# *A Cattle Controversy*
## *Great Basin National Park and the Struggle for Environmental Tourism in Nevada*

Peter A. Kopp

Toward the entrance of Great Basin National Park, on Highway 488 heading west from Baker, Nevada, a roadside exhibit celebrates the region's ranching history. Sponsored by local stock raisers and developed with the assistance of National Park Service employees, the exhibit explains the industry's cultural roots and the local ranchers' commitment to natural resource conservation. It appears to be a successful collaboration, an appreciation for the dominant culture and history of the area that existed for the previous century and a half. But the exhibit sits just *outside* of park boundaries, and this spatial relationship hints at a tension not readily evident to visitors. Upon my first trek to the park, in 2007, two questions arose about the geography: If developed in cooperation with the National Park Service, why did the exhibit sit outside of park boundaries? And, what was the significance of exhibiting the region's ranching legacy to park visitors prior to entry as opposed to exhibiting geology or the indigenous past? The answers to these questions, in part, address a drawn out and controversial history of local stewardship and federal land management in the West. More immediate, the questions pertaining to the exhibit evoke a controversial memory of the park's founding.

Peter A. Kopp is an assistant professor at New Mexico State University, where he is also the director of the public history program. His research centers on the environmental and agricultural history of the North American West, and he is currently finishing his first book on the history of hop growing and beer making in Oregon's Willamette Valley. Kopp earned a Ph.D. in history from the University of Nevada in 2012.

Roadside ranching exhibit outside Great Basin National Park near Baker, Nevada, 2007. Photo courtesy of the author.

At the heart of the act to create Great Basin National Park in 1986 lay a compromise of multiple use. Although such an arrangement was rare in the National Park System, Congress mandated that the park allow cattle and sheep grazing to occur amidst its recreational, educational, and scientific agendas.[1] The decision thrust a spotlight on a long-standing tension between competing natural resource users and required park employees to be creative in tending to the needs of conflicting interest groups. Yet it was an experiment that did not last long. Just twelve years after the opening of Great Basin National Park a collection of nongovernmental organizations successfully fought to end cattle grazing in the park. While seemingly a brief chapter in the park's history, the story highlights the struggle for environmental tourism in Nevada as part of a longer struggle for control of federal lands in the West.

---

The origins of the Great Basin National Park cattle controversy date much earlier than the founding of the park. Tension between a federally sponsored park and natural resource users in the South Snake Range date to 1922, when President Warren G. Harding—under the 1906 Antiquities Act—established Lehman Caves National Monument. The decision initially caused little controversy as the federal government appropriated less than fifty acres of land surrounding a series of underground limestone caves. The tenor changed after Nevada's Governor James Scrugham and State Senator Cada Boak (who had spearheaded the national monument campaign) suggested that the national monument extend its boundaries. The politicians wanted to capture and present the unique qualities of the Great Basin region in a national park. Whereas many Nevadans embraced the idea of a new tourist attraction, local stock raisers and mine owners immediately rejected the idea. They need not have worried. The National Park Service director, Stephen Mather, refrained from sponsoring the expansion because the income the monument produced was dismal and the costs of maintaining the remote attraction mounted. Dreams of a national park dwindled further when Governor Scrugham left office and the Great Depression settled in. Into the 1930s and the World War II years, ranchers and miners retained political control of the landscape as the nation turned its attention to the importance of national resource use.[2]

After World War II, several factors led to a renewed call for a Great Basin National Park. A young and educated middle class contributed to an outdoor recreation boom in the United States. They had more leisure time, better access to the outdoors via highways, and more designated parks, monuments, and recreation areas to visit. They also became active in promoting wilderness-related nongovernmental organizations.[3] The changes played in Nevada's favor because the state's economy increasingly depended on some forms of outdoor tourism. In Lake Tahoe, particularly, Nevada's politicians and planners recognized the potential for investment. Under these changing conditions in 1958 Nevada's United State Senator Alan Bible first proposed an investigative bill to create a Great Basin National Park. Unfortunately for him and his supporters, White Pine County ranching and mining interests wanted no part of a new tourism economy or, more important, the federal government taking control of the lands they argued had been respectfully managed through their natural resource practices.

