Hetch Hetchy, developing small, fenced agricultural holdings with goats, pigs, cattle, and planted crops and orchards for both subsistence purposes and for sale to early Valley visitors (Greene 1987).

Soon after his first visit to Yosemite, Muir began to publicize the adverse effects of herds of domesticated sheep – “hoofed locusts” as Muir famously called them – that were herded into Sierra-Nevada high country meadows each summer, and to call for their exclusion from the dramatic landscapes of the Yosemite region. Over the next two decades, during a period when the State of California still administered a park which covered only Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Grove of Big Trees (a situation that lasted from 1864 until 1906, despite the passage of legislation assigning national park status to these lands in 1890), his crusade against sheep grazing in the high Sierra would become the foundation for a larger effort to create a national park that would exclude all extractive uses of the landscape.

In the summer of 1889, as sheep flocks arrived in large numbers and Yosemite residents were forced to enclose their springs to keep them out, Muir decided that it would be best to allow members of the Eastern conservation community to witness the damage first-hand. Not only was Muir’s opposition based on sheep grazing’s effects on vegetation such as wildflowers, he and others were concerned about wildfire as some herders lit fires in an effort to increase forage the following year.

With those examples at hand, Muir sought to galvanize his effort to set aside portions of Yosemite using national, rather than state, mechanisms. Muir took influential publisher, Robert Underwood Johnson, to Tuolumne Meadows to witness the damage to vegetation, soils, and the aesthetics of this dramatic landscape. Their observations prompted a discussion of the creation of a national park to protect the Yosemite region from these effects.⁴ Johnson was clearly moved by his observations of grazing impacts at Yosemite, and his lobbying and influence was critical to the U.S. Congress passing the 1890 “Act to set apart certain tracts of land in the State of California as forest reservations” [H.R. 12187], setting aside about two million acres of “reserved forest lands,” most of which eventually became the nucleus of Yosemite National Park.

The act placed the park lands off-limits to “occupation” by private parties, and gave the Secretary of the Interior the authority to “cause all persons trespassing upon [these lands] to be removed therefrom.” The legislation was founded on an argument that had become central to the campaign of the park promoters, namely that the benefit incurred

by the masses of the nation in seeing the untrammelled beauty of Yosemite outweighed the material interests of a handful of ranching families (Hall 1882).

Despite this legislation and the promise of federal protections, grazing and squatter agricultural settlements continued to proliferate throughout Yosemite. At the time of the national park's creation in 1890, an estimated 90,000 sheep lingered in and immediately around the park, with largely foreign and immigrant hired herdsmen – French, Portuguese, Chilean, Mexican, and Basque – tending these flocks for both foreign and domestic agricultural interests. Lacking clear precedents, , with the additional complication that Congress made no appropriation for the park until 1898 while vesting management authority in the Secretary of the Interior, federal authorities did not yet have long-term solutions that might repel the stock invasions that had motivated park creation.

At Yellowstone, U.S. Army troops had been successful in prohibiting the entry of livestock into the park and, though this had created great tensions in the region, had effectively defended federal interests. (Admittedly, in the Yellowstone case, agriculturalists were not uniformly negative about park creation, despite the end of grazing rights; some local boosters suggested that the creation of a national park might actually draw this relatively unsettled region to the nation's attention and therefore hasten agricultural development in the remote country surrounding the park [Cramton 1932: 28]). At Yosemite, too, it was determined that the military would be sent in to enforce grazing prohibitions in the new park, but the only penalty for trespass was ejection until legislation allowed for arrests to be made in 1905 (Ise 1961).

In 1891, a unit of the U.S. Army cavalry arrived at Yosemite, under the command of Captain A.E. Wood, the first Park Superintendent. Headquartered at Wawona, they were empowered to “protect” the park from stockmen and sheepherders, and became fast champions of the young Progressive conservationist movement. The cavalry patrolled the high meadows of the park throughout the summer season. Yet, enforcement options were limited; herders, being scolded and escorted out of the park, soon realized that they could double back into the park with few direct consequences and an atmosphere of casual recidivism characterized the herding communities of the turn-of-the-century. Increasingly the cavalry used strong-armed tactics to expel herders; by 1904, it became standard practice for the cavalry to expel sheep herds and their herders to opposite sides of park, in order to maximize the inconvenience to grazers and to discourage repeat violations of park policy (see Runte 1993: 62-73).

Displaced from some of the finest grazing lands in the region, grazing around the park's margin only intensified after park creation. Shepherders continued to utilize areas that would only later be added to the park, building cabins in such places as Tuolumne Meadows and stock grazing areas in Wawona Meadows. The grazing damage that Muir had used to rally support during his earlier campaigns was mounting around the park's perimeter. The protection of the watersheds of Yosemite from logging, cattle and sheep grazing became a new rallying cry for park promoters, providing one of the greatest motivations for park expansions in the years that followed (Greene 1987).

Herders and their supporters, including the business communities of small towns outside of the park, increasingly lobbied for a reopening of grazing rights within the park. Relying not only on the usual economic and social arguments, they often employed ecological arguments as well, unsuccessfully making the claim to the NPS that grazing would restore or maintain meadow conditions that appeared to be natural at the park. Only once, and briefly, did this lobbying yield results – between the years of 1917 and 1919, when World War I nationalism briefly facilitated an opening of the park's borders at the request of the Department of the Interior – ostensibly to augment the national food supply (Greene 1987; Runte 1993).

Despite howls of protest from high-level NPS officials and a publicity campaign against the “hoofed locusts” being unleashed on the park, the grazing permit system continued throughout U.S. involvement in the war (Albright and Schenck 1999: 214-16). Meanwhile, NPS managers increasingly placed agricultural inholdings within the park under scrutiny. For decades, agriculture on the valley floor was tolerated and even promoted somewhat by early park managers so that concessionaires could cater to the needs of visitors, given the high costs of shipping from outside the park. However, by the 1920s, the NPS began to exert pressure for the elimination of farms from the Yosemite Valley floor for reasons that were primarily “esthetic” (Runte 1993: 50; Greene 1987: 718-21).

As the park was expanded, these strategies were employed in newly incorporated areas, until all of what is now Yosemite National Park was devoid of agricultural users. Only limited grazing to support the park's interests – principally the grazing of concessioners' horses and mules in meadows at Wawona and elsewhere – was allowed in the park, a practice that continued until as late as 1977. Tensions with surrounding communities and economic interests on the grazing issue reportedly persisted into the early 20th century, while issues with livestock “trespass” from adjacent lands have continued

well after that date. As grazing faded, becoming with time a “historical” rather than a contemporary use of park lands, the park’s management priorities relating to agriculture shifted as well. No longer a pressing matter for law enforcement, agriculture became increasingly “historicized” in the park’s interpretation and resource management strategies through the last half of the 20th century.

Yosemite resource managers, working under the mandates on the National Historic Preservation Act and other cultural resource laws, sought to document agricultural features, such as shepherders’ tree blazes, cabin sites, stock trails, and orchard trees, and to manage these landmarks as “cultural resources.” Meanwhile, the park’s natural resource program still contends with the legacy of agricultural use of the park, including ongoing efforts to eradicate invasive forbs and grasses introduced during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Grazing, once the bane of Muir and his fellow park promoters, is now meticulously documented and even celebrated by the very park that they had proposed in no small part for the purpose of grazing exclusions. Park policy rendered grazing practices “historical” and, now safely in the past, Yosemite’s grazing heritage has become a cornerstone of the park’s story (Synder 2002).

GRAZING, THE ORGANIC ACT, AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The debate over the extinguishment of agriculture as an outcome of Western park creation grew increasingly intense in the years following the establishment of Yosemite. As new national parks were proposed in the absence of an agency authorized to manage them, challenges over grazing rights posed frequent political challenges to park promoters. Lassen Volcanic (established 1916), Rocky Mountain (est. 1915), Mount Rainier (est. 1899), Crater Lake (est. 1902), Sequoia (est. 1890), Kings Canyon (est. 1890) – all were established before the institutionalization of the National Park Service, and all had some degree of agricultural use at the time of park creation.

Most of this agriculture consisted of summertime cattle or sheep grazing in subalpine meadows. Some, but not all, of these agricultural enterprises were comparatively recent and fleeting, in part because of their remoteness, and in part because much of the land in these early parks was agriculturally marginal, being of limited value even to herders of sheep and cattle. In fact, many lands that would later be incorporated into parks were being rapidly abandoned during the late 19th and early 20th century, even prior to park-creation proposals, after only brief and abortive attempts at grazing and other agricultural development. To cite one celebrated example at the future site of

Bryce Canyon National Park, 19th century Mormon settlers including Ebenezer Bryce, for whom the park was named, occupied and then just as quickly abandoned their remote, hardscrabble agricultural homesteads - Bryce dismissing the entire labyrinthine rocky and arid landscape of the future park as "a hell of a place to lose a cow" (Scrattish 1985: 14).

Nevertheless, the fact that the grazing on these lands was not always economically significant was not particularly relevant to many Western opponents of park development; even where the agrarian economy was still nascent in many respects, opposition to the elimination of any economic uses of land, realized or potential was strong (Robbins 1994). Opposition from fledgling rural communities to park development was sometimes intense, and they were occasionally able to muster congressional support for their positions. Yet, there were a number of factors that allowed park promoters to overcome the momentum of Western political opposition. Many of the rural areas in which parks were being considered were often too remote and too sparsely settled to mount effective organized opposition. Political institutions were fledgling and disorganized when compared to their Eastern and urban counterparts, where most park development proposals had their origins and their strongest supporters. At the dawn of the 20th century, local interests were little match for the interests of the Eastern plutocracy, the two-term tenure of popular pro-conservation president Theodore Roosevelt, and park-promoters claims that parks were in the "national interest."

Park promoters and officials in the U.S. Department of the Interior were nonetheless becoming increasingly aware of how Western agricultural interests, if they became politically unified around economic issues, could significantly delay or even kill national park proposals. Grand Canyon gave them one of their most valuable lessons on this point. From the earliest proposal for park development at Grand Canyon, agricultural interests presented formidable opposition. The key individual in this battle, Ralph H. Cameron, was a personification of Western distrust of Eastern interests and conservation proposals, and of the political potentials of fringe political movements in the American West. Grand Canyon had first proposed as a national park as early as 1882, with broad support in conservation circles and legislation developed by then Indiana senator, Benjamin Harrison. This legislative effort was unsuccessful, being opposed by a number of Western senators on various grounds.

Following his election to the office of the U.S. President in 1889, however, Harrison revisited his vision for the Grand Canyon; still encountering opposition to the national

park proposal, Harrison opted to designate the Grand Canyon Forest Reserve during the final months of his Presidency in 1893. It was during the same period that Ralph Cameron had established a number of mines in the Grand Canyon, enhancing an old Havasupai Indian trail into the canyon to access his claims and grazing horses and livestock in the canyon to support his mining efforts. Viewing federal management of Western lands as a form of resource 'taking' without due territorial representation, Cameron very publicly chose to extract resources from the federal lands of the Grand Canyon without authorization. On more than one occasion, Cameron was evicted from the federal lands, including the Forest Reserve, for unauthorized grazing and mining. Promoters of the Grand Canyon national park proposal therefore were dismayed when Ralph Cameron successfully ran for the office of Republican congressman from Arizona Territory on a platform that included opening Arizona's federal lands to resource extraction and celebrated Cameron's resistance of federal land conservation efforts.

By 1908, Theodore Roosevelt rededicated the Forest Reserve as Grand Canyon National Monument, under authorities granted in the 1906 Antiquities Act. However, Cameron – who arrived in Washington D.C. the same year as Roosevelt's "redesignation" of the canyon – worked diligently to fight further national park proposals, citing the interests of local cattlemen and miners, for the duration of his tenure. In the time Cameron was in office, from 1908 through 1911, he became a vocal opponent of Western park development generally, and specifically, any expansion of Grand Canyon's status from national monument to national park. He instead lobbied for federal support of an alternative vision of the Grand Canyon, suggesting that the canyon be used for two hydroelectric dam projects, with its remaining above-water areas being opened for platinum mining and cattle grazing. Cameron may not have succeeded in realizing his alternative vision for Grand Canyon, but he did hold at bay all proposals to declare the canyon a national park. By the time the NPS was established, five years after Cameron's departure, Grand Canyon National Park remained only a proposal and a dream of park promoters, its fate uncertain in the face of opposition from Western grazers (Anderson 2000; Strong 1978).

The early National Park Service took form with the grazing issue very much in the forefront of its immediate challenges. In 1913, when visiting Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks, prominent businessman and conservationist Stephen Mather was appalled by the damage he witnessed to these two parks, with sheep and cattle grazing unchecked in subalpine meadows and agricultural "squatters" still present in abundance – especially at Sequoia, where military protections were largely absent. Writing a letter to

Secretary of the Interior Franklin Lane, Mather expressed his dismay; Lane, a personal friend of Mather, responded by inviting Mather to Washington D.C. to oversee an effort to improve and consolidate management of the parks. Mather arrived in Washington, agreeing to assume *pro bono* administrative responsibilities for parks as an assistant secretary within the Department of the Interior for a single year. This appointment would be extended until, at the passage of an organic act in 1916, he became director of a new bureau empowered specifically to administer the parks.

In his role at the Department of the Interior, Mather became keenly aware of the need for separate agency to manage the growing inventory of America's national parks. By 1915, working collaboratively with his friend, prominent New York journalist Robert Sterling Yard, Mather oversaw an effort aimed at the creation of a new "National Park Service" within the Department of the Interior. There had earlier proposals for such an agency, promoted by the American Civic Association, the Sierra Club, and other organizations, with unsuccessful legislation drafted by senators from Utah and California, but Mather and Yard's efforts would help galvanize the effort as had never been done before (Ise 1961; Albright 1985; Albright and Schenck 1999).

Soon after Mather and Yard initiated their campaign, work began on drafting new legislation that would become the National Park Service's organic act. Predictably, passage of the Organic Act and, by extension, the founding of the National Park Service as an agency of the United States government was held up by the opposition of ranching and timber interests. Supporters of U.S. Forest Service land management, among them Chief of the Forest Service Gifford Pinchot, opposed the development of the new agency, noting that national forests performed similar functions, but that national parks would systematically exclude certain uses allowed in these forests, agricultural uses being prominent among them. Secretary of the Interior Lane appeared to be at least publicly sympathetic to these concerns.

Meanwhile, an ally of Mather and one of the principal congressional supporters of the new bill for park creation, California Congressman William Kent, was himself a livestock magnate and owner of a Nevada ranch. In the course of debate regarding the bill's contents, Kent increasingly served as a spokesman for a coalition of Western ranchers who sought to retain grazing rights in newly established parks. Kent argued that livestock grazing reduced fire hazards by consuming fuels from grasslands and forest floors – a popular view at the time – and proposed an amendment to the bill that would allow grazing within the parks managed by the new agency. Without the amendment, Kent's

support of the bill was unlikely. Mather and other park proponents realized that they could not shepherd the Organic Act through congressional review without Kent's support and so, despite their private opposition to grazing in parks, Mather and his supporters moved forward with a revised bill (Albright and Schenck 1999: 214 ff.). As recounted by Richard West Sellars,

"influenced by his need for Kent's support in the legislative campaign...Mather compromised with the ranchers and told Congress in April 1916 that permission to graze was a "very proper" amendment to the bill. In accord with Kent's views, his chief concern was to prevent grazing in areas frequented by park visitors. Mather recalled that the [national] parks' general superintendent, Robert Marshall, had asserted that "a certain amount of grazing in those areas where it will not interfere with the campers' privileges is perfectly proper." Mather testified that he concurred with this assessment, noting also the hazards of allowing grasses and other plants to build up to the point where they could ignite and feed destructive fires. Although initially the Senate would vote against grazing in the parks, inclusion of the provision helped secure House support for the legislation. Mather, Albright, and others found it expedient to agree to the provision despite their private opposition" (Sellars 1999: 37).

