

THE LOOKOUT



Upcoming Social Events

October 14 Thursday Peakbaggers Social Meeting: Have you ever been lost or not sure where you are? Come listen to Wildflower Software explain how to use their topo mapping software with GPS. To gain first hand experience we'll create a route using Topo software with GPS waypoints & then walk the route using a GPS unit (it's a night, so bring warm clothing). Refreshments & socializing, something for everyone. 7:30 pm Griffith Park Ranger Sta Aud

November 11 Thursday Peakbaggers Social Meeting "New Hiker Program" Have you ever wondered what to take on a day hike? Come listen to experienced HPS hikers describe what to carry, how to read a trip write-up, what to pay a hideshow driver, etc. Everyone welcome. Refreshments & socializing, something for everyone. 7:30 pm Griffith Park Ranger Sta Aud.

December 9 Thursday Management Meeting: The Management Committee of the Hundred Peaks Section meets to discuss management issues of the section. Everyone welcome. Refreshments & socializing, something for everyone. 7:30 pm Griffith Park Ranger Sta Aud

Jan 22, 2000 Saturday HPS Annual Awards Banquet Save this date for a most exciting Annual Awards Banquet at Taix Restaurant, 1911 Sunset Blvd, in Echo Park. No host bar and raffish starts at 5:00 PM. Dinner at 6:30 PM. Program a multimedia presentation by Kurt Weberg, "ON TOP OF THE WORLD: A Journey to the top of Mt. Everest." Seat \$ase w/choice of entree (beef, fish, vegetarian or chicken) and \$29/person to reservation and Fleming. Seating is limited, so sign up early.

Angeles Chapter Holds Its Annual Election

The Hundred Peaks Section submitted questions to candidates running for the Angeles Chapter ExCom. Replies from candidates were printed in the Sep - Oct issue of **THE LOOKOUT** and have been re-printed in this issue. Please read the responses carefully before you cast your ballots.

Hundred Peaks Section Holds Annual Election: Ballots to be Sent By Separate Mailing

By the time you receive this newsletter you should have received your ballot for this year's annual election of officers for 2000 as well as proposals for the addition and deletion of peaks to our peak List. **Your ballots will be mailed separately from THE LOOKOUT!**

Please return your ballot by December 1, 1999. If you are a member of the HPS and have not received your ballot, please inform David Eisenberg at (818) 247-1635 or email DavidFE@ix.netcom.com

Candidates for Management Committee are as follows:

- Tom Hill
- Walter Hoffmann
- George Woodrup
- John Hestert
- John Conroy
- Ray Wolfe
- Nanda Hill
- Barbara Howard Eyerly (as a shared position)

The proposed peak additions:

- San Fink Peak
- Russell Peak
- Barkus Peak
- Dragon's Head
- Henry Peak

The proposed peak deletions:

- Pause Hill
- Indian Mountain
- Ranger Peak
- Climax Peak
- Sugar Pine Mountain
- Monument Peak #2
- Peak Mountain
- McPherson Peak

Membership Report

By David F Eisenberg

Achievements

100 Peaks Emblem

984	Patricia Arredondo	July 17, 1999	Ten Thousand Foot Ridge
985	Sharry Puraty	August 29, 1999	Sugarloaf Mountain
986	Lynda Hill	August 21, 1999	Wright Mountain

200 Peaks Bar

363	Ray Wolfe	July 10, 1999	Suicide Peak
364	James Carden	August 14, 1999	Mount San Antonio

List Completion No. 6

5	Peter H. Doggett	August 15, 1999	White Mountain No. 2
---	------------------	-----------------	----------------------

<u>Membership Summary</u>			<u>New Member</u>		
<u>Category</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Inactive</u>	<u>Roy Randall</u>	Sid Newsom	Robert Gordon
Sustaining	32	8		Jennifer Ponce	Ed Johnson
Member	291	169		Laura Quinn	Linda Landau
Household	65	26		Ramesh Raghavan	Kurt Levens
Subscriber	124	230	<u>New Subscriptions</u>	Michael Tobias	Ken Moss
Honorary	2		Denny Bean	Barbara Torres	Alan Pincus
Sust. Sub.	2	1	Ed Benison	Becky White	Tom Rogers
Life	2		Rachel Burnage	Jim Williams	Jean Willis
Patron	1		Henena Czepiec	Ralph Winter	
Benefactor	1		John Dark	Cindy Yoon	<u>Sustaining Renewals</u>
Extra	6		Peter Duerst	Jason Call	Leo Rosario
			Louise Ghandhi	Jim Clements	W. Ross Yates
			Mark Hickox	David Comerzan	
			Gloria Jacobson	Ron Duffin	
			Eileen Larkins	Alan Erickson	
			Edith Liu	Jacob Golbus	
Totals	526	434			