In the late 1950s and 1960s, Nevada's Representative Walter Baring pushed back in the United States Congress against the national park campaign, acting as an advocate for mining and ranching interests. Both sides tried to persuade Nevadans and the Congress that their stance on a national park best suited the region. An array of reports, the redrawing of boundaries, and numerous rallies for the park during these years highlighted conflicts between tourism and natural resource use. Bible attempted to work with local interests in Ely, and even suggested a compromise that would have included twenty-five years of continued grazing in the proposed park. The efforts proved fruitless as Baring continued to deny the importance of recreation and tourism in White Pine County in favor of traditional natural resource uses. In 1967, Congress interpreted the intrastate fighting as a signal to move on and abandon plans for the park.[4]

Despite the setback, Senator Bible and other national park supporters did not quit. After nearly a decade-long lull, nature enthusiasts and supporters of Nevada tourism returned with more vigor. New activists—including the University of Nevada, Reno, professor Richard Sill and the geographer Robert Starr Waite—allied with previous advocates, including the former ranger Darwin Lambert and his wife, Eileen, to bring attention to the area. At the same time economic trouble in White Pine County spurred local support for the creation of a national park. In 1977, Kennecott Copper—a leading regional employer since the first decade of the twentieth century—suspended operations. According to Darwin Lambert, this action alone "wiped out most of the community's economic support, multiplying the need for other sources."[5] Later attempts to reinvigorate the economy failed, including the opening of new mines and a coal power plant. Some reports also indicate that cattle and sheep grazing in the proposed parklands had reached a period of decline and could potentially relocate.[6]

Politics surrounding the creation of Great Basin National Park remained divided. At the same time that advocates witnessed new opportunities to create a national park, western stock raisers and miners were in the midst of a political awakening. Mining and ranching groups protested environmental restrictions placed on federal lands by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. Political organization and sometimes violent rallies gave birth to the Sagebrush Rebellion, a movement in which local counties not only demanded a say in federal activity taking place on state lands, but in many cases demanded transfer of lands to local holdings. They had little success in the late 1970s, but remained hopeful for change when Ronald Reagan assumed the presidency, in 1981. At that time, Secretary of the Interior James Watt helped transition the Sagebrush Rebellion into the Wise-Use Movement. He advocated for natural resource users who distrusted federal bureaucracy and wanted autonomy in public land management.[7] In White Pine County, two local residents and park detractors, Charles Cushman and Ron Arnold captured this spirit when they spoke out against the proposed Great Basin National Park. They suggested that the area's residents did not want a national park, as the National Park Service would contribute to the "loss of grazing, mining, hunting, and water rights." Highlighting the fear of federal control of local lands, they even went so far as to suggest, "In 1986 the park will be 174,000 acres, by 1996 it will be 1 million acres."[8]

Amid this tension, Nevada's Democratic Representative Harry Reid (to be elected to the Senate in 1986) came to the aid of park advocates. He believed that the creation of a national park would not only serve state tourism, but could also serve pending federal requirements for wilderness designations. Republican Senators Paul Laxalt and Jacob "Chic" Hecht, as well as Representative Barbara Vucanovich, did not see the situation in the same light. Along with a pro-ranching stance, they claimed that the potential embodied in deposits of tungsten, beryllium, and other metals should supersede a proposed national park. Still, the establishment of a Great Basin National Park moved forward with increased support from White Pine County residents, the National Park Service, and preservationist organizations. In 1985, Reid submitted a congressional bill calling for 592,000 acres of wilderness in Nevada and 174,000 acres for a Great Basin National Park. Park advocates and preservationists celebrated. But it was clearly more than conservative interests would concede. In response, Laxalt, Hecht, and Vucanovich introduced a similar bill for a 44,000-acre park and called for multiple use. Incredibly, Congress passed both bills. In the end, Reid and Vucanovich worked out a compromise: a national park of approximately 77,000 acres and a clause that allowed for continued mining and livestock grazing as part of the region's historical identity.[9] When signed into law in 1986, the Great Basin National Park Act included the following directive: "The Secretary shall permit grazing on lands within the park to the same extent as was permitted on such lands as of July 1, 1985. Grazing within the park shall be administered by the National Park Service."[10]