These provisions added, Kent ultimately became the lead sponsor of the legislation that became the Organic Act within the U.S. House of Representatives. Thus, the resulting Organic Act of 1916 emerged as the product of significant compromise, specifically on the issue of agriculture in parks.

As approved, Section 1 of the Act stated that the foremost goal of the NPS was to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" (39 Stat. 535[1]). While this implied the restriction of extractive uses of the parks, the Organic Act also made significant provisions for the perpetuation of cattle grazing on these lands as a result of Kent's amendment. As stated in Section 3 of the Act,

"the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations and on such terms as he may prescribe, grant the privilege to graze live stock within any national park, monument, or reservation herein referred to when in his judgment such use is not detrimental to the primary purpose

for which such park, monument, or reservation was created” (39 Stat. 535).

Only Yellowstone National Park was identified in this Act as an exception to this provision, apparently prohibiting agricultural uses of that park as a concession to opponents of the grazing provision. Mather became the new agency’s first Director in May of 1917. In that position, which he held until 1929, Mather – alongside Assistant Director Horace Albright - effectively established the institutional culture of the NPS. The elimination of grazing from parks, or only the grudging and limited continuation of grazing, became a personal rallying point for Mather, even as the Organic Act gave broad discretion for agricultural uses of parks (Albright and Schenck 1999; Shankland 1970). Still, a persistent lobbying emanated from Western congressmen and residents for the agricultural reopening of certain parks and, much to Mather and Albright’s dismay, these efforts convinced Interior Secretary Franklin Lane to open a number of parks to grazing during World War I, including Yosemite, ostensibly to provide food for the war effort (Albright and Schenck 1999: 216).

The winter following the Organic Act’s passage, Interior Secretary Franklin Lane – who had always been more receptive to grazing than Mather - outlined his department’s new policy on grazing in national parks. Echoing, but expanding upon Kent’s amendment to the Organic Act, Lane suggested that grazing should be permitted broadly in the national parks, but within the context of the agency’s broader mandates. He noted,

“In all of the national parks except Yellowstone you may permit the grazing of cattle in isolated regions not frequented by visitors, and where no injury to the natural features of the parks may result from such use. The grazing of sheep, however, must not be permitted in any national park” (Lane 1918: 111).

Mather and Albright wrote the letter for Lane’s signature, and the immediate result was blunt denials to operators who proposed to graze sheep in Mount Rainier, Crater Lake, and Glacier national parks (Mather 1918: 24). Mather and Horace Albright struggled to find ways of making any concessions to grazing in some parks workable in light of the competing mandates of the agency and the broad opposition to grazing among park promoters and the nascent park bureaucracy (Albright and Schenck 1999: 213-39). When Lane left office in March of 1920, Mather and Albright began to revisit and increasingly eliminate grazing from the parks.

LINES IN THE SAND: AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS AND CHALLENGES TO PARK CREATION IN THE EARLY YEARS OF THE NPS

In the wake of the Organic Act's passage, Mather, Albright, and their allies in the Department of the Interior consolidated management of existing national parks and, with private-sector park promoters, began to revisit park development proposals that predated the NPS. High on their list was Grand Canyon. Efforts to develop park-enabling legislation for Grand Canyon commenced very soon after the NPS offices were operational. In 1919, little more than two years after the agency's establishment and some eight years after Ralph Cameron's departure from the U.S. House of Representatives, park legislation successfully passed Congress and was signed into law by President Wilson. Still, the park incorporated many concessions to the growing agricultural lobbies of the West. The park had a relatively narrow footprint compared to original proposals, consisting largely of the canyon itself, where grazing was challenging at best (Anderson 2000). Cameron ran and was elected as Arizona Senator in 1920, a position which he held from 1921-27. He continued battling against NPS management authority within the Grand Canyon - a campaign in which he believed strongly, and in which he took a certain amount of pleasure (Strong 1978). Nonetheless, he was unable to derail federal efforts to secure national park status for Grand Canyon.

A few years later, the park was expanded through additional legislative efforts (16 USC 221e) but, here too, a compromise was needed for its passage, especially with Cameron back in Washington, D.C. After some deliberation, it was determined that the park expansion legislation would have to provide additional protections for agricultural interests - not permitting agriculture within the park, but allowing for the unprosecuted grazing of livestock that might cross into newly added portions of the park from adjacent lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service. Moreover, lands added to the park under the expansion legislation of the early 1920s were kept open to grazing for all those individuals who had been permitted to graze there before park expansion; this provision allowed them to retain their grazing permits for the duration of their lifetimes (16 USC 228f; Anderson 2000).

During the same period, quiet petitioning by Mather, Albright, and other opponents of grazing in parks began to sway Department of the Interior positions on the agricultural issue in the wake of Franklin Lane's departure. Reports had been arriving in Washington from throughout the agency of the damaging effects of grazing and the difficulties of balancing high priority NPS mandates with the practical realities of cattle herds entering some parks each year.

By the time Interior Secretary Hubert Work took office in 1923 under President Harding, concern about the grazing issue and related development pressures within Western parks had reached a new level of prominence. On March 11, 1925, Interior Secretary Work responded in a general policy against overdevelopment of parks that specifically called for the elimination of grazing, in spite of the agricultural provisions of the Organic Act. As stated in this new policy: "In national parks where the grazing of cattle has been permitted in isolated regions not frequented by visitors, such grazing is to be gradually eliminated" (Work 1925). For a moment, the dividing lines between park policy and grazing interests had become clear (Albright 1985; Albright and Schenck 1999).

Ironically, some of the most strict and damaging adherence to Secretary Work's policy statement did not occur in a Western park, but in a major new park development project in the eastern United States. Mather has a growing vision of building a large Eastern national park analogous to the large natural parks of the West; in time, he began to focus his interests on the proposal for a Great Smoky Mountains national park, a proposal that had been circulating since before the agency's formation. Being settled and partially arable, with timber and agricultural interests well-established in the southern Appalachians, the cost of such an undertaking had far exceeded that of many Western parks, and the entire proposal's cost seemed prohibitive. This all changed, however, when John D. Rockefeller, Jr. pledged \$5 million to the Great Smoky Mountain park effort in the memory of his recently deceased mother.

Touring the region, Rockefeller and Mather witnessed a well-occupied country, a region of Appalachian farmers, including both owner-occupants and tenant farmers, operating both subsistence and commercial farming operations, with some taking employment in fledgling lumber mills that were widely distributed throughout the mountain valleys. Seasonal sheep grazing was well-established in mountain grasslands, while foraging by pigs and other livestock was widespread in the forests below. Orchards and gardens were found in association with most established homes. Rockefeller, especially, was unsympathetic to the condition of these farmers, and pushed for park policy that would exclude any agricultural or lumbering from the proposed park.

Rockefeller's vision was realized in May of 1926, with the passage of legislation – signed by President Coolidge – that would allow the federal government to create Great Smoky Mountains National Park through a combination of federal land transfers and private land acquisitions, with the states of Tennessee and North Carolina administering land acquisition efforts. While the legislation prohibited federal purchases of private lands,

to occupants of the proposed park, and then donated purchased lands to the NPS. This legislation set in motion the acquisition of roughly 300,000 acres of land and set the stage for the extinguishment of approximately 1,100 Anglo-American farmsteads through the 1920s and 1930s – a process made considerably easier after 1929 by the economic disruption of the Great Depression. Considerable pressure was exerted on residents to sell their farmsteads; only a few – the elderly and the ill, primarily – were allowed to sell their lands but to then take lifetime leases that allowed them to remain in place for their lifetimes.

While timber companies with interests in the Great Smoky Mountains region were paid at market value, the less powerful and less organized farming communities reportedly were offered far below market value by brokers working for the state governments. The coerced sales and the low valuations were contested by residents from the state of Tennessee all the way to the Tennessee Supreme Court, but this Court sided with state brokers and the federal park creation effort. Beginning in 1933, WPA and CCC crews were mobilized to build park infrastructure, and to demolish farmsteads of purchased farms in order to create the “wilderness” that had been envisioned by park proponents – a process that continued until 1940. By the time that Franklin D. Roosevelt dedicated the park in September of that year, Great Smoky was a radically transformed place (Cotham 2006; Pierce 2000; Campbell 1960). As one writer summarized it,

“Mountain communities, some of which had existed for several generations, were largely dispersed, and a unique way of life vanished from the highest mountains in eastern North America...By selectively removing many of the houses and farm buildings from the park, the history of the people in the Great Smoky Mountains was rewritten” (Cotham 2006: 95).

Many families moved to communities around the margins of the park, and many descendants continued to reside there to the present day. As at Yosemite, the history of these former park residents and their rich agricultural traditions were later interpreted and celebrated at a number of venues in the park, such as the Mountain Farm Museum. The park still manages and shares with the visiting public some 80 historic structures, most made vacant by agency policies that called for the removal of its former agrarian residents (Pierce 2000; Campbell 1960).

In practice, however, compromises were still quite necessary to develop and manage new national park units during this period. After transfer of Gettysburg National Military Park from the War Department in 1933, the NPS wanted to maintain a historic

scene that resembled the landscape as it appeared when the battle occurred in 1863. This involved issuing agricultural leases and special use permits for grazing that was consistent with grazing practices as they had existed during the Civil War era (Fiege et al. 2008: 24). Congressional delegations from western states continued to exert pressure to amend or kill park proposals, especially when these proposals affected the profitability of large ranching operations.⁵ The early NPS was forcefully reminded of these pressures when attempting to establish such parks as Grand Teton.

Although the expansion of Yellowstone to encompass the Teton Range had been identified as a top agency priority by Stephen Mather and Horace Albright shortly after the passage of the Organic Act, ranchers' concerns regarding the elimination of grazing all but tabled this proposal for a number of years. A 1919 bill for encompassing the Teton Range in Yellowstone was effectively blocked by Idaho Senator John Frost Nugent, due to anticipated impacts of park creation on sheep grazing access to and through the newly expanded park. Significantly, the Organic Act had identified Yellowstone as the only park in the NPS system without legal avenues to allow grazing, and the extension of that park would also geographically extend the footprint of this firm grazing ban. That same year, Horace Albright visited Jackson Hole to promote the idea of park development and found himself "run out of town" by stockmen because of the grazing issue (Daugherty 1999; Albright and Schenck 1999; Albright 1985).

As with Great Smoky and elsewhere, the patrician aesthetes of the period had a decisive influence on plans for the Tetons. Touring the West in 1926 with an eye toward park development, John D. Rockefeller Jr. felt that the grazing and other agricultural uses he witnessed in the Grant Teton and Yellowstone region marred the landscape (Daugherty 1999). He began to formulate a plan to circumvent the opposition of stockmen and to incorporate the Teton Range and Jackson Hole area into Yellowstone National Park. In 1927, Rockefeller formed the Snake River Cattle Company - a "front" for Rockefeller's purchases of strategically located private lands from ranchers. Presenting itself as a ranching firm, the Company effectively concealed both Rockefeller's involvements and his intentions for the property.

This Company set a goal of acquiring no less than 35,000 acres - most of it privately owned ranchlands as well as a few small dude ranches - to place in NPS stewardship. Over the next three years, word of Rockefeller's secret plans leaked to the public, bringing angry responses from the local ranching community and howls of protest from the Wyoming state government and congressional delegation. By the late 1920s, however,

private investors - apparently unconnected with Rockefeller or other park boosters - began to circulate proposals for dam construction in the Teton Range as well as large-scale commercial tourist developments, a fact that began to sway local opinion somewhat in favor of national park proposals. A few very hard years in the ranching industry, immediately preceding and continuing into the Great Depression, made the final difference: ranchers began to sell their land to Rockefeller - some apparently doing so enthusiastically, others with considerable reluctance.

They did so, however, with a variety of proposed caveats. Stockmen and their congressional representatives ventured proposals that the U.S. government compensate ranchers for revenues lost as an outcome of park creation, that the Tetons be placed in a separate park so as to not fall within Yellowstone's grazing prohibitions, and that stock be allowed to graze within the new park. These proposals under consideration, a plan was developed to buy out ranching interests directly, to create a separate Grand Teton National Park, heavily subsidized by the private fortunes of Rockefeller and his peers.

Only in 1929, ten years after the first failed attempt at legislation to place the Teton Range in NPS management, was legislation allowing for land acquisitions to create Grand Teton National Park signed into law (Righter 1982). Even with this legislation passed, the ranching controversy had not passed and local suspicions remained high; with the support of the Idaho and Wyoming congressional delegations, a U.S. Senate subcommittee was formed in 1933 in response to claims of illegal activities by Rockefeller's Snake River Cattle Company and the NPS in land purchases, but this committee cleared Rockefeller and the NPS of all formal charges. Land purchased by Rockefeller was placed in the Jackson Hole National Monument in March of 1943, and by 1950 this land was merged into the newly-established Grand Teton National Park. The 1950 enabling legislation grandfathered in cattle grazing rights within certain portions of the park, as well as rights of egress - rights that are still observed today. Hubert Work's policy statement notwithstanding, it is unlikely that the Teton Range would have been placed in NPS management without these compromises (Daugherty 1999).

The Great Depression marked a period of transformative change for the young National Park Service, as was true in many federal agencies. Economic contractions brought about agricultural decline throughout the West while park creation and improvement efforts were buoyed by unprecedented federal spending. Meanwhile, the agency devoted considerably more attention to the explicit protection of "wilderness," a movement reflected by the 1935 formation of the Wilderness Society, which lobbied federal

governments for the designation of wilderness areas in which myriad extractive uses, including agriculture, were forbidden; its early founders included Aldo Leopold as well as NPS publicist and the late Stephen Mather's friend and confidant, Robert Sterling Yard. From within the agency wildlife biologists such as George Wright criticized grazing on park lands, especially in the West, due to its effects on wildlife and habitat (Fiege et al. 2008: 28-29).

The agency's efforts during this period were guided in no small part by Harold L. Ickes, a former Chicago political figure, who served as Secretary of the Interior from 1933 through 1946. Serving concurrently as Director of the Public Works Administration, Ickes was one of the principal administrators responsible for implementing Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal policies, while also redefining the direction of NPS policy during the period. Ickes worked aggressively to establish new parks through land transfers and, where possible, acquisitions of large tracts of lands devalued by the Great Depression, while developing park infrastructure at new and preexisting national parks using Civilian Conservation Corps and other federally supported labor programs through the Work Projects Administration.