---

Nevada's first national park opened with the challenge of catering to both ranchers and an expanding tourist base. Annual visitation numbers that had averaged around forty thousand prior to the establishment of the park increased to more than seventy-five thousand in its first few years.[11] Figuring out the needs of these visitors and implementing tourist plans became a central mission for the new park. But the congressional directive for multiple use complicated that mission. With 46,000 of its 77,000 acres open to livestock grazing, park planners also needed a natural resource management plan. To mitigate the ecological threats of livestock and potential conflicts with visitors, the park administration first created restrictions on riparian usage and salt licks. They also demanded that the ranching permittees clean up after their animals in public areas. Participating ranchers tried their best to respect these regulations, but wandering stock proved difficult to manage all of the time. Cattle roamed into campgrounds, where they were unwelcome and often left their waste on roads and trails. As visitors vocalized their discontent, the park's tourist-livestock debate became heated early and often.

The existence of a folder in the Great Basin National Park archive entitled "Grazing, Visitor Complaints" indicates that the park's administrators had a keen awareness of the tourist-livestock tension. Park employees collected an assortment of both formal letters and informal notes scratched on the back of camping-deposit envelopes. The notes revealed real situations plaguing tourists. One anonymous camper noted in 1990, for example, "We drove 1,000 miles to visit this place. Please fence the camp grounds. It's rather gross to rise in the morning and have a big cow crap in front of your door. The small area of the campgrounds won't starve any critters. Please, please, please." Another noted, "Lovely areas and we enjoyed the mountain tremendously—Please keep the cattle out of the campground—it makes walking hazardous and their droppings even tracked into the toilets."[12] While apparently sympathetic to the concerns of tourists, the park administration could do nothing to overturn the founding legislation. Their only course of action was to continue administering the grazing allotments and research into the effects on ecology and the tourist experience.

From 1986 to 1994, the National Park Service sponsored a range of studies to better understand and manage the multiple-use directive of Great Basin National Park. By examining historical and contemporary modes of tourist activities in the region, changes in the economy, and, most extensively, livestock management, the park administration initiated a process to clearly identify park needs and implement policies to best address them. Almost immediately the reports revealed continuing conflict between national park ideals and natural resource policy in the Great Basin.

Research on tourist trends conducted by the consultants Martha Lee and Perry Brown in the late 1980s and early 1990s provided a foundation for future studies of the new park. The team surveyed thousands of visitors, establishing a baseline of visitor enjoyment and how their experiences in the region changed after creation of the national park. Some visitors (mostly from White Pine County) were frustrated with the cessation of hunting and, to a lesser degree, of fishing opportunities. But, generally, Lee and Brown found that, as they put it, "Visitor satisfaction with their experiences at Great Basin [National Park] remains very high."[13] Other discussion revealed the difficulties related to the congressional compromise. A 1988 survey, for example, suggested that 11.8 percent of visitors found livestock encounters in the park problematic. In 1990, a follow-up report based on the same questions revealed that the number had grown to 15.1 percent. Given that these data also indicated that the most important service of national parks was to provide "unspoiled environments," the presence of cattle and sheep proved challenging for the park's administration.[14]

A study in the early 1990s conducted by the consultants Scott Dawson, Dale Blahna, and John Keith explored the same issues, but focused solely on perceptions from White Pine County residents. The results looked similar to previous studies save for a couple of major differences: Many locals were frustrated with the loss of traditional grazing locations in Humboldt National Forest, and they also perceived that the park was failing to meet its economic potential. Even though park visitation had increased, local residents suggested that the National Park Service had contributed to a sagging economy by failing to develop an adequate tourist infrastructure.[15] The criticisms were particularly problematic given that the National Park Service's director, William Penn Mott, Jr., noted in his 1987 dedication speech that he would be sensitive to the local needs. He even stated boldly, "I pledge to be a good neighbor."[16] To make matters more challenging for Mott and his employees, preservationist groups now increasingly challenged the park administration on issues of ecosystem integrity. The National Park Service's juggling act stood at a pivotal point in Great Basin National Park's early history.[17]

In 1993, following research sponsored since its inception park administration released a "Final General Management Plan." Of the many topics covered, infrastructure issues seemed the most immediately manageable. Consistent with longtime National Park Service development policies, the plan called for limiting roads in the park except for a seven-mile extension to the Wheeler Peak campground and trailhead. In addition, while park administrators designated some trails for improvement and restoration, they called for only twenty-four miles of new trails to provide better access to some campgrounds and backcountry areas. In the spirit of development since the 1950s, park planners also sought to move park operations away from Lehman Caves and out of the park altogether to the small town of Baker. These changes would take time and depend on funding, but the plan was meant to ensure that Great Basin National Park could provide access and amenities to around a hundred thousand visitors yearly without compromising the integrity of its natural and scenic features.[18]

In regard to ranching, the "Final General Management Plan" confirmed the status quo, noting, "The grazing of domestic livestock would continue in the park in accordance with the enabling legislation."[19] But continued pressure from visitors and nonprofit organizations such as the Wilderness Society (which spoke out loudly against grazing in preliminary drafts of the management plan) forced the park administration to address more directly the conflict of both tourist experience and preservation of natural areas—despite continued complaints from local stock raisers. The management plan suggested:

> The Park Service would develop and use sound range management techniques, consistent with NPS policies and guidelines, to minimize grazing's adverse effects on exceptional resources such as riparian areas and rare and sensitive plant species. In addition, to reduce the recurring conflict between park visitors and livestock, methods would be used to separate cattle and sheep from visitors.[20]

Achieving these goals was another matter.

To meet the requirements of multiple use and provide an enjoyable tourist experience, park planners proposed the development of three different park zones. The park administration first designated a "Park Development Zone" that would "serve visitors and meet the needs of management."[21] This included high-use areas of the parks with roads, trails, and buildings, while still seeking to accommodate natural and cultural resource protection. Second, the administration established a "Natural Zone" for the "conservation of natural resources and processes," with subzones designated "Rural," "Semi-Primitive Day Use," and "Primitive." Thus "Natural Zone" provided medium to low-level access for visitors who sought to enjoy an experience away from the human-built environment. Third, a "Special Use Zone" outlined ecologically sensitive and research areas for protection.

While the "Final General Management Plan" addressed some of the problems of multiple use by establishing separated zones, there remained questions of how to implement a grazing policy. The park commissioned another series of studies on allotment assessment and range monitoring. Lee Eddleman and Ray Jaindl, the authors of a report that outlined monitoring of livestock allotments, framed the larger picture of managing natural resources and tourism. They sought to "separate the effects of grazing from other environmental influences."[22] The "Final General Management Plan" already outlined this task as difficult and brought attention to ecosystem issues, including water pollution, habitat destruction, competition with wildlife in the park, and the spread of disease. Eddleman and Jaindl suggested that strict livestock monitoring and herding to keep cattle and sheep from entering fragile park ecosystems were essential. In subsequent reports, Eddleman and Jaindl confirmed that approach.[23]