Like a number of his predecessors, Ickes was also resolutely opposed to the continuation of grazing in parks. When plans coalesced for a new national park at Kings Canyon in the 1930s, fueled in no small part the lobbying of photographer Ansel Adams, Ickes saw the opportunity to create a new kind of park – a wilderness park with little evidence of prior human occupation, set aside without provisions for future park development or grazing provisions. The new park would center on the small General Grant National Park, created some 40 years earlier to protect Giant sequoia groves, but would extend National Park Service protections to a much larger swath of Sierra mountain terrain. While opponents to Ickes' vision were diffuse, consisting of local ranchers, loggers, miners, and irrigation interests with existing or proposed interests in the Kings Canyon area, they quickly formed a coalition, motivated by reports of NPS relationships with resource users in such parks as Yosemite and Sequoia. As Dislaver summarized the coalitions' views,

“locals perceived the Park Service as an agency opposed to development, unconcerned about the economic fates of local farmers and communities, dictatorial and restrictive in the management of their lands and resources, largely under the control of wealthy urban pleasure-seekers and, finally, extraordinarily land hungry” (Dilsaver 1990).

This coalition threatened to block legislation unless granted continued grazing and other resource rights. Most members of this coalition petitioned for the continued management of Kings Canyon by the U.S. Forest Service, in order to facilitate multiple extractive resource uses alongside recreational development. NPS Assistant Regional Director, B.F. Manbey, was mobilized by the NPS to attempt to turn the tide. Manbey spent a number of months lobbying agricultural and other interests in the Kings Canyon area, attempting to downplay the economic disruption caused by a new park and appealing to their nationalism, with speeches regarding the need for parks to lift national spirits during the Great Depression.

Meanwhile, Ickes quietly brokered a labyrinthine series of agreements with corporate irrigation and timber interests until only a few, generally smaller opponents within the coalition – stockmen among them – were left politically isolated and comparatively ineffectual in stopping the park proposal. Still, to smooth the passage of the Kings Canyon National Park bill through congress, Ickes realized that some concession was needed and that the immediate expulsion of grazers could create dire political consequences, at Kings Canyon and beyond. He began work on a series of minor compromises within a bill that would create his wilderness park, but would “grandfather” existing grazing rights within the park with the goal of their eventual elimination. Despite these concessions, the Kings Canyon bill was almost killed in congressional committee due to the opposition of stockmen and mining interests. Still, Ickes’ gamble paid off: in March of 1940, Franklin Roosevelt authorized legislation to create Kings Canyon National Park – legislation with provisions for the rapid “sunsetting” of grazing in the park by allowing currently permitted grazers one last opportunity to renew their permits prior to the bill’s passage (16 USC 80a; Dilsaver 1990).⁶ While effectively eliminating agriculture in the park within a generation, this model of agricultural “compromise” became a model for a number of park proposals in the years that followed.

Ickes’ stalwart support of “wilderness” interests continued despite considerable national pressure during World War II. At the onset of the war, Ickes’ CCC crews, who had been working at parks throughout the system, were abruptly disbanded as these men were recruited into military service. In a move that was reminiscent of World War I efforts, Western interests lobbied to reopen the parks to grazing, mining and timber harvesting to support the war effort. With support by the NPS and a coalition of conservation groups, Ickes resisted these pressures. He successfully convinced President Roosevelt and Congress that the national parks were to provide places of inspiration

and beauty in support of national morale (Miles 1995: 141-142). When Ickes retired in 1946, the events of the War now behind him, he had an accomplished record of conservation with few equals in the U.S. government. Perhaps ironically, he bought a commercial farm in rural Maryland and spent his final years managing a commercial flower-growing operation there with his wife (Clarke 1996; Watkins 1990).

STRIKING A BALANCE: COMPROMISES AND NEW MODELS OF PARK AGRICULTURE IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD

In the post-War years, NPS relationships with grazers became increasingly complex, if not always more adversarial. To be sure, the West was changing quickly. In the case of early parks, such as Yosemite and Yellowstone, park boosters and park management had arrived on the scene more or less concurrently with agricultural resource users. By the mid- to late-20th century, in contrast, park creation occurred within the context of what were sometimes well-established agricultural communities, with enduring attachments to particular landscapes and economic dependencies upon certain resources. While agricultural resource users of the 19th century, when displaced from lands designated as national parks, had a vast range of comparable and readily accessible alternatives for agricultural use, this was no longer the case. Cumulatively, demands for particular lands on the Western landscape had become less “elastic” in economic terms than they were during the park creation efforts of the late 19th century.

Changing demographic and political realities in the American West also coincided with a growing popular interest in recreational and preservationist interests operating at national levels. Thus, as the West became increasingly developed and its urban areas grew, the political contestation of agriculture in national parks was becoming less of an interregional conflict, but increasingly manifested urban-rural differences and the class, educational, and occupational schisms defined by that divide. Western congressional delegations were still effective at blocking and stalling specific park proposals if these compromises did not meet the approval of agricultural users, but their constituencies became increasingly polyvocal, with growing support for the NPS mission in the urban West especially, but pockets of anti-NPS sentiment often becoming more entrenched in rural settings.

The post-War urbanization of the West, coupled with the rise of automotive tourism in parks also brought unprecedented visitor demands on Western parks, as well as bringing new public visibility to both the amenities and foibles of the National Park Service

system (Louter 2006). The rise of automotive tourism in parks also much increased potential hazards for grazers and park visitors alike. The landscape had shifted, in a way that the old ways of doing things – whether within the realm of NPS policy or agricultural practice – were no longer tenable. In the enabling legislation and policies that have addressed agriculture since World War II, there was a growing, if uncelebrated, element of compromise with local interests. These were no easy compromises, but they involved enabling legislation and NPS policy that often, as O’Brien notes, “allowed for some noncompatible uses of the park to appease those who opposed it” (O’Brien 1999: 49).

National Park Service compromises and innovation on the agriculture question came in many forms, and evolved with these changing circumstances of the American West. One happened to be at Coronado National Memorial in Arizona, established in 1952 with provisions to historic grazing rights. Justified by planners as a way to memorialize the Spanish *entrada* of 1540 that first brought horses, cattle, goats, and sheep into the region, the NPS made an arrangement with the U.S. Forest Service to administer grazing permits within the memorial (Fiege et al. 2008: 41-42). Compromise occurred at many moments in the post-War era, but it was perhaps best exemplified by the tenure of Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior from 1961 through 1969, under both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Udall set a new standard for park creation in the post-war period, and perceived a need for balancing strong conservation agendas with rural community’s needs. Udall was a skilled advocate of public land expansion, with strong support from both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. During his tenure, Udall oversaw the creation of Canyonlands, Redwood, and North Cascades national parks, Point Reyes National Seashore, and an astonishing 43 additional units that included national monuments, national seashores and lakeshores, national recreation areas, and national historical sites across the nation.

Udall also oversaw the development of legislation that would be key to later NPS natural resource management efforts, including but not limited to the Wilderness Act (1964), the Endangered Species Act (1966), the National Trail System Act (1968), and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (1968). Nonetheless, as part of the Udall political dynasty of Arizona, Udall lacked the trappings of the old, moneyed Eastern establishment and had a keen sense of the political currents of the West. He brought Western rural needs and perspectives into the foreground of NPS thinking regarding the agricultural question and was clearly reluctant to extinguish preexisting resource uses within newly established parks. Some of the more innovative balances between conservation and grazing

interests – such as the grazing policies of Point Reyes National Seashore – were crafted under his watch. From the home state and divisive politics of Ralph Cameron, Udall set a tone for compromise that was elusive before, and occasionally after, his tenure as Interior Secretary. Even in retirement, and until shortly before his death in 2010, he continued to mentor public lands advocates and to subtly guide aspects of public policy from the sidelines (Finch 2008).

By this period, parks had finally established a broad national constituency as dreamed of by their founders, as places of scenic and recreational value, though perhaps without the same conservationist zeal that motivated early park enthusiasts. Nonetheless, public attention to ecology and “wilderness preservation” saw growing attention during and after Udall’s tenure, and the emphasis of NPS policy arguably shifted from a focus on recreation and development aimed at meeting the demands of increasing visitor numbers to a management style that also emphasized maintaining “naturalness” and ecological stability (Chase 1987). Internal “master plans” for each park gave way to general management plans for parks that for the first time included public involvement and the occasional legal challenge. This created new pressures on grazing, as the maintenance of park integrity required a growing consideration and regulation of backcountry natural resource conditions, instead of focusing largely on publicly accessible portions of the landscape.

Many park advocates held expectations that the 1964 Wilderness Act might help resolve this and other grazing issues somewhat, in that wilderness designation of a park’s backcountry might forbid grazing and other agricultural uses even if the Wilderness Act did not expressly forbid grazing in designated wilderness managed by other federal agencies such as the Forest Service. In practice, the creation of new wilderness areas within parks proved almost as controversial as new parks, with frequent opposition to wilderness proposals from stockmen (Roth 1995).

By the 1980s, the growing consolidation and political clout of the rural West, as well as the policies of the Reagan and Bush administrations, made the outright extinguishment of agricultural uses impossible. In some ways, this period witnessed the return of adversarial positions seen in earlier decades; unlike in those past decades, however, land managers now had a vast range of past policy alternatives and precedents to consider as a background to the agricultural debate. Fears of restrictions on grazing and other agricultural uses continued to cause significant obstacles and delays in park creation, as well as causing the reduction in the scale of new parks.

Grazing interests in eastern Nevada and western Utah, for example, effectively held up the proposal for a Great Basin National Park for years. This resulted in a series of compromises in the creation of that park, including a smaller park footprint and the grandfathering of preexisting grazing. The park, founded in 1986, not only arrived late, but differed in a number of ways from the vision of early park promoters due to the myriad agricultural compromises (Lambert 1991; Unrau 1990).

To respond to these pressures, the establishment of agricultural use in newer NPS units was not guided by a singular agency policy, but – perhaps more than ever before – by highly localized efforts to exercise agency mandates within the context of local histories, communities, and economies. The addition of new units to the national park system made it increasingly diverse, with more than 20 different types of designations. The difficulties of getting new units established more than ever dictated compromise on the NPS inclination to prohibit uses such as grazing and hunting in parks.

Simultaneously, one park established in 1970, the Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site in Montana, has as its purpose to show visitors a living, working ranch. Summarizing national monument creation by the NPS and other agencies in the late-20th century, Kerr and Salvo noted that, “Grazing appears to have been either perpetuated or restricted in each national monument based on the history of the area, the future envisioned for each reservation, and local politics” (Kerr and Salvo 2001). This appears to have been true whether the National Monument was placed under NPS jurisdiction or remained under the jurisdiction of other agencies, such as the BLM or the U.S. Forest Service.

In the absence of consistent NPS policy on the issue, the grandfathering of preexisting agricultural uses within parks has occurred through a number of venues, and is manifested in parks’ enabling legislation and a number of park-specific policies. The precise mechanisms to achieve these local balances were numerous. While the NPS had sought to avoid “inholdings” in prewar parks, the NPS increasingly used inholdings as a way to achieve compromise with park opponents. These included both fee-simple private lands being retained within parks’ external boundaries, as well as the designation of dedicated “lease areas” within the boundaries of parks – especially in those places where ranching was already well established.

As will be discussed later in this document, Point Reyes National Seashore in California was perhaps the preeminent example of this inholding strategy, with private inholdings

being allowed at the time of park creation, but later being transferred to NPS ownership with families continuing to occupy their former lands as lessees. A number of other recent NPS units, such as Great Basin National Park (1986), Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument (2000), and an expanded Pinnacles National Monument (2001) have principally used the lease area option.

A number of grazing practices continue to be allowed, with or without “inholders” who still had title to their lands inside of a park, with provisions that these practices will be “sunset” or terminated after a specified period of time, usually as part of NPS purchase of lands or grazing allotments. In one case, the NPS extinguished all grazing permits at Great Basin National Park in 1999 after non-profit organizations donated funding for this purpose (Fiege et al. 2008: 46). In a few cases, NPS management has incorporated mosaics of private and public lands within a liberally established external boundary where NPS may not even be a principal landowner. This multi-ownership model was most visibly employed at Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve, an NPS unit created in 1978; this example is discussed in more detail in the pages that follow. In a very small number of cases, the NPS has been unable or unwilling to purchase lands from ranchers and has instead chosen to create park units by assuming long-term agency leases on private ranch lands or by purchasing development rights through vehicles such as scenic easements. John Day Fossil Beds National Monument, created in 1974, is an example of this strategy, and it also will be discussed in more detail later in this document.

Despite these compromises - many of them successfully protecting both NPS and agricultural interests - political pressure to restrict or eliminate ranching on public lands reached a fever pitch at the end of the 20th century. This pressure arose on multiple fronts, including not only campaigns by environmental organizations, but also through pressure exerted by a variety of public employees and research scientists, operating both individually and collectively. Growing documentation of grazing’s adverse environmental impacts on public lands, as well as highly publicized examples of *de facto* taxpayer subsidies of public lands grazing, only added to this momentum. In response, the NPS issued Director’s Order 53 in 2000, which provided more explicit guidelines for how the agency should manage livestock grazing in parks.

As the agency mandated to preserve “unimpaired for future generations,” the National Park Service arguably was held to a different standard than other agencies by the critics of public lands grazing (Wuerthner and Matteson 2002; Donahue 1999; Belsky and

Blumenthal 1997; Belsky et al. 1997; Horning 1994). In this context, efforts to restrict grazing have once again rebounded, reflecting general trends among all federal agencies (Kerr and Salvo 2001). Despite these pressures, and perhaps because of them, agricultural interests also became more entrenched in their resistance to the elimination of grazing. Amidst this anti-grazing foment that the Code of Federal Regulations were revised, and then put into effect new and more clearly articulated restrictions on grazing in parks. As stated in the revised CFR, dated January 24, 2002,

“The running-at-large, herding, driving across, allowing on, pasturing or grazing of livestock of any kind in a park area or the use of a park area for agricultural purposes is prohibited, except: (1) As specifically authorized by Federal statutory law; or (2) As required under a reservation of use rights arising from acquisition of a tract of land; or (3) As designated, when conducted as a necessary and integral part of a recreational activity or required in order to maintain a historic scene” (36 C.F.R. § 2.60(a)).

Without explicitly addressing the question of superintendents’ discretionary authority, this new regulation effectively reduced that authority, while also institutionalizing the practice of permitting agricultural activities principally as part of National Park Service recreational or historic preservation objectives. Agriculture increasingly had to abide by the larger mandates of the agency, rather than simply being “grandfathered,” unmodified into modern park landscapes.

Clearly, the story of NPS relations with agriculturalists continues to develop to the present day. It is all but certain that, in the absence of a more comprehensive policy on the matter, NPS policy on agricultural uses will continue to evolve over time, reflecting the influences of political currents, changing federal leadership, and changing dynamics between different, sometimes competing, segments of the American population. More often than not, NPS policy will still respond to each park’s idiosyncratic circumstances, and this policy will need to be informed by knowledge of rural communities, their values, and their economies if it is to be successful. The status of resident agricultural resource users, so close to the heart of the original national parks movement and the genesis of the nation’s most prominent parks, clearly continues to influence modern park managers and practices into the present day. The future of the agency will no doubt require continued and thoughtful attention to this issue as well.

Awkward Balances: Mechanisms for Grandfathering Agriculture into the National Parks of the West

The sometimes awkward political balances struck in the process of park creation have shaped the enabling legislation of parks, as well as in various examples of park expansion legislation. In early parks, with some notable exceptions, the NPS and the Department of the Interior often sought to extinguish agricultural uses outright from parks, or – if political opposition was sufficient – grandfathered in agriculture with few firm limitations. In the period following World War II, the NPS and Interior seldom took either approach, neither extinguishing grazing rights immediately among the community of active agricultural users, nor allowing grazing to continue unabated in parks indefinitely. And, while the Organic Act granted general authority to the Secretary of the Interior to allow grazing, in time it would become clear that most Secretaries took a “hands-off” approach, exercising this authority principally within the development of enabling legislation of new parks or expansion legislation established after the date of the Organic Act; meanwhile, park superintendents were granted increasingly broad latitude in the establishment of individual park policy on grazing within these legislative parameters. A review of how these issues have been addressed within enabling legislation, therefore, seems warranted.

Within this legislation, and within agency-wide and park-specific policies and regulations, the National Park Service has used a combination of incentives and disincentives to achieve its goals of land acquisition and – to the extent that it can be described as a formal agency goal - the removal of grazers. Incentives have included buyout programs for grazing leases and lands remaining in new parks, land or permit “swap” arrangements for grazing lands outside of parks, and other mechanisms. Disincentives have included a variety of regulatory mechanisms to remove livestock from the landscape, such as prohibitions of grazing within all or part of a new NPS unit, as well as livestock trespass and other law enforcement programs meant to expel unpermitted livestock from the land.

A review of enabling legislation and park expansion legislation since the passage of the Organic Act reveals some of the diverse strategies that have been employed over the years to address the agricultural question on lands obtained by the NPS. In very general terms, these approaches include,

- 1) Grandfathering in preexisting agricultural practices, albeit often with restrictions on locations and activities to avoid conflicts with visitor access and other park uses;
- 2) Grandfathering agricultural uses with eventual sunset provisions, such as the lifetime of current users, a specified date, or a specified number of permitting cycles;
- 3) Grandfathering agricultural permits in a way that they are heritable to heirs alive at time of park creation, or heritable to later generations of descendants of park users;
- 4) Grandfathering and otherwise allowing grazing on designated “inholdings” under leases issued by the NPS;
- 5) Grandfathering and otherwise allowing grazing on designated “inholdings” under leases issued by the agency that managed the land (such as the BLM or U.S. Forest Service) prior to park creation, in consultation with the NPS;
- 6) Grandfathering grazing on “inholdings” in fee-simple ownership of grazers;
- 7) Grandfathering grazing leases or private grazing land ownership within the park, but the park establishes a lease or land purchasing program to eventually consolidate these holdings in NPS ownership;
- 8) Grazing prohibited within NPS units, but allowed on lands acquired by NPS and/or other entities, and sometimes transferred to former park agricultural users, as part of land-swap arrangements developed to facilitate park expansion;
- 9) Hybrid strategies that combine elements of the above.

As suggested above, a number of parks have had to manage around “inholdings” in the parks, resulting from the continued presence of private lands, Indian allotments, designated permit areas, and other claims on the land typically dating from before park creation. NPS units such as Point Reyes, Zion, Black Canyon of the Gunnison, Lake Mead, and Glen Canyon have had to manage around these kinds of inholdings at some point in their history. In order to avoid these types of inholdings and the complications they engender while still facilitating park expansions, some parks have employed land swaps to acquire key parcels from ranchers in exchange for suboptimum lands that are already in NPS management, or have been temporarily held by the NPS or allied organizations to facilitate the transaction; Rocky Mountain National Park (MacGregor parcel) and Hawaii Volcanoes National Park (the 116,000 acre Kahuku Ranch) have been involved with transactions of this general type.

Also, as suggested, some park creation or expansion legislation allowed for the agency that managed the lands prior to NPS ownership to continue overseeing the permitting

of grazing on NPS land under interagency agreements. This method has been employed especially when there has been opposition to land transfers from grazing communities that favor preexisting federal land management regimes. This approach to land transfers was employed in the creation of Saguaro National Monument in the 1930s, for example, a move that was contested by grazing interests who had used those lands historically. Working with their elected representatives, this group fought for retention of the proposed park lands by the U.S. Forest Service. As a compromise position, the Department of the Interior ultimately brokered a deal to allow continued Forest Service permitting of grazing on lands that were otherwise transferred to NPS management – an agreement that was reflected in the park’s enabling legislation. This two-agency approach to grazing management in parks – understandable as a political compromise, but awkward in practice – shaped Saguaro National Monument policy for a number of decades until grazing was largely discontinued in the second half of the 20th century (Clemensen 1987).

“Hybrid” strategies were often combined within individual park expansion agreements, or resulted within a single park as the result of aggregation of multiple strategies over multiple rounds of park expansion. In the aggregate, these hybrid approaches could prove complex. One example consisted of the 1975 expansion of Grand Canyon National Park (16 U.S.C. s 228f), which grandfathered existing permittees to continue grazing livestock for their lifetimes within the old Grand Canyon National Monument boundary, while also placing a time limit on further leasing in newly added portions of the park; meanwhile earlier park expansion legislation allowed the cattle of unpermitted stockmen to stray into certain portions of the park and graze without penalty, as specified within the terms of the legislation for those portions of the park. No doubt, while each of these compromises made political sense at the time of their creation, they resulted in a great deal of practical complexity for park managers attempting to enforce the letter of these agreements. In the case of Grand Canyon, most of these grazing options have run their course, so that permitted grazers have now terminated or “sunsetted” their operations and there is little grazing remaining in that park, but the progression to this point from the original legislatively-established park policy was slow and often cumbersome.

It is important to note that, even when agriculture has been effectively removed from parks, ranching and other agricultural activities often persist just beyond its boundaries, creating new challenges and opportunities. A number of NPS units that occupy former grazing lands now must maintain livestock trespass programs, such as at Kings Canyon

National Park, Grand Canyon National Park, and Big Bend National Park. It is also important to note that some park enabling legislation appears to favor corporate agricultural operations somewhat over individual permit holders. To cite one example, the 1999 Black Canyon of the Gunnison expansion (P.L. 106-76 s 4e) allowed individuals to retain permits for their lifetime, but allows corporations to hold permits until the dissolution of the corporation – a time period that ostensibly could continue indefinitely. Family grazing operations were not necessarily protected by individual permits in the event that the permittee died, for example, and it is clear that this kind of legislation produces incentives for those ranchers lacking corporate status to incorporate before the legislation’s passage. While the outcomes of this legislation remain unclear, it is quite possible that – in time – it will result in a transition of the park’s grazing permits from a mixture of corporations and individuals, to a pool of permittees made up exclusively of corporations.

The status of grazing rights in NPS units today reflects an outcome of these historical and legislative processes. In a systematic assessment of the legislative basis of grazing authorities within NPS units undertaken for the agency, Davis (2006) identified no fewer than 22 parks, preserves, and national monuments under NPS management that still permitted livestock grazing as a matter of park policy in 2005.⁷ These included:

- 1) Badlands National Park
- 2) Bering Land Bridge National Preserve
- 3) Big Cypress National Preserve
- 4) Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument
- 5) Buffalo National River
- 6) Canyon de Chelley National Monument
- 7) Capitol Reef National Park
- 8) Chaco Culture National Historical Park
- 9) Coronado National Memorial
- 10) Death Valley National Park
- 11) Dinosaur National Monument
- 12) Glen Canyon National Recreation Area
- 13) Golden Gate National Recreation Area
- 14) Grand Teton National Park
- 15) Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historical Site
- 16) Great Basin National Park
- 17) Lake Mead National Recreation Area

- 18) Mesa Verde National Park
- 19) Mojave National Preserve
- 20) Ozark National Scenic Riverways (horses only)
- 21) Point Reyes National Seashore
- 22) Sequoia National Park

Nonetheless, the retention of grazing rights in a park does not necessarily imply the continuation of extensive grazing within that park. Some of the parks listed above still have active grazing today, but only at a fraction of their original levels, such as at Capitol Reef and Sequoia National Parks, largely as a cumulative result of many years of buyout programs and other NPS efforts. Others, such as Chaco Culture National Historical Park, effectively extinguished grazing within the original park boundary, only to subsequently expand the park into areas (in the case of Chaco, discontinuous areas) where grazing was well established and grandfathered into the management of these expanded areas; in the case of Chaco Culture, these areas were largely grazing lands utilized by Navajo herders, who continued to graze within the expanded park boundary.

Another ten NPS units have had legislative authority to permit grazing, but grazing has subsequently been extinguished or rendered inactive for other reasons. These include:

- 1) Arches National Park
- 2) Big Thicket National Preserve
- 3) Canyonlands National Park
- 4) El Malpais National Monument
- 5) Fort Donelson National Battlefield (farm sites)
- 6) Gettysburg National Military Park (farm sites)
- 7) Grand Canyon National Park
- 8) Lassen Volcanic National Park
- 9) Shiloh National Military Park (farm sites)
- 10) Vicksburg National Military Park (farm sites)

Among these parks, the battlefield sites stand out, being in the eastern United States and permitting farming that includes, but is not limited to grazing. These four cases emanate from the unique history of those battlefield parks. The NPS's first experience with legislatively-protected farming (as opposed to ranching) began in 1933, when an Executive Order placed 56 national monuments and military sites into agency control

Table 1: Park Examples where Grazing Permitted Outright within Specified Management Parameters

| <u>Park</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Legislation</u> | <u>Notes on Conditions Specified in Legislation</u> |
|--|-------------|--------------------|--|
| Black Canyon of the Gunnison (exp.) | 7/84 | P.L. 98-357 | Grazing allowed in perpetuity on lands acquired by NPS without “fee interest” if not detrimental to visual resources; allows for construction of fences, stock ponds |
| Coronado Memorial | 8/41 | 16 USC 450y | Grazing allowed to continue so long as it does not inhibit recreational uses; water rights retained by permittees and park infrastructure must accommodate cattle passage |
| Glen Canyon | 10/72 | 16 USC 460dd | Grazing allowed to continue under same conditions as BLM management that preceded NPS management but with reference to NPS conservation standards |
| Great Basin | 10/86 | 16 USC 410mm | Grazing by current users permitted in perpetuity, subject to regulations made by Secretary of the Interior; heritability of permits unclear; negotiations may be undertaken between permittees and the Secretary re exchange of allotments in the park for allotments outside the park |
| Lassen Volcanic | 8/16 | 16 USC 202 | Mandates development of park regulations allowing “the reasonable grazing of stock” |
| Mesa Verde | 6/1910 | 16 USC 115 | Grazing permitted with exceptions: not in ruins, and not in a way that would exclude public’s access to ruins; by 1930, most permits were purchased in buyout program, eliminating majority of grazing |
| Sequoia | 7/26 | 16 USC 45 | Secretary of the Interior given authority to permit continued grazing so long as it does not interfere with park’s other mandates |

from the U.S. War Department. This was a pivotal development in the history of the NPS generally, as it helped consolidate the NPS mandate as a manager of sites of national historical importance, rather than serving almost solely as a manager of natural sites and antiquities. The NPS managed these battlefield sites with an emphasis on military history, and with relatively little attention (initially) for natural resource protections, resulting in only minor friction with existing agricultural users. While agriculture was permitted on many of these sites, it also appears to have been in decline well before assumption of NPS management. Over time, as noted previously, the NPS began to try to reactivate agricultural leases in order to maintain landscapes within these parks that were compatible with their historical scene – especially at Gettysburg National Military Park. By the late-20th century, grazing rights within these parks remained largely unutilized, except within narrowly circumscribed farm activities, occurring with active NPS encouragement.

Reviewing the legislative history of those NPS units where grazing is still permitted as of 2005, one sees that some of the mechanisms for grandfathering agriculture employed in past park enabling legislation are no longer represented in the pool of agricultural parks. The conditions of agricultural activity within these remaining ‘grazing parks’ can be divided into five general categories:

- 1) There are some parks where grazing was never terminated, but allowed to continue within certain parameters that insured compatibility with other NPS mandates (Table 1, page 35). Most, though not all, of these parks were established in the early years of the NPS, reflecting the fact that the NPS and the Department of the Interior have moved away from these agreements in the intervening years, for many of the reasons outlined earlier in this document.
- 2) In addition, a small number of parks allow American Indians to continue grazing because of federal responsibilities to honor treaty and trust resource obligations. Similarly, one NPS unit, Bering Land Bridge National Preserve (est. 1978), permits largely Alaska Native communities to graze domesticated reindeer there as an outcome of negotiations guided by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (ANCSA) and apparently in anticipation of the terms of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA) (Table 2, page 39).
- 3) A number of NPS units allowed for the continuation of grazing on new or newly expanded park lands for a certain window of time before sunseting of all agricultural uses – a period usually, though not always, defined by the life of preexisting grazing permits (Table 3, page 40).

- 4) A number of NPS units, as the outcome of predictable political compromises, have allowed for the continuation of grazing for the lifetime of existing agricultural permittees, or for the lifetime of their heirs living at the time of park creation. This approach has still allowed the NPS to “sunset” agricultural uses, but over a relatively long period of time (Table 4, page 41).
- 5) Finally, several NPS units allow for the indefinite continuation of grazing on specified inholdings, either permitted inholdings or fee-simple inholdings; however, in these cases, enabling or park expansion legislation specifies some mechanism by which the NPS or the Department of the Interior can obtain either the grazing permit or the land, through purchase or donation (Table 5, page 42).

The production of each of these tables was aided considerably by a review of the work of Davis (2006) as well as a detailed review of associated legislative texts. A final category, not included in these tables, are those parks established specifically for the purpose of commemorating and promoting grazing history, most notably Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historical Site.

While it is clear that most of these compromises were in some manner “political,” there has been repeated recognition in some circles of the NPS that park creation needed to go beyond short-term political expediency if it was to be successful; some pressed for additional research to determine the best course of action on the agricultural question in new, or newly-expanded, NPS units. This was the case at Capitol Reef, where legislative compromises at the time of park creation had resulted in solutions that were in many respects untenable for NPS managers and grazers alike, and had exacerbated many of the preexisting tensions between the grazing community and the federal land managers (Frye 1998; Thow 1986). As the NPS and park proponents proposed additional acreage be added to the park in the late 1970s and early 1980s, parties on all sides of the debate called for a cautious and comprehensive look at the past, present, and future of grazing at Capitol Reef. The resulting legislation, authorizing expansion of Capitol Reef (P.L. 97-341) passed on October 1982, specifically required a detailed study of the effects of ongoing agriculture in the park, and the effects of grazing bans on rural communities, before any further park expansions or grazing policy could be proposed. This legislation specifically requested that the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study addressed:

- 1) historic and ongoing impacts of grazing upon natural and cultural resources within the park,

- 2) current impacts of grazing upon visitor uses within the park,
- 3) alternatives to grazing within the park that might be feasible on adjacent Bureau of Land Management lands,
- 4) the projected economic impact of grazing prohibitions on permit holders and the local economy, and
- 5) any other information and findings as may be deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate this analysis.