In 1994, following completion of the grazing and tourist studies, the National Park Service finally felt prepared to directly address the tension of multiple use.[24] In a "Natural and Cultural Resources Management Plan" the park administration declared, "The enabling legislation (Public Law 99-565) contains provisions that are incongruent with the mission of the National Park Service as stated in the NPS Organic Act—to preserve and protect natural and cultural resources, and provide for their enjoyment by the public."[25] The report differed from previous documents in its straightforward concern about livestock grazing. After noting that the park allowed "over 600 cattle and 3,000 sheep" to graze, the authors argued, "Livestock grazing is the biggest natural resource impact affecting many biological communities."[26] The report elaborated on specific problems including range conditions, competition with wildlife for forage and water, the potential for disease transfer from domestic sheep to wild bighorn, and, finally, livestock encounters with park visitors.[27]

Unlike previous plans, the "Natural and Cultural Resources Management Plan" sought head-on to mitigate the environmental impacts of permitted grazing. The authors first called for $60,000 to build fences, noting, "There are a number of grazing allotments that need drift fences built in order to manage cattle and to protect the fragile riparian zones. Drift fences will also reduce visitor use conflicts on trails and in developed campgrounds."[28] Then, drawing from Eddleman and Jaindl's reports, the plan suggested, "Utilization monitoring is a long-term commitment as long as livestock grazing continues in the park."[29] Whereas preservationists and many tourists supported the decisions, the action proved problematic for the owners of the park's cattle-grazing allotments, who themselves had never been happy with the park's founding compromise.

Dean Baker, the most outspoken of the White Pine County stockmen, had long argued that it was the ranchers who would be best suited to manage the land, and without government bureaucracy. And he made a compelling case after the release of the "Natural and Cultural Resources Management Plan." He was, after all, fighting for his livelihood and culture. In 1995, Baker noted, "First and foremost, this area has been grazed for an extended period of time—heavier prior to the 1950s and at the present level in recent years." He later noted, "In fact, the range, given the level of moisture, is in better condition now than it was 25 years ago when Baker Ranches began running cattle there. Our observation and those of our consultants show we have a healthy plant community in the riparian areas. The cattle are not damaging these areas."[30] At issue was the stewardship of the land: Baker and his fellow stock raisers believed that they could best manage the range.

Baker and his supporters argued that they had never been given a chance. The stock raisers suggested that guidelines for grazing in the park were too stringent. And they suggested that the rules did not adhere to the compromise of the park's founding legislation. In a 1995 "Response to the Environmental Assessment," Baker noted:

> This environmental assessment is slanted and written with a bias against grazing. Almost all of the people consulted and mailed to are biased against grazing. Without the anti-grazing bias, the goals would be to continue grazing. National Park Service goals should include continued grazing.
>
> * It is a good compatible use of the land.
> * It is a renewable resource that provides a valued product.
> * It is the law."[31]

The last point regarding the legal requirements for the park had always struck the most resounding chord for National Park Service employees. Yet change was around the corner.

---

In the same year that Baker wrote his "Response to the Environmental Assessment," the *High Country News* captured a story familiar to Nevada residents, noting:

> In the mid-1980s, Harry Reid, then a congressman and now a senator, argued a national park would help the public see that Nevada is not a wasteland and contribute to economic development through increased tourism. Reid had to compromise with ranchers; he told them grazing would continue in the new park."[32]

The article pointed to the reality that, at less than ten years old, the compromise of multiple use haunted Great Basin National Park. The author remarked, "The compromise has not worked."[33] As evidence shows, grazing in Great Basin National Park proved difficult to manage. Despite ongoing measures to please all parties—ranchers, tourists, preservationists, scientists, and park administrators—none was left completely satisfied. At the time of the *High Country News* article, however, an end was nearer than many people realized. It had been developing for some time.