A lengthy prospectus for this research was developed by two parallel NAS committees, one investigating natural resource considerations and the other investigating agricultural implications (National Research Council 1984). The committees were to bring together some of the most knowledgeable people available to assess the topic representing a range of disciplines and specialties, including NPS resource managers, academic and agency researchers from the natural and social sciences, and representatives of the agricultural users from Capitol Reef. This study, apparently controversial from the start, was never completed, in spite of its impressive prospectus. Instead, politics won out: the 1982 legislation language regarding the study was explicitly overturned by 1999 park expansion legislation (P.L. 106-76 s(4e)), which allowed the continuation of grazing by current permit holders (both individual and corporate) for the duration of their lives, without recourse to such an analysis. Still, the questions posed by this original analysis remain, and will no doubt continue to shape relationships between the NPS and grazing interests at Capitol Reef for many years to come.

Table 2: Park Examples where Grazing is Permitted under Treaties, Trust Resource Mandates & ANCSA/ANILCA

| <u>Park</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Legislation</u> | <u>Notes on Conditions Specified in Legislation</u> |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--|
| Badlands | 8/68 | 16 USC 441n(a) | Grazing and mineral development allowed in southern portion of park for Oglala Sioux grazing and mineral development; allows for use of tribal lands within park boundary |
| Bering Land Bridge | 12/85 | 16 USC 410hh(2) | Grazing of reindeer permitted subject to “reasonable” regulations designated by Secretary of the Interior |
| Canyon de Chelley | 2/31 | 16 USC 445a | Monument is located on the Navajo Reservation. Navajo Tribe of Indians’ rights to various resources, including “surface use of [monument] lands for agricultural, grazing, and other purposes” within certain cultural and natural resource management parameters; Navajo also possess preferential right of furnishing riding animals to monument visitors. |
| Lake Mead | 10/64 | 78 Stat. 1039 | Hualapai Indian lands (principally allotments) within the external boundary of the park are subject to grazing laws and policies applying to Indian lands rather than NPS policies, allowing grazing that is consistent with the development program and standards of Lake Mead NRA; other users’ grazing permitted at Secretary of Interior’s discretion |

Table 3: Park Examples where Legislation Terminated Grazing After a Specified Date

| <u>Park</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Legislation</u> | <u>Notes on Conditions Specified in Legislation</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|---|
| Arches | 11/71 | 16 USC 272 | Grazing in newly added areas allowed for the life of existing leases plus one period of renewal thereafter; stock trails and other infrastructure can continue to be developed after legislation |
| Capitol Reef | 12/71 | 16 USC 273 | Grazing permitted under current leases plus one period of renewal thereafter |
| Canyonlands | 9/64 | P.L. 88-590 | Grazing in newly added areas allowed for the life of existing leases plus one period of renewal thereafter |
| Canyonlands (expansion) | 11/71 | 16 USC 271 | Grazing permitted for one more lease renewal; stock trails and other infrastructure can continue to be developed after legislation |
| El Malpais | 12/87 | 16 USC 460uu(3) | Grazing permitted until 10 years after passage of legislation |
| Grand Canyon (expansion) | 1/75 | 16 U.S.C. 228(f) | Grazing in newly added areas allowed for the life of existing leases plus one period of renewal thereafter; users in former G.C. National Monument allowed to graze under permit for their lifetime |

Table 4: Park Examples where Grazing Allowed for Life of Current Users or Living Heirs, Extinguished Thereafter

| <u>Park</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Legislation</u> | <u>Notes on Conditions Specified in Legislation</u> |
|--|-------------|--------------------|--|
| Black Canyon of the Gunnison (exp.) | 10/99 | P.L. 106-76 4(e) | Grazing permit held for lifetime of individual permit holder, or until dissolution of corporate permit holders; permit holders may voluntarily retire permits beforehand |
| Capitol Reef (expansion) | 9/88 | 16 USC 2736 nt | permits available to those using park as of 12/18/71 for their lifetime, or for lifetime of any of their children born by 12/18/71; no increases in stock or physical improvements allowed; grazing will be managed to protect park’s natural and cultural resources |
| Dinosaur (expansion) | 9/60 | 74 Stat. 857 | 25-year leases available to those using the park for grazing prior to enactment and any heirs from immediate family alive at the time of enactment |
| Grand Canyon (expansion) | 1/75 | 16 USC 228(f) | Users in former G.C. National Monument allowed to graze under permit for their lifetime; Grazing in newly added areas allowed for the life of existing leases plus one more lease term |
| Grand Teton | 9/50 | 16 USC 406(d) | 25-year leases available to those using the park for grazing prior to enactment and any heirs from immediate family alive at the time of enactment; permanent stock paths to be built through park |

Table 5: Park Examples where Grazing Allowed with Provisions for Potential NPS Acquisition

| <u>Park</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Legislation</u> | <u>Notes on Conditions Specified in Legislation</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|---|
| Great Basin (expansion) | 4/96 | 16 USC 410mm | permits grazing; permittee may donate permit to Secretary of Interior, who must retire claim; grazing allotments may be offered outside park in exchange for those inside park |
| Death Valley | 10/94 | 16 USC 410aaa(5) | ranch inholdings maintained and grazing grandfathered at same levels as time of legislation, subject to NPS permitting; in the event that permitted inholdings are made available for sale, NPS will prioritize their purchase over other land acquisitions |
| Mojave | 10/94 | 16 USC s410aaa(50) | ranch inholdings maintained and grazing grandfathered at same levels as time of legislation, subject to NPS permitting; in the event that permitted inholdings are made available for sale, NPS will prioritize their purchase over other land acquisitions |

Whither Agriculture?

Interpretation and the Historicization of Grazing in Parks

In recent years, the National Park Service has devoted growing attention to the public interpretation of local, regional, and national agricultural history. Proponents of this movement, such as McEnaney (2001: 41), suggest that the NPS has a clear mandate to celebrate agricultural activities in parks because “our nation’s agricultural legacy has created a sense of shared identity, values, and nostalgia.” Park visitors often possess a view of agriculture that is romanticized and emphasizes the pastoral qualities of rural life. In practice, of course, the NPS has often found that the agricultural process, as it has existed in national parks, can be messy, unsightly, intractable, and politically fractious. Romanticized public expectations stand in sometimes stark contrast to the dirt, the hard labor, and the forms of poverty that often have accompanied American agrarian life; they also exist in sharp contrast to the automated capital-intensive realities of modern commercial agriculture as well. Indeed, when park visitors observe first-hand the realities of contemporary livestock grazing in parks, they are often critical, and sometimes even lobby for its exclusion.⁸

For the NPS, the need to interpret and even celebrate agricultural history while simultaneously preventing grazing’s collateral damage to park natural and cultural resources presents another “awkward balance” for the agency. Of course, NPS policy has in many cases rendered ranching a “historic” rather than a contemporary use of the park’s landscape. Ironically, many park units have worked diligently to eliminate ranching due to its apparent incompatibility with other NPS mandates and then, as ranching fades from the landscape, have developed extensive interpretive and cultural resource management programs intended to celebrate the history of ranching within the park. Arguably, ranching has been seen as most consistent with both NPS resource management mandates and visitor expectations if it is discussed in the past tense, as a commemorated aspect of national heritage, rather than as a living practice.

As in most cultural resource management efforts, there tends to be more of an emphasis on the documentation of the material culture and landmarks left behind by stockmen than on the stockmen themselves, reflecting in part the strong influence of the fields of archaeology, architecture, and landscape architecture on the priorities of cultural resource management. Accordingly, the NPS increasingly has attempted to preserve “agricultural landscapes” under the agency’s mandate to document and nominate properties under its management to the National Register of Historic Places.

The preservation of “agricultural landscapes” generally focuses upon those built portions of the cultural landscape – barns, fences, orchards, and other elements – due to their representativeness of particular periods in rural American history (cf. Wegman-French 2006; Scott 2005; Taylor and Gilbert 1996). In support of these efforts, the NPS Cultural Landscape program initiated a national-level investigation of the cultural landscapes within national parks associated with agricultural activity (Westmacott 1998). In practice, the emphasis upon agricultural material culture and landscapes, rather than agriculturalists, has proven to be a relatively tidy but in many ways unfulfilling exercise. As is true of any “historicized” landscape, the retention of objects in their absence of their social, economic and cultural contexts, for example, presents significant challenges to the full understanding or meaningful preservation of what were originally functional, evolving landscapes (Lowenthal 1975). More investigation on this point might prove revealing.

With the considerable momentum generated by National Register considerations, a growing number of NPS units have identified agricultural history as a core theme of their interpretive and resource management mandates. Today, some parks engage in the interpretation and even perpetuation of cattle ranching to support historical mandates; most prominent among these, perhaps, is Grant-Kohrs National Historic Site in Montana (established 1970), which boasts a working cattle ranch used in telling the story of cowboys and cattle empires associated with the site in the late 19th and 20th centuries. In cases such as these, the NPS becomes the agricultural land manager, with a vested interest in grazing and other agricultural activities within the park boundary.

There have been a number of other, smaller demonstration projects in Western parks with a history of ranching, such as at Yellowstone’s Lamar Buffalo Ranch, where NPS staff manage a working ranch for the edification and amusement of park visitors. Meanwhile in a number of Eastern parks, other forms of agriculture have become central to park interpretive efforts; plantation agriculture is now accentuated in the “Golden Crescent” sites of northeastern Florida and southeastern Georgia, for example. In some northeastern parks such as Marvin Van Buren NHS attempt to foster agricultural activities in and around the park to help reinforce the historical “context” associated with the park landscape’s “period of significance” in National Register terms (Stanton 2010). No doubt, in Western ranching parks especially, these contemporary park-sponsored efforts bear little resemblance to their historical precedents and referents. By extinguishing ranching and then commemorating it, or by creating small demonstration

ranches, the NPS has effectively 'compartmentalized' the agricultural experience of parks, so that it is safe, controllable, and manageable for agency staff.

This shift in the interpretation and management of agricultural heritage reflects a larger shift of the perception of agricultural landscapes and their national importance within American conservation circles. Non-governmental organizations such as the American Farmland Trust, the National Trust for Historic Preservation's "Barn Again!" program, and the National Council for Historic Preservation have allied themselves with NPS efforts with their own programs for the preservation of agricultural landscapes - particularly preindustrial and family farms. This external lobbying has run somewhat counter to the lobbying of other entities that traditionally support the National Park Service mission, such as the Wilderness Society, who have sought to preserve natural resources and landscapes to the exclusion of those of anthropogenic origin and to eliminate grazing from parks. Efforts to strike a balance between these contending pressures no doubt contribute to the very limited and historicized preservation of agriculture in parks. This balance may also work against the development of a comprehensive and internally consistent NPS policy on the issue of agriculture in parks.

Meanwhile, ranching occupies a very different position in the domain of natural resource management. In addition to active monitoring of grazed areas, the restoration of landscapes altered by decades of grazing has been a focal point of many natural resource management programs within NPS units. Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument is a typical example, where the family of Robert Louis Gray used the natural springs to water cattle for roughly a half century before NPS management; the springs now located within the park served as the Gray family's principal staging ground for rounding up cattle, which freely returned from the open range and gathered there to drink. Gradual restoration of the springs, the vegetation, and the landscape has been among the top natural resource management goals in the park (Broyles and Huey 1997; Greene 1977). These efforts, of course, create interpretive opportunities that intersect with historical and cultural interpretation in interesting ways. Little is said, typically, regarding the NPS role in eliminating agriculture within parks, even as the natural resource 'victories' associated with restoration of grazed landscapes is of growing interest. In time, no doubt, the NPS will devise more nuanced and multidimensional interpretive strategies that can tell the intersecting human, environmental, and administrative stories of agriculture in ways that are illuminating to park visitors and paint dignified portraits of all key protagonists in these stories.

Alternative Models for Agriculture in Parks: Four Case Studies

In the effort to find workable solutions for the continuation of agriculture within national parks, the NPS, the U.S. Department of the Interior, and private park promoters have exhibited considerable innovation. This section provides an overview of unique and varied historical trends at four NPS units, developed in the late 20th century, that have employed unusual methods to maintain a balance between agricultural interests and park resource management mandates over the last five decades. These include: Point Reyes National Seashore, Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, John Day Fossil Beds National Monument, and Mojave National Preserve.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Point Reyes National Seashore, on the central California coast, is an outstanding example of a park where agriculture has persisted, and perhaps even thrived, within a unit of the NPS. The Point Reyes peninsula, which juts into the Pacific Ocean north of San Francisco, is graced with long beaches, cliffs pounded by a surging sea, but also rolling hills, woods, pasture, sand dunes, lagoons, and esteros. It is a "land in motion" on the boundary between the Pacific and American plates which form a portion of the earth's crust. What separates the peninsula from the rest of Marin County, California, is a rift zone containing many large and small faults often lumped together with the tag of "San Andreas." Stress far below the earth's surface is manifested in the jumbled appearance of the peninsula's topographic features.

National Park Service interest in the creation of a national seashore at Point Reyes began in 1935 with a study, though the costs of acquiring land from private owners stopped any moves toward congressional authorization until the 1950s. At that point widespread concern that open space along the coastline near San Francisco Bay was fast disappearing drove another, more comprehensive feasibility study by the NPS. Against this backdrop, Congress authorized the national seashore in September 1962 to preserve its natural character, but also to prevent urban sprawl at Point Reyes, where developers might have eventually subdivided some 50,000 acres that formed the heart of this national park system unit. The later NPS study noted that much open space remained on the peninsula, and just 25 owners had title to virtually all the land away from the towns

of Bolinas, Inverness, Olema, and Point Reyes Station in 1960, with much of it used as pasture (USDI-NPS 1961).

Congress did not mandate that the land on the peninsula continue to be used for agriculture, but the price of holding back urban sprawl and intrusions on open space demanded the perpetuation of ranching. The NPS could acquire land from ranchers on a willing seller basis, but was also empowered to condemn property where the owners chose not to continue agricultural operations. Over time the NPS acquisition program secured federal title to all but 6500 acres within the park's authorized boundary of more than 71,000 acres, including almost 54,000 acres of land and roughly 17,000 acres of waterways and intertidal lands (Sadin 2007).

Beef ranching at Point Reyes began in the 1830s through Mexican land grants, whereas dairy operations commenced two decades later in response to demand from the urban centers of San Francisco Bay. Dairy and beef cattle dominated land tenure in what became the national seashore, given how four-fifths of the originally inhabited areas within the National Seashore was split among a little more than 20 ranches in 1960 – the other fifth consisting of residences and small agricultural inholdings. The continued operations of dairies and ranches became an integral part of the park, and the NPS found itself having to work with ranchers directly as neighbor and often owner. When the NPS consummated purchases of ranch land, it usually granted reservations of use and occupancy for a period of 25 years to those who wished to continue ranching.

As these reservations of use and occupancy began to expire in the late 1980s, park management began to negotiate leases and grazing permits with an eye toward continued investment on the part of ranchers at Point Reyes. The latter consequently became tenants subject to five-year rental agreements, with individual terms based on independent appraisals. With the shift from inholder to lessee came permit fees, based on animal unit month rates established by the Bureau of Land Management for public rangeland in California. Leases could be renewed indefinitely as long as the ranch operation remained viable. Special use permits were also issued to allow certain activities, including some agricultural activities, for a set period, but with no provision for their renewal (Sadin 2007).

The progression from a park where most ranchers had either fee simple ownership or 25-year reservations, to one characterized by short-term leases and permits, has not come without occasional tension regarding terms and conditions of occupancy. Conflict

might also arise from changes imposed by the NPS in range management (such as pasturing fewer animals in an allotment) or through terminating practices like the ranchers' use of borrow pits. NPS law enforcement staff used to be the primary point of contact between the agency and the ranching community, but the park has labored to develop collaborative opportunities, centered around such shared interests as stream restoration and barn repair.

Restrictions on changes to ranching properties increasingly has been guided by cultural resources concerns, with management goals informed by landscape studies and identification of characteristics that made a property eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (Livingston 1994). Viewshed management along roadways and other visitor infrastructure has also played a growing role in park efforts to reshape the agricultural landscape – with park staff sometimes requesting that ranchers use certain types of materials on building exteriors, or even providing ranchers with materials and labor if they comply with park requests.

Responses to these pressures within the ranching community have been mixed. An organization representing ranchers' interests, the Point Reyes Ranchers Association, represents many of the ranching families in the park and sometimes serves as an intermediary between members of the ranching community and the NPS when grievances arise – as they inevitably do. While NPS management has clearly hindered ranching in some ways, ranching families are clearly aware that – in part due to park management – the “Point Reyes” name now connotes natural grandeur and has its own imprimatur recognized in the San Francisco metropolitan area and beyond. Some families now enthusiastically capitalize on this, using the “Point Reyes” name for their products and some are moving into specialty organic niche markets with their products as a result, apparently with some success.

As landlord at Point Reyes, the NPS continues to be challenged by the complexities inherent with maintaining economically viable ranch operations within a recreation area where visitors see natural values as predominant. Many of the ranchers have nevertheless viewed the NPS presence as beneficial, since the peninsula also represents the only large block of land in Marin County remaining in agricultural production. It can also be seen in a wider context, as part of a county-wide effort that began with the imposition of restrictive zoning in an attempt to stop sprawl emanating from San Francisco.⁹ Regulators and many of the ranchers and other residents subsequently built an alliance that was highlighted by a land trust aimed at buying development rights for much of the

145,000 acres agricultural land in Marin County that lies outside of the national seashore. Taken together, the NPS and county efforts to perpetuate dairy and beef ranching along with open space in the face of constant urban pressure are instructive, Point Reyes National Seashore has been seen by some as an experiment that offers insight into how public and private uses could be combined to meet the needs of disparate stakeholders (Hart 1991).

EBEY'S LANDING NATIONAL HISTORICAL RESERVE

Located north of Seattle on Whidbey Island in Puget Sound, Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve encompasses 21,700 acres of land and water where no point is more than 2.5 miles from shore. In forming a bend on this part of the island, bluffs are a dramatic feature of both Penn Cove as well as the reserve's western edge along the Strait of Juan de Fuca. Lakes and lagoons can also be found in the reserve, as can kettles (depressions created by ice pockets left from melting glaciers) and wetlands. The reserve is more than 85 percent privately owned, with predominate uses being either agricultural or woodland, though residential land and the town of Coupeville are also within its boundaries. Only approximately 2% is in direct NPS ownership.

Authorized by Congress in 1978, Ebey's Landing is the nation's first national historical reserve. Legislative intent for the reserve aimed at perpetuating agriculture and other forms of traditional land tenure through a framework of planning and intergovernmental cooperation. In the case of Ebey's Landing, legislation assigned management responsibility to a unit of local government. This took the form of a trust board created by the cooperative planning process among state, county, and town governments in addition to the NPS. Its composition includes seven volunteers who are residents and appointed by the county and town governments to four year terms, a representative from Washington State Parks, and a member from the NPS. This makes the NPS role advisory rather than regulatory, though it has sought to purchase development rights to key sites within the reserve through the federal government.

At the time of the reserve's creation, the NPS promoted a new type of unit. The so-called "Greenline" park served as a means of involving the agency in regional planning, so as to spark creation of new units where traditional ones were impossible to establish. As a place of national concern, any such reserve required designating an area under a mixed pattern of public and private ownership. Comprehensive and cooperative planning could then aim at preserving nationally significant resources, so that the federal

planning role assigned to the NPS in the reserve represented just one component of a partnership involving state, county, and city governments. As a partner, the NPS could directly manage a portion of the land, but acquisition focused on only a few parcels that allowed for public access when no other means were available. More often the NPS obtained development rights to private tracts in the reserve through scenic or conservation easements as a way of perpetuating forms of land use rooted in the historical past. At Ebey's Landing, the closest applicable administrative model is perhaps that of the English national park, where cooperative planning efforts for a mix of private and public land form the backbone of management (Foresta 1984).

Protection of the rural landscape, in particular its historic fabric and heritage, is the main aim of the trust board. They promote the preservation of cultural resources while administering the reserve, though the NPS can be a conduit for grants to offset the costs of operations and maintenance as well as in supplying other types of assistance. The NPS can provide no more than 50 percent of the reserve's annual budget according to the authorizing legislation, so ongoing financial support from Island County and Coupeville is critical for realizing the trust board's management goals. Authority to acquire land within the reserve has largely been used to obtain development rights through scenic easements, even though fee title to several high priority tracts was secured through purchase from owners in the 1980s (McKinley 1992).

With considerably less leverage than in its traditional park units, the NPS depends on local zoning and related land use controls to achieve the goal of preserving open space within the reserve. It proceeded through the trust board under Island County's comprehensive plan which encouraged the continued existence of agricultural and rural uses by guiding residential and commercial growth into existing clusters. The idea was to manage and perpetuate patterns, such as how historic settlement tied to donation land claims of the 1850s could still be seen in the reserve's road system and fence lines. Agriculture accounts for more than 40 percent of the land area in the reserve and is centered on three prairies located south and east of Coupeville (Evans-Hatch and Evans-Hatch 2005).

Groundwork for establishing the historical reserve designation came from listing Central Whidbey Island Historic District (CWIHD) on the National Register of Historic Places in 1973. The historic district and reserve boundaries coincide, with the CWIHD including a diverse range of structures, many of them related to agriculture. Supplementing the original nomination were several cultural resources inventories conducted

by the NPS during the 1980s which became the basis for adding to the historic district. The landscape inventory in particular allowed for subsequent work to evaluate and measure change in the reserve. This database provided practical assistance to the county's design review board, and a historic advisory committee charged with reviewing building permits for properties listed on or eligible for the National Register (Rottle 2003).

The NPS inventories also provided a foundation for sophisticated analysis of cultural landscape integrity, as well as recommendations for preserving farm land in the reserve. Those recommendations utilized a matrix to illustrate how the NPS could facilitate partnerships to protect the land, support the farmers, and improve markets for agricultural products. Consultants identified the three most important partners that the NPS had to cultivate, starting with Island County, which could adopt a special zoning designation or overlay district that covered the reserve. The agency could also help establish a farm land trust to oversee acquisition of conservation easements and parcels suited to agriculture, but the trust might also operate a development credit bank. This "Ebey's Farmland Trust" and the NPS might also help farmers establish a cooperative, an organization to focus on both processing and marketing agricultural products. The cooperative could then give farmers a direct role in managing land in the reserve (Jones and Jones 2001).

JOHN DAY FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Situated in the semi-arid interior of Oregon, John Day Fossil Beds National Monument represents a unique experiment in NPS-rancher relations. At the heart of John Day Fossil Beds National Monument are three former and noncontiguous state parks transferred to the National Park Service in 1975. They are located in the river basin of that name, which drains some 8,000 square miles of north central Oregon. As such, the monument was authorized by Congress to be just slightly larger than 14,000 acres, yet the three units are representative of the wider basin. Largest and furthest upstream is the Sheep Rock Unit, situated about 10 miles northwest of Dayville in Grant County. Next in size and some 30 miles due west of Sheep Rock in Wheeler County on a tributary stream called Bridge Creek is the Painted Hills Unit. The smallest unit, Clarno, is also in Wheeler County and furthest downriver, located roughly 20 miles north of the Painted Hills.

Of the three units, Sheep Rock has the largest amount of relief and the greatest topographic diversity. It possesses bottomland that supports irrigated pasture, crops, and

residential plots in addition to canyons like Picture Gorge, steep sided landforms like the Blue Basin, and upland range. Painted Hills, by contrast, possesses the colorful namesake landforms of weathered volcanic ash, as well as a riparian corridor along Bridge Creek, along with formations containing fossil plants and animals. Impressive “palisades” of ash-laden mudflows tower above Pine Creek in the Clarno Unit, but monument land there also includes nut beds and a mammal quarry along with two canyons and a non-profit educational field station run by the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry.

Tremendous outpourings of lava during the distant geological past once covered most of the upper John Day Basin, but water and time have worked in tandem to strip away much of its basalt cap. Exposed layers, especially in the three park units, reveal an unusually coherent fossil record spanning some 40 million years and can be seen rather easily. Fossilized evidence allows for study of evolutionary and environmental change over this period (65 to 25 million years ago) since rock formations can be correlated with a place on the geologic time scale. Juniper and sage dominate the modern flora in all three units, as well as the semi-arid upper basin in general. Riparian areas, however, contain comparatively lush vegetation and in some cases can support irrigated agriculture. Livestock grazing remains the basin’s main industry due to dry conditions and often rugged topography, factors that restrict crops to riverine areas. Grazing has often been seen as a benign use with respect to the basin’s record of ancient life, since fossils are often found either too far below the ground to be affected, or when on the surface, in areas of high relief. Nevertheless, there are exceptions to this generalization, with one example being impressions of ancient plants found on Leaf Hill in a relatively gentle part of the Painted Hills Unit.

While much of the fossil-bearing formations in the upper John Day Basin is federal and within the existing grazing allotments issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service. Since the national monument’s establishment in 1975, the NPS has acquired all but 1,562 acres within the authorized boundaries and generally limited trespass grazing through a fencing program implemented at the Sheep Rock and Painted Hills units during the 1980s. The agency did, however, inherit grazing leases from BLM upon the monument’s establishment, but that number fell to two by 1980. Most of the grazing on land administered by the NPS took place on a tract located outside of the Sheep Rock Unit once the monument’s boundaries were revised in 1978 (Mark 1996). That tract was retained by the NPS for possible future exchanges involving fee acquisition or scenic easements that might be negotiated for private land still located

within the monument's authorized boundaries. A proposed exchange, one included within the monument's general management plan update of 2008, proposes acquisition of a private tract on Cathedral Rock. This represents an addition to the monument and is contingent on the owners acquiring a tract administered by the Bureau of Land Management in exchange for it. Short of fee acquisition, scenic easements could prevent adverse actions by land owners, such as increasing the density of residential structures or changes in fence types near the road corridors or prominent features. They essentially allow the NPS to buy development rights, while perpetuating traditional uses like ranching or crops within the authorized boundaries of the monument (NPS 2008).

The NPS took more active steps to perpetuate agriculture through a lease, once grazing ceased on the Cant Ranch in the Sheep Rock Unit. Acquisition of the house for a visitor center and operational headquarters in 1976 had come with the condition that grazing there continue for an additional seven years, so termination allowed the NPS to lease the 74 acres of irrigated bottomland for hay in order to possibly defray the costs of rehabilitating the land it now held in fee. The lease arrangement, however, lacked enough incentive for a nearby property owner to work as the NPS had intended. Even so, the fields remained an important part of a historic district listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1984. Several NPS officials also found the lease arrangement to be a good case study of how to handle similar agricultural properties elsewhere, especially ones that included irrigated crops, an orchard, and ornamental vegetation associated with the house (Taylor and Gilbert 1996).

With the moving of most NPS operations in the Sheep Rock Unit to the Thomas Condon Paleontological Center, the focus at Cant Ranch shifted toward interpreting historic ranch operations. This posed some problems, since the time period selected was when sheep dominated grazing in the early part of the twentieth century. A general shift to cattle by the end of World War II had since taken place on this property and throughout the John Day Basin. Even visualizing a contemporary cattle operation remained difficult while visitors remained in the park, since ranchers usually owned bottomland for growing hay and winter pasture, but then ran their herds on allotments located on higher elevation public land situated away from the "home place" during summer months. In the first four years following the monument's establishment, NPS officials had also discussed utilizing the Cant Ranch to embody the history of grazing in north central Oregon, but this broader sweep is still largely absent at the site (Mark 1996; Beckham and Lentz 2000).

MOJAVE NATIONAL PRESERVE

Encompassing more than 1.5 million acres, the Mojave National Preserve is located entirely within the southeast corner of California. It is representative of the eastern Mojave Desert, yet large enough to include transitional elements of the Great Basin and Sonoran deserts. The preserve is thus a place where three of the four principal deserts in North America meet. Bounded largely on the north and south by interstate freeways (I-15 and I-40, respectively), the preserve is in one of the least populated parts of California.

Mojave National Preserve contains a variety of desert landscapes, and ranges in elevation from some 1,000 feet near Baker on I-15 to almost 8,000 feet at the top of Clark Mountain. The preserve's habitats can overlap depending upon the locale, but starting from desert washes and climbing upward, visitors and residents encounter creosote bush scrub, dunes, then cactus-yucca scrub, Joshua tree woodland, and finally the piñon-juniper woodland. Atop some of the highest peaks are relict stands of Douglas-fir and white pine, though the mountains as a whole the piñon pine and juniper predominates. Lower down, the emblematic Joshua tree is widely in evidence, not only in forests on Cima Dome and in the Lanfair Valley, but also on the gently sloping alluvial plains known as bajadas. The preserve also includes a number of mountain ranges, lava beds, huge sand dunes, and dry lakes called playas (Nystrom 2003).

The preserve designation (which allows for hunting and continuation of uses such as grazing) came from passage of the California Desert Protection Act (CDPA) in 1994. This legislation transferred administration of what had been known as the East Mojave National Scenic Area from the Bureau of Land Management to the National Park Service. The national scenic area created by BLM in 1980 had come at the heels of a failed attempt to legislate an "East Mojave National Park," whereby the BLM promised to showcase "multiple use management" over some 1.2 million acres. While providing for continuation of hunting, mining, and grazing, BLM managers were to pay special attention to prospective wilderness designation through a number of study areas as well as habitat conservation such as that for the endangered desert tortoise. When the CDPA replaced the nation's first NSA with the preserve, it allowed for a continuation of multiple uses, albeit more restrictively (Mark 1984; Nystrom 2003).

According to the CDPA, grazing in the preserve could continue indefinitely. Part of the reason was that the preserve not only included private tracts, but also 11 grazing allotments covering 1.25 million acres of federal land at the time of its establishment. While

the forage is relatively good in relation to the larger Mojave Desert, the preserve's harsh environment provided for only 3,400 head of cattle in 1986, or feed for an average of one cow and calf per 350 to 600 acres. Grazing in the preserve is thus quite dispersed, occurring year-round through rotation within allotments. It provided an income for only five to eight ranching families by the mid 1990s. This represented less than one half of one percent of cattle grazed on public range in California, and the entire Mojave Desert yielded thereabouts of 0.3 percent of the state's beef production (Hamlin 2003).