As early as 1989, the Nature Conservancy had worked quietly and behind the scenes to end grazing in Great Basin National Park. The Great Basin Field Office of the nonprofit organization had led the way, initially with fieldwork determining that commercial grazing interfered with the ecological processes of the park. On January 17, the Nature Conservancy's director, Dave Livermore, wrote to Park Superintendent Al Hendricks to discuss the nonprofit's findings: "Due to input we have received recently from wildlife biologists and some of our members, we have reason to believe that grazing within the park boundaries may not be in the best interest of wildlife or threatened and endangered species which occur in the area."[34] Subsequent reports elaborated on the problems of erosion, destruction of native plants, and transfer of disease between domestic and bighorn sheep. The Nature Conservancy next sought to convince national park administrators to let them fight on the park's behalf. In July, Livermore directly asked Hendricks if the National Park Service would support the organization's desire to eliminate cattle grazing from the park.[35]

It was a fragile issue for Hendricks to say the least. The National Park Service had identified maintaining a harmonious relationship with White Pine County residents as vital, including its ranching population. Administrators also had a responsibility to heed the park's founding legislation. It was critical that Hendricks and his staff not spearhead the removal efforts. By the middle of 1989, he supported the Nature Conservancy's efforts, though quietly and only by supplying information. In a letter from July of 1989, Hendricks simply stated that he would "support the Nature Conservancy buy-out of willing permittees" and "pursue options for voluntary acquisition and retirement of remaining grazing permits."[36] The record is subtle and indicates that the park administration took a back seat to the Nature Conservancy.

At this point, the Nature Conservancy facilitated buyout discussions between the National Park Service and grazing permittees Dean Baker, Dave Eldridge, and Owen Gonder. While it took patience and time, the men ultimately agreed to a buyout, perhaps realizing, too, that the multiple-use agenda did not work in the national park. Throughout this time, Harry Reid worked to change the founding legislation to allow for such a buyout to occur. He achieved success in April of 1996, when Public Law 105-134 amended the act that created Great Basin National Park. It noted, "The Secretary may acquire by donation valid existing permits and grazing leases authorizing grazing on land in the park." The law also said, "The Secretary shall terminate a grazing permit or grazing lease acquired…so as to end grazing previously authorized by the permit or lease."[37]

The Nature Conservancy next had to raise $400,000 to purchase the grazing allotments. By July 1997, the organization had been unable to raise the funds and asked other organizations for assistance.[38] The National Park Foundation, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the Conservation Fund, and even the state-run Nevada Commission on Tourism all heeded the call.[39] In 1999, the Conservation Fund assumed control of the project and succeeded with the buyouts. Once purchased, the permits were cancelled by the federal government, and the ranchers removed their cattle in accordance with the new legislation. In the following years, the park administration removed several miles of fences and repaired habitats that had been affected by the cattle.

---

In the first decade of the twenty-first century, the Great Basin National Park website suggested, "The final outcome involving the cattle ranchers and the buyout of their grazing permits has been described by a local rancher as a win-win situation for both the ranchers and the National Park Service."[40] The reality was not so simple. A 2006 *Las Vegas Review-Journal* article, for example, highlighted a continued rift. On the one hand, Baker suggested that the grazing compromise "was a farce."[41] From the creation of the park, he argued, the continued research, regulations, and management plans prevented stock raisers from realistic opportunities. Baker remained upset about how the events played out. On the other hand, in the same article, Reid and former park superintendent Cindy Neilson maintained that the end of cattle ranching in the park was good for Nevada tourism. Neilson also pointed to the $6 million of annual income generated by the park and the additional jobs created in White Pine County.[42]

Still, there remains more to the story. Despite removal of the cattle, the legacies of multiple use in and around Great Basin National Park linger. Powerful mining interests continue to influence the region. Although the park administration has effectively closed all mines within park boundaries, mining activities surrounding the park may pose threats to wildlife habitat and water supplies. In addition, sheep grazing persists in 4 percent of the park. While these sheep forage in remote areas where visitors seldom roam, their presence interferes with plans to introduce bighorn sheep because of fear of disease transfer. This is all to say that the traditional users of natural resource's continue to maintain an important influence in Great Basin National Park.