Ranching in the preserve area began in the 1870s, with the numbers of cattle considerably greater before passage of the Taylor Grazing Act in 1934. The legislation required users to fence their ranges and pay fees on federal lands for the forage consumed. Its regulations, along with changing market forces, contributed to some consolidation of ranch holdings in the preserve and elsewhere. Grazing retained enough of a political constituency, however, by 1994 for the CDPA to allow the practice to continue indefinitely in the preserve. The NPS could acquire ranches on a willing-seller basis, at which point grazing permits for allotments were retired. Within a decade the NPS made several key purchases of ranches and their respective allotments, leaving just one major cattle operation in the preserve. This reduced total grazing in Mojave National Preserve by more than 80 percent from 1994. About half of the private lands, has been owned by individuals as a legacy from early homesteading and includes some grazing. The biggest purchase of exclusively private holdings by the NPS came in 2003 and consisted of some 80,000 acres that had once been part of a grant to the Southern Pacific Railroad (Nystrom 2003).

Opportunities for Future Research

Agricultural users are in many cases intimately familiar with park landscapes, and have their own attachments to, and understandings of, the land that arguably rival any park constituency. They are also creators of the cultural landscape, the builders of cabins, fences, spring boxes, and myriad other features of the built landscape; they have blazed trails and left their blazes on trees. In many parks, they must still coordinate and communicate with park staff on diverse issues, from resource protection and public safety to road maintenance and the completion of National Register nominations.

The NPS has sometimes supported research on historical agricultural practices within particular regions, in support of interpretation and research management efforts within specific park units – especially within the course of larger Historic Resource Studies that address all historical resources within a park.¹⁰ Less commonly, the NPS has supported research that directly involves living agriculturalists or the descendents of agriculturalists who have used park lands. On those occasions when the NPS has reached out to past or present agricultural users, the results have been surprisingly productive. Their knowledge and experiences have contributed immensely to park cultural resource and interpretive efforts, such as studies of “Canyonland’s cowboys” and the endurance of their lifestyle in and around Canyonlands National Park (Negri 1997), or studies of the enduring ranching communities found within Point Reyes National Seashore (Livingstone 1995). Their knowledge also has been used to solve natural resource questions, such as the origins, configuration, and species composition of grassy balds at Great Smoky Mountain National Park (Lindsay 1976).

Still, with a few noteworthy exceptions such as these, there has been very little documentation of the lives, values, and perspectives of agricultural communities associated with national parks, beyond the very limited discourse surrounding compliance. In light of the history presented in this document, it is perhaps understandable how this situation has emerged. With historical relationships that often were adversarial, there have been enduring barriers in the communication between agricultural users and park staff. Detailed multidisciplinary studies of agriculture and its role in parks, such as was proposed but never fully completed at Capitol Reef, would be well advised in light of the diverse economic, social, cultural, and resource management issues involved (National Research Council 1984). Tied directly to management decisions regarding the expulsion of grazers, the Capitol Reef research proposal appears to have collapsed under its own political weight. Similarly, the compliance context of most information-

gathering surrounding agricultural communities has restricted the scope of this documentation. It has almost surely biased its findings as well. To be sure, compliance duties related to sometimes contentious proposed management actions are a poor context in which to get to know one's neighbors. Only occasionally, such as in the course of general management plans and other larger planning efforts, have these works revealed much beyond the predictable interests and political agendas of their participants – ranging from the agricultural users and associated organizations that reflexively seek to push back most regulatory limitations on grazing, to the environmentalist and associated organizations who reflexively seek to eliminate agricultural activities outright (e.g., NPS 2008; Jones and Jones 2001).

There is an urgent need in many parks for comparatively “pure” research, not tied to compliance for any specific proposed federal action, that can inform many aspects of park management while being separated from the short-term interests, biases, and narrow communications surrounding compliance. In turn, documentation gathered in the course of these efforts can still be used to assist compliance tasks in the future, as they emerge. Without the kind of information yielded by more focused investigations of agricultural communities, the management and interpretation of many of these parks proceeds without entire domains of information that might help their efforts to be more productive, more accurate, and more likely to facilitate enduring goodwill between the NPS and its rural neighbors.

While some park managers may feel that the knowledge and interests of agricultural communities is predictable, and centered on mundane, well-documented themes, a review of even basic compliance documentation on the agricultural issue reveals otherwise. When asked about their concerns and priorities regarding NPS management, agricultural users often cite – not just material factors that affect their use of parks – but just as critically, the relationship of continued agricultural use of parks with relatively “intangible” themes: the viability of their communities, their understandings of their history, their sense of attachment to the landscape, their efforts to maintain rural traditions and pass them on to future generations. For example, in one NPS grazing permit EIS relating to Glen Canyon, which solicited comments broadly from the communities of agricultural users, one of the most common responses was (as summarized by NPS staff), “Grazing on the desert and mountains [of Glen Canyon] is a part of the cultural practices and beliefs of our living community, rooted in our history, and important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of our community” (Glen Canyon NRA 1998: 6). It is often these “cultural practices and beliefs” that underlie much of the in-

tensity, tone, and content of NPS communications with ranching communities, but are among the least understood dimensions of these exchanges among NPS managers. Certainly, it would be in the best interest of NPS resource managers to take a closer look at these practices and beliefs, their origins, their connections to specific lands and resources under NPS management, and their implications.

Clearly, there are many other questions that NPS managers might have, which could be answered by focused inquiry into the knowledge and perspective of past and present agricultural users of parks. For those who wish to understand the genesis of the agricultural landscapes that the NPS now manages, this kind of investigation seems essential. Many questions readily present themselves:

- Are there things that might be learned about the cultural landscapes of parks, their origins, their past use, or their significance, by systematic interviews and site visits with past and present agricultural users?
- Are there issues and resources of mutual concern to park staff and agricultural users that could serve as a foundation for cooperation, and help to ameliorate any past conflict between these groups?
- Are there particular places and resources in the park that are of enduring importance to the traditions, practices and identities of historically associated agricultural communities? Might some of these be eligible as Traditional Cultural Properties or warrant documentation as Cultural Landscapes?
- Are there resource monitoring tasks in which agricultural users might assist, and from which they might benefit?
- Are agricultural users receptive to the “historicization” of agricultural landscapes under the National Register of Historic Places, or aesthetic changes to the agrarian landscapes within parks? Are there certain kinds of changes, compatible with these NPS mandates, that they might receive positively?
- Are there oral histories or stories that the community of agricultural park users have, relating to lands and resources in the park, that they would like assistance recording? Would the community wish to share these through interpretive venues with park visitors?

This is, of course, only a representative list.

Researchers often are able to assist parks in gathering more information about these types of issues, by conducting research addressing the communities of agricultural users and their past and present associations with park lands and resources. Anthropological research has been especially effective in gaining access to these perspectives, as well as oral histories and other information that might help answer these questions. Much research of this type has been sponsored by the Ethnography Program of the NPS, as well as Regional Anthropologists and park cultural resource staff, through a variety of studies classified as “ethnographies” within NPS guidelines. Director’s Order 28, the National Park Service’s Cultural Resource Management Guideline, provides a range of interconnected methodologies used in the course of such ethnographic research,

“[researchers] use diverse methods such as analysis of archival and published documents and historic photographs, census taking, individual and group interviews, oral and life histories, [mapping], cognitive analyses, site visits, participant observation, surveys, focus groups, decision charting, place name analysis, and genealogical charting” (DO-28, Chapter 10, B[2]).

DO-28 also identifies a number of study types that are used within the agency to conduct research with resident communities (Chapter 10, B[3]). They include, but are not limited, to the following:

Traditional Use Studies – Traditional Use Studies are conducted to give NPS managers access to detailed information regarding “traditional resource use and management regimes” of communities that have historical ties to parks. Drawing extensively from interviews with past and present park users, as well as archival and other documentary evidence, the products of these studies are typically reports that provide detailed information for the use of NPS interpretive and resource management staff. NPS-28 specifies that studies of this type must “be conducted and periodically updated for all parks having traditional resource users.” While these studies have commonly been applied to Native American communities with historical ties to parks, they can also be used to document the historical practices, as well as contemporary knowledge, values, and concerns of agriculturalists with ties to parks.

Ethnohistory – Ethnohistories are conducted to give NPS managers access to information regarding communities’ ties to parks within a historical context. These studies direct particular attention to historical changes in the ways that

people have used, understood, and valued resources that exist within contemporary parks. Special topics of investigation often include changes in land use practices, family and economic organization of communities, migrations, and responses to changing land management regimes when parks and other public lands are established. Interviews are commonly used in Ethnohistories, in combination with a detailed survey of existing data within published and archival accounts related to the study area and study communities.

Oral and Life Histories – Oral and Life Histories are conducted to give NPS managers detailed information regarding the recollections of living people, with particular knowledge of, or ties to, the park. These studies, generally smaller than a Traditional Use Study or Ethnohistory, draw from a limited number of interviews with key “informants” to elicit information germane to park interpretation and management, but also involve limited archival and other documentary research to provide context and corroboration for themes that emerge within interviews. These studies are often combined with other study types, such as Traditional Use Studies or Ethnohistories.

Also, the History program of the NPS sponsors types of studies that are useful for documenting park’s agricultural legacies within parks. Certainly, oral histories are carried out through this program, as they are within the Ethnography program as well. The two preeminent report types, the Historic Resource Study (HRS) and Administrative History, may provide information on agricultural traditions within parks, amidst a range of other themes relating to historic resources and park administrative history, respectively. Most units within the NPS already have these documents completed – indeed, such reports have served as an important source of data for preceding sections of this document – but in-depth coverage of agricultural issues varies considerably. These two report types can be periodically updated by parks, allowing park staff the opportunity to request the addition of material on previously underreported themes, agriculture among them. However, the History program also sponsors Special History Studies. These can be undertaken in support of a park’s HRS or Administrative History, or can be conducted as stand-alone studies. Special History Studies allow research on particular themes that are of pressing importance to parks for interpretive, resource management, or planning purposes. While most studies in the History program perhaps do not provide the depth of information on park user’s knowledge, values, and concerns as Ethnography and social science program studies might, they can still be of critical importance in understanding the context and changes in agricultural activities over time.

Housed within the Natural Resources Program of the National Park Service, the NPS Social Science Division has parallel objectives, but approaches park relationships with associated communities using tools from such disciplines as sociology, psychology, economics, and human geography. This NPS division often sponsors research on such topics as visitor expectations of parks, the economic impacts of parks within adjacent communities, and the design of resource protection measures – such as signage that is effective in conveying park wishes in ways that are intelligible and generally well-received by visitor populations. While a diverse range of methods are used in these studies, reflecting the breadth of the disciplines involved, this Division is especially effective in generating meaningful quantitative measures of park users' values, perceptions, knowledge and expectations – using surveys and other standardized research instruments.

No doubt, with sufficient, time, budget, and agency commitment, multidisciplinary studies of particular parks, or groups of parks, would be especially revealing. Drawing upon the skills of environmental historians, cultural anthropologists, cultural geographers, and other social scientists, the NPS might be able to generate a portrait of agriculture within particular parks that would answer a wide range of interrelated questions. Such multidisciplinary efforts might effectively illuminate the cultural, social, economic, and technological influences that have shaped agriculture and agriculturalist-agency relations from the beginnings of NPS management. Designed properly, and involving significant NPS staff cooperation, such an investigation might point toward specific policy and management alternatives that can foster improved relationships with rural communities, improved interpretation, and improved resource management strategies.

There would also be tremendous value in the development of a broad, comparative study, assessing the past, present, and future of agriculture in parks throughout the national park system. Such an investigation might draw heavily from interviews with past and present NPS staff and leadership as well as past and present agricultural users, in addition to employing files and “gray literature” documents from various parks, and a variety of published sources. Such a comparative perspective might better illuminate many of the trends and processes outlined in this document, and provide the NPS with a comprehensive statement as to the agency's experiences with agricultural users within specific regions and periods of NPS operations. Importantly, such an analysis could be a critical first step in assessing policy alternatives for the contemporary National Park Service. Aided by such a background document, the NPS would be in a much better

position to articulate any new agency policies that might provide additional clarification and coherence on this complex issue. Such a background document might also prove valuable in assessing ways of addressing agricultural activities within the context of proposals for new NPS units, new National Heritage Areas, and other venues for NPS management and assistance.

In addition to technical studies addressing this theme, there is certainly a need to document the larger story of the NPS and its relationship to agricultural interests in the West - as briefly summarized in the introductory sections of this document - in a way that is accessible to a general readership. In the extensive literature addressing the history of the National Park Service, the agricultural story is a frequently if parenthetically mentioned subtheme. The agricultural users' perspectives are remarkably silent in these works, and the celebration of the agency's preservationist legacy tends - intentionally or not - to present agricultural users in the role of antagonist. Certainly, this story could be told in a way that is fair, balanced, and does not cast anyone as an unambiguous villain. The National Park Service and its neighbors in myriad rural communities throughout the American West would benefit much from such a treatment, ideally a book-length treatment, that would tell the story in its full richness, for the edification and enjoyment of contemporary readers and future generations alike.

Sources

Albright, Horace

1985. *The Birth of the National Park Service: The Founding Years, 1913-33*. (Institute of the American West Books). Salt Lake City: Howe Brothers.

Albright, Horace M. and Marian Albright Schenck

1999. *Creating the National Park Service: The Missing Years*. (Forward by Robert M. Utley). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Anderson, Michael F.

2000. *Polishing the Jewel: An Administrative History of Grand Canyon National Park*. Monograph No. 11. Grand Canyon, AZ: Grand Canyon Association.

Bachelet, Dominique, James M. Lenihan, Christopher Daly, and Ronald P. Neilson

2000. Interactions between Fire, Grazing and Climate Change at Wind Cave National Park, SD. *Ecological Modeling*. 134(2-3): 229-44.

Beckham, Stephen Dow and Florence K. Lentz

2000. *Rocks and Hard Places: Historic Resources Study, John Day Fossil Beds National Monument, Oregon*. Seattle: U.S.D.I. National Park Service, Pacific-West Region.

Belsky, A.J. and D.M. Blumenthal

1997. Effects of Livestock Grazing on Stand Dynamics and Soils in Upland Forests of the Interior West. *Conservation Biology*. 11: 315-327.

Belsky, A.J., A. Matzke, and S. Uselman

1997. Survey of Livestock Influences on Stream and Riparian Ecosystems in the Western United States. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*. 54: 416-531.

Brown, Frederick L.

2009. *Paiutes, Mormons, and Mericats: A History of Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument*. Seattle: USDI National Park Service Pacific-West Region.

Broyles, Bill and George H.H. Huey

1997. *Organ Pipes National Monument: Where Edges Meet*. Tucson, AZ: Southwest Parks and Monuments Association.

Campbell, Carlos C.