As the story continues to unfold, compromise will remain important. Competing natural resource users must find common ground with supporters of outdoor tourism, preservationists, and scientists, and the National Park Service must help facilitate these discussions. The roadside ranching exhibit sited just before Great Basin National Park's boundaries reveals a joint commitment to ongoing collaboration. But it does remain outside of park boundaries, and that offers a reminder of the divided legacies of natural resource users and the struggle for environmental tourism in Nevada.

## NOTES

[1]Other national parks that maintained grazing but were seeking to eliminate it were Grand Teton (Wyoming) and Capitol Reef (Utah). There were, however, more than thirty total National Park Service units—particularly national monuments—that included grazing as part of similar compromises or included it as historical parts of the park experience.

[2]Darwin Lambert, *Great Basin Drama* (Niwot, Colo: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1991), 75-86. Interestingly, when Governor Scrugham lost re-election in 1926, people argued that his failure was in ignoring the interests of miners and ranchers in favor of those of tourists.

[3]Samuel P. Hayes, *Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 3-10.

[4]Gary E. Elliot, "Whose Land Is It?: The Battle for the Great Basin National Park," *Nevada Historical Society Quarterly*, 34:1 (Spring 1991), 246-52.

[5]Lambert, *Great Basin Drama*, 173.

[6]Elliot, "Whose Land Is It?" 242-43, 251.

[7]For a complete overview of these issues, see R. McGreggor Cawley, *Federal Land, Western Anger: The Sagebrush Rebellion and Environmental Politics* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1993).

[8]"Briefing Statement," January 20, 1985, Folder 011: (A2623), "Briefing Statements, 1965, 1980-1989," GRBA 331/001: A: Administration and Management, Great Basin National Park Resource Management Records (ACC# 00331 CAT# 04453).

[9]Harlan D. Unrau, *Basin and Range: A History of Great Basin National Park, Nevada* (Denver: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1990), 408-17.

[10]United States Government Printing Office, *An Act To Establish a Great Basin National Park in the State of Nevada, and for Other Purposes* (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1986), 1.

[11]Martha Lee and Perry Brown, *Great Basin Visitor Surveys: Comparison of 1988 and 1990 Results* (Seattle: National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Science and Technology, 1993), 9.

[12]"Grazing, Visitor Complaints," Folder 029: (L3019), "Lands and Recreation, Great Basin National Park Resource Management Records (ACC# 00331 CAT# 04453), GRBA 331/005.

[13]Lee and Brown, *Great Basin Visitor Surveys*, 44.

[14]*Ibid.*, 34-39. Other studies by Lee, Brown, and Randall Stark prove useful in understanding tourism and changes in White Pine County after the establishment of Great Basin National Park. See Martha E. Lee and Randall Stark, *Past Recreation Use in the Great Basin National Park Region* (Corvallis: National Park Service Cooperative Park Studies Unit, and Department of Forest Resources, Oregon State University, 1989), and Martha E. Lee and Perry J. Brown, *Resident Use of and Attitudes toward Great Basin National Park* (Seattle: National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Science and Technology, 1993).

[15]Scott Dawson, Dale Blahna, and John Keith, *The Regional Economic Impacts of Visitors to Great Basin National Park* (Seattle: United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Science and Technology, 1993), 20-23. This study, published just before the "Final General Management Plan" in 1993, was based on reports dating back to 1988.

[16]"Great Basin National Park Dedication, 1987-1988," Folder 049.1: (A8215), "Briefing Statements, 1965, 1980-1989," GRBA 331/001: A: Administration and Management, Great Basin National Park Resource Management Records (ACC# 00331 CAT# 04453).