1960. *Birth of a National Park in the Great Smoky Mountains*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

- Chase, Allston
1987. *Playing God in Yellowstone*. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Clarke, Jeanne Nienaber
1996. *Roosevelt's Warrior: Harold L. Ickes and the New Deal*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press
- Clary, David A.
1972. *The Place Where Hell Bubbled Up: A History of the First National Park*. Washington, D.C.: USDI National Park Service.
- Cotham, Steve
2006. *The Great Smoky Mountains National Park*. Charleston SC: Arcadia Publishing.
- Cramton, Louis C.
1932. *Early History of Yellowstone National Park and its Relation to National Park Policies*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Clemensen, A. Berle
1987. *Cattle, Copper, and Cactus: A History of Saguaro National Monument*. Denver: USDI National Park Service, Denver Service Center.
- Daughetry, John
1999. *A Place Called Jackson Hole: A Historic Resource Study of Grand Teton National Park*. Moose, WY: Grand Teton Natural History Association.
- Davis, Kathy
2006. *General and Specific Legislative Authorities Pertaining to Domestic and Feral Livestock Grazing in the National Park Service*. (amended ed. with additions by Steven Bekedem) Phoenix: USDI National Park Service, Southern Arizona Office.
- Dilsaver, Lary M.
1990. *Challenge of the Big Trees: A Resource History of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks*. Three Rivers, CA: Sequoia Natural History Association.
- Donahue, Debra L.
1999. *The Western Range Revisited: Removing Livestock from Public Lands to Conserve Native Biodiversity*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Ekaterini, Vlahos

2005. Preserving Ranches: Not Only Possible, but Imperative. *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 2(1).

Evans-Hatch, Gail E.H. and Michael Evans-Hatch

2005. *Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve: Historic Resources Study*. Seattle: USDI National Park Service, Pacific-West Region.

Fiege, Mark, Maren Bzdek and Ruth Alexander

2008. Parks and Pastoralism: A Preliminary Administrative History of Livestock Grazing in the National Parks. Draft chapter and prospectus from proposed "Livestock Grazing in the National Parks: An Administrative History." Fort Collins, CO: Center for Public History and Archaeology, Colorado State University.

Finch, L. Boyd

2008. *Legacies of Camelot: Stewart and Lee Udall, American Culture, and the Arts*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Foresta, Ronald A.

1984. *America's National Parks and Their Keepers*. Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future.

Frye, Bradford J.

1998. *From Barrier to Crossroads: An Administrative History of Capitol Reef National Park*. (2 vols.) Cultural Resource Selections. Denver: USDI National Park Service, Intermountain Region.

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area

1998. Glen Canyon National Recreation Area Grazing Management Plan: Values and Purposes Guideline, Goals and Objectives for Grazing Management. Page, AZ: Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Resource Management Division.

Greene, Jerome A.

1977. Historic Resource Study: Organ Pipe National Monument, Arizona. Denver: USDI National Park Service, Denver Service Center.

Greene, Linda W.

1987. Historical Resource Study: Yosemite, the Park and Its Resources; *A History of the Discovery, Management, and Physical Development of Yosemite National Park, California*. (3 vols). Washington, D.C.: USDI National Park Service.

Hall, William Hammond

1882. *To Preserve from Defacement and Promote the Use of the Yosemite Valley*. Sacramento: California State Printing Office.

Hamin, Elisabeth M.

2003. *Mojave Lands: Interpretive Planning and the National Preserve*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hart, John

1991. *Farming on the Edge: Saving Family Farms in Marin County, California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Horning, John

1994. *Grazing to Extinction: Endangered, Threatened and Candidate Species Imperiled by Livestock Grazing on Western Public Lands*. Washington, D.C.: National Wildlife Federation.

Igoe, James

2003. *Conservation and Globalization: A Study of National Parks and Indigenous Communities from East Africa to South Dakota. Case Studies on Contemporary Social Issues*. Boulder: University of Colorado Press.

Ise, John

1961. *Our National Park Policy: A Critical History*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Jones and Jones Architects and Landscape Architects

2001. *Farmland Preservation Recommendations for Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve. Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II: Technical Supplement*. Seattle: USDI National Park Service, Pacific-West Region.

Keller, Robert H. and Michael Turek

1999. *American Indians and National Parks*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Kerr, Andy and Mark Salvo

2001. *Evolving Presidential Policy Toward Livestock Grazing in National Monuments*. *Pennsylvania State Law Review*. 10(1).

Lambert, Darwin

1991. *Great Basin Drama*. Niwot, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers.

Lane, Franklin K.

1918. Statement of National Park Service Policy, written to Stephen Mather, May 13, 1918. In *Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1918*. Volume 1. Pp. 110-13. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Lindsay, Mary

1976. *Grassy Balds in Great Smoky Mountains National Park*. Research/Resources Management Report No. 4. Gatlinburg, TN: USDI National Park Service, Southeast Regional office, Uplands Field Research Laboratory.

Livingston, Dewey S.

1994. *Ranching on the Point Reyes Peninsula: A History of the Dairy and Beef Ranches within Point Reyes National Seashore, 1834-1992*. Point Reyes Station, CA: USDI National Park Service, Point Reyes National Seashore.

Livingston, Dewey S.

1995. *A Good Life: Dairy Farming in the Olema Valley; A History of the Dairy and Beef Ranches of the Olema Valley and Lagunitas Canyon, Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Point Reyes National Seashore, Marin County, California*. Point Reyes Station, CA: Point Reyes National Seashore.

Loomis, John B.

2002. *Integrated Public Lands Management: Principles and Applications to National Forests, Parks, Wildlife Refuges, and BLM Lands*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press.

Louter, David

2006. *Windshield Wilderness: Cars, Roads and Nature in Washington's National Parks*. Seattle: University of Washington.

Lowenthal, David

1975. Past Time, Present Place: Landscape and Memory. *Geographical Review*. 65: 1-37.

Mark, Stephen R.

1984. *Wilderness Review in the East Mojave National Scenic Area, California*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Ashland, OR: Department of Geography, Southern Oregon State College.

Mark, Stephen R.

1996. *Floating in the Stream of Time: An Administrative History of John Day Fossil Beds National Monument*. Seattle: U.S.D.I. National Park Service, Pacific-West Region.

2005. *Preserving the Living Past: John C. Merriam's Legacy in the State and National Parks*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mather, Stephen T.

1918. *Report of the Director of the National Park Service*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

McEnaney, Marla

2001. Working the Land: Understanding and Managing our Nation's Agricultural Legacy. *CRM*. 7: 41-43.

McKinley, Laura

1993. *An Unbroken Historical Record: Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve Administrative History*. Seattle: USDI National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Region.

Miles, John C.

1995. *Guardians of the Parks: A History of the National Parks and Conservation Association*. Washington D.C.: Taylor and Francis.

Miller, Margaret

2005. Labor History of Point Reyes National Seashore. Unpublished report in files of Pacific-West Regional Office of the National Park Service, Seattle WA.

Nash, Roderick Frazier

1967. *Wilderness and the American Mind*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.

National Park Service

1961. *Land Use Survey, Proposed Point Reyes National Seashore*. San Francisco: USDI National Park Service, Region Four Office.

National Park Service

2008. General Management Plan, John Day Fossil Beds National Monument. Kimberly, OR: USDI National Park Service, John Day Fossil Beds National Monument.

National Research Council, Committee on Grazing Phaseout at Capitol Reef National Park

1984. *Grazing Phaseout at Capitol Reef National Park: Phase I Final Report*. Washington, D.C.: National Research Council, Board of Agriculture.

Negri, Richard F.

1997. *Tales of Canyonlands' Cowboys*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Nystrom, Eric Charles

2003. *From Neglected Space to Protected Place: An Administrative History of Mojave National Preserve*. Reno, NV: Great Basin Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit, University of Nevada-Reno.

O'Brien, Bob R.

1999. *Our National Parks and the Search for Sustainability*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Pierce, Daniel S.

2000. *The Great Smokies: From Natural Habitat to National Park*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Responsive Management

2003. Regional Residents' Opinions on Management Issues at Point Reyes National Seashore. Unpublished report in files of Point Reyes National Seashore, Point Reyes Station, CA.

Righter, Robert

1982. *Crucible for Conservation: The Creation of Grand Teton National Park*. Boulder: Colorado Associated University Press.

Robbins, William G.

1994. *Colony and Empire: The Capitalist Transformation of the American West*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Robbins, William G. and James C. Foster (eds.)

2000. *Land in the American West: Private Claims and the Common Good*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Roth, Dennis

1995. *The Wilderness Movement and the National Forests*. 2nd ed. College Station, TX: Intaglio Press.

- Rottle, Nancy
2003. *An Analysis of Land Use Change and Cultural Landscape Integrity, Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve*. Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II: Technical Supplement. Seattle: U.S.D.I. National Park Service, Pacific-West Region.
- Runte, Alfred
1993. *Yosemite: The Embattled Wilderness*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Sadin, Paul
2007. *Managing a Land in Motion: An Administrative History of Point Reyes National Seashore*. Oakland, CA: USDI National Park Service, Pacific-West Region.
- Sanfilippo, Pamela K.
2000. *Agriculture in Antebellum St. Louis: A Special History Study*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.
- Scott, Sara Elizabeth
2005. *Balancing History and Nature in the National Parks: The Management of the Bar BC Ranch in Grand Teton National Park*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Eugene: University of Oregon Department of History.
- Scrattish, Nicholas
1985. *Historic Resource Study, Bryce Canyon National Park*. Denver: USDI National Park Service, Denver Service Center.
- Sellers, Richard West
1999. *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Shankland, Robert
1970. *Steve Mather of the National Parks*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Stanton, Cathy
2010. *"Plant Yourself in My Neighborhood": An Ethnographic Landscape Study of Farming and Farmers in Columbia County, New York*. Boston: USDI National Park Service, Northeast Region.
- Synder, James B.
2002. *Putting "Hoofed Locusts" Out to Pasture*. Unpublished ms. in the Yosemite National Park Research Library, Yosemite National Park.

- Spence, Mark David
2000. *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks*. New York: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Strong, Douglas
1978. Ralph H. Cameron and the Grand Canyon. *Arizona and the West*. (University of Arizona Press). 20(1): 41-64; 20(2): 155-72.
- Taylor, Terri A, and Cathy Gilbert
1996. *Cultural Landscape Report: Cant Ranch Historic District, John Day Fossil Beds National Monument, Oregon*. Seattle: National Park Service, Columbia Cascades System Support Office Cultural Resources Division.
- Thow, Jonathan S.
1986. *Capitol Reef: The Forgotten National Park*. Unpublished M.S. thesis. Department of History and Geography, Utah State University.
- Unrau, Harlan D.
1990. *Basin and Range: A History of Great Basin National Park, Nevada*. Denver: US-DI National Park Service, Denver Service Center.
- Veblen, Thorstein
1899. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. [reprinted 1973, Boston: Houghton Mifflin].
- Watkins, T.H.
1990. *Righteous Pilgrim: The Life and Times of Harold L. Ickes, 1874-1952*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Wegman-French, Elizabeth
2006. *Faraway Ranch Special History Study, Chiricahua National Monument*. Santa Fe, NM: National Park Service, Intermountain Region Cultural Resources Division.
- Westmacott, Richard
1998. *Managing Culturally Significant Agricultural Landscapes in the National Park System*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service.
- Woodbury, Angus
1997. *A History of Southern Utah and Its National Parks*. Springdale, UT: Zion Natural History Association.

Work, Hubert

1925. Statement of National Park Policy, Secretary Work to NPS Director, March 11, 1925. Reprinted in National Park Service 1968. *National Park Service Handbook of Administrative Policies for Natural Areas*. Pp. 72-75.

Wuerthner, George and Mollie Matteson

2002. *Welfare Ranching: The Subsidized Destruction of the American West*. Foundations for Deep Ecology 2. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Wyckoff, William and Lary M. Dilsaver, eds.

1995. *The Mountainous West: Explorations in Historical Geography*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Notes

¹ On this point, see the work of Igoe (2003), Keller (1999), Spence (2000), and others.

² Linda Greene (1987: 200) recounts that

“In 1869 a California sheep rancher hired a young drifter named John Muir to take charge of a flock of several thousand sheep headed for grazing grounds in the High Sierra. The party reached Soda Springs in late summer and the sheep were deposited in a high pasture north of Tuolumne Meadows. While the sheep fattened, Muir spent much of his time exploring the surrounding high country.”

³ Linda Greene (1987: 200) noted of shepherding in Yosemite,

“Shepherders with immense flocks had been annual visitors to the Yosemite high country meadows since the 1860s. Sheep husbandry in California had boomed since the gold rush days, and the introduction of hardier breeds, such as the Merino, had resulted in excellent wool as well as good meat. Increased agricultural use of the Central Valley, however, began to crowd the flocks, and the extreme heat and dryness of the summer season inflicted great hardship and casualties upon them. During the summers, Basque, Portuguese, Scottish, and French shepherders escorted the animals through the hills, into the high mountain meadows of the Sierra Nevada, and back again. Along the way the animals feasted on the lush grasses and green plants of meadows such as Tuolumne, uprooting flowers, destroying the soil cover, and fouling water sources as they passed.”

⁴ Summarizing this visit, Greene (1987: 298-99) recounts,

“On visiting Yosemite Valley together in 1889, Muir and Johnson were appalled to find the valley despoiled by commercialism and exploitation in the form of fenced pastures, plowed hayfields, and unsightly development. Even Tuolumne Meadows, remote from the sordid moneymaking projects they perceived going on below, had not been spared the ravages of man’s unregulated occupation. Fires set to improve pasturage and unrestricted grazing had resulted in charred tree stumps; dusty, bare meadows; and trampled, muddy streams. Upon leaving the high country where their flocks had consumed nearly all the vegetation, sheepmen habitually set fires...To Muir and Johnson it was obvious that state man-

agement had proven inadequate and would ultimately ruin forever the precious landscape of the Sierra. Neither the valley nor the surrounding forests, mountains, and meadows received adequate attention, enabling businessmen, cattlemen, sheepmen, and timber interests to rape the resources unopposed."

⁵ The extent to which the ranching and other agricultural operations of the West fit the image of modest "family farms" is much debated; there is considerable evidence that even the earliest ranching in lands that later became parks represented extensions of large corporate farming operations, some having little enduring tie to the land.⁵ Family farms were often affected by NPS land management and acquisition, but commonly it was the impacts on large, affluent ranchers and even larger corporate agricultural efforts that mobilized action among Western congressional representatives during this period (Robbins and Foster 2000; Robbins 1994).

⁶ Specifically, the legislation states that "no grazing permits heretofore issued and in effect on January 15, 1939, affecting the area described in this section, for whose renewal an application is made before the date of expiration shall be affected by this subchapter, except that they shall be subject to such terms and conditions to insure protection of the lands and for other purposes as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior" (16 USC 80).

⁷ Other sources have mentioned grazing in such NPS units as Craters of the Moon National Monument, Pipe Springs National Monument and Haleakala National Park, but their veracity is uncertain and this was not investigated in the course of the current research.

⁸ Interviews have suggested that some resource managers have opted not to intervene to avoid certain predictable conflicts between agricultural users and visitors as a means of facilitating change; sometimes, though not always, this change is accomplished using authorities within enabling legislation to prohibit agriculture where it results in such conflicts. On the point of visitor perceptions of ranching, see, e.g. Responsive Management 2003.

⁹ Simultaneously, it is important to note that residents of the larger Point Reyes area, while supportive of park management, have expressed ambivalence, and even opposition, toward the continued operation of private ranches within Point Reyes National Seashore (Responsive Management 2003).

¹⁰ For example, a study of *Agriculture in Antebellum St. Louis* was undertaken in support of management efforts at Ulysses S. Grant National Historical Site.