[17]Following a 1963 report by Luna Leopold regarding elk in Yellowstone, Secretary of the Interior Steward Udall called for an ecosystem approach to preservation, and provided more funding for science in the parks. This reversed a decades-long trend of predator elimination, construction, and other ecologically destructive activity in the national parks. The momentum carried into the 1970s and 1980s.

[18]United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *Great Basin National Park, Nevada: Final, General Management Plan, Development Concept Plans, Environmental Impact Statement* (Denver: United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1992), *iii-iv.*

[19]*Ibid.*

[20]*Ibid.*, iv.

[21]*Ibid.*, 27.

[22]Lee E. Eddleman and Ray Jaindl, *Monitoring of Livestock Allotments in Great Basin National Park* (Seattle: Oregon State University Cooperative Park Studies Unit, National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Region, 1994) 1.

[23]Lee E. Eddleman and Ray Jaindl, *Range Analysis for Great Basin National Park* (Seattle: National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Region, 1994).

[24]Other reports include Krista Deal, *An Archeological Overview of Great Basin National Park* (Tucson: United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Western Archeological and Conservation Center, 1988), and Susan J. Wells, *Archeological Survey and Site Assessment at Great Basin National Park* (Tucson: United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Western Archeological and Conservation Center, 1990).

[25]United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *Natural and Cultural Resources Management Plan for Great Basin National Park* (San Francisco: United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Western Region, 1994), *i.*

[26]*Ibid., xi.*

[27]*Ibid., xi-xiii.*

[28]*Ibid*., 195.

[29]*Ibid.*

[30]Dean Baker, Baker Ranches, Inc., "Response to the Environmental Assessment (received June 19, 1995)," Folder 026: (L3019 Environmental Assessment/Allotment Management Plan/ Comments, 1995," Grazing, 1987-1989, GRBA 331/005 L: Lands and Recreation, GRBA 331/001: A: Administration and Management, Great Basin National Park Resource Management Records (ACC# 00331 CAT# 04453).

[31]*Ibid*.

[32]Jon Christensen, "A Bitter Rancher and a Failed Compromise," *High Country News* (3 April 1995).

[33]*Ibid*.

[34]Dave Livermore to Al Hendricks, January 17, 1989, Folder 022: (L3019) Grazing, 1987-1989, GRBA 331/005 L: Lands and Recreation, GRBA 331/001: A: Administration and Management, Great Basin National Park Resource Management Records (ACC# 00331 CAT# 04453).

[35]Dave Livermore to Al Hendricks, July 21, 1989, Folder 022: (L3019) Grazing, 1987-1989, GRBA 331/005 L: Lands and Recreation, GRBA 331/001: A: Administration and Management, Great Basin National Park Resource Management Records (ACC# 00331 CAT# 04453).

[36]"GRBA Mission, Goals, Five Year Objectives and Strategies for 1997-2001," Folder 037: (A6423), Briefing Statements, 1965, 1980-1989," GRBA 331/001: A: Administration and Management, Great Basin National Park Resource Management Records (ACC# 00331 CAT# 04453).

[37]Public Law 105-134 (April 23, 1996), Section 319.

[38]"Briefing Paper prepared for Senator Reid," Folder 025: (L3019) Conservation Fund, GRBA 331/005 L: Lands and Recreation, GRBA 331/001: A: Administration and Management, Great Basin National Park Resource Management Records (ACC# 00331 CAT# 04453).

[39]Other assistance included the Richard and Rhoda Goldman Foundation, the Weeden Foundation, the Turner Foundation, the Foundation for Deep Ecology, and the Sperling Foundation. "Ranchers lead way at Great Basin National Park, The Conservation Fund News Release," c. 1999.

[40]National Park Service, Great Basin National Park, "Grazing the Great Basin," http://www.nps.gov/grba/historyculture/grazing-the-great-basin.htm (accessed May 2007).

[41]Henry Brean, "Great Basin National Park Celebrates 20 Years," *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (30 October 2006), p. 1B.

[42]*Ibid*.