THE LOOKOUT is published six times each year. Deadlines for receipt of materials are the first weekend of each even numbered month. According to the Hundred Peaks Sections By-Laws, the first issue mailed each year must contain the Peak List, unless there were no changes in the List from the previous year. The second issue each year contains the membership list. Usually the November - December issue includes the ballot for the election of HPS Management Committee members, unless the ballots are to be mailed separately. Items submitted must be typewritten, or submitted by email. Photographs must be identified. If submitting photographs please identify the subjects (individuals and background). Please state if you need to have your photographs returned to you; otherwise they may be lost. Please also include a sase if you want your photographs returned. Items are subject to editing for reasonableness, appropriateness, or relevancy. **THE LOOKOUT** is the property of the Hundred Peaks Section. All rights reserved.

From the Chair

By Byron Prinzmetal

With much apprehension, I need to report that my term as chair is almost over. I have been thinking about what to say for some time and I have finally settled on telling you, from my point of view, what the state of the union (that is, HPS) is.

As I have said in the past our biggest challenge is to attract new subscribers/members who like to hike. Without new active hikers our "club" (as I like to call it) will wither up and die. I believe that this problem (lack of many new active hikers) has been with us for some time (least five+ years). It is a hard problem to correct because it takes a mental change in the way we run our club and lead our hikes (more about that later.)

So what are some of the symptoms of the problem?

Great peaks like Weldon, Martinez, Eagle's Rest, Cobblestone, etc. have few sign-ins. Only four people show up for a great hike led by two of our best leaders to Ten Thousand Foot Ridge et al. Contrast this to the Wednesday's local hikes I sometimes lead and go on often. A small Wednesday hike has 30 people while a large one has 50+ people. One asks are these easy hikes...nope (average hike is 2000 to 3000 feet gain and 8 miles and they often go to HPS peaks!) So why do people show up for these hikes in great numbers versus our average of, say, 12 people?

I have been told that in our heyday (when John Backus et al were leading) a typical outing had over twice the number of participants than what we have today. And, our active membership was much greater then than now.



Some will say we are the most successful of the three mountaineering sections in the chapter as we have over twice the members (we now have about 500 members/subscribers). I say that is an excuse for mediocrity and perhaps a prescription for failure. There are literally 20+ million people who live in the Los Angeles to San Diego area. With all of the health news being blasted to everyone that walking is one of the best things one can do to extend ones life and increase its quality, one would think we would attract a much higher percentage of people (currently we are attracting less than .0025 percent who live near our beautiful mountains). Further, more people are retiring than ever before, many at an earlier age. The Wednesday group is 99% retirees. Why are we not attracting these people (retirees) in larger numbers? Something seems terrible wrong to me.

The answers to all of these questions and

what we need to do are simple, but not easily implemented in a volunteer organization. Below is my list of two things we need to do. We have started to do many of these things. But, we have a long ways to go to make OUR club everything it can be.

We need to lead many more of our hikes whose hike objective is to have the majority of the participants ENJOY the outing and want to come back for more and more. This means that if we have three peaks we are trying to bag and if we can only bag two of them without turning off the majority of the participants so be it. While I have not done a statistical study on this, my observation is that leaders who lead this way attract many more hikers who come back over and over again. We need to market ourselves to attract new active hikers.

So where do we stand on doing these two things? We have started a number of things this year that to try to address the above. Here are the things we have done and a starter list of some of the items to be done. We have implemented what some call "Truth in Trip Descriptions." We now include the type of terrain (trail, cross country, steep cross country, brushy, etc.) and intended pace (moderate, tiger, etc.) so someone has a better idea of what they are getting themselves in for. I have started a new hiker column to help educate new people so they have a higher probability of enjoying hiking in general and our outings in particular. I have started a column for leaders to try to help them better understand how to lead more enjoyable hikes. The column will also reinforce the things that were taught by the LTC (sometimes decades before). But, all of the above is just a start. The most important thing is the attitude of our leaders. If someone wants to lead a tiger hike...great. Advertise this and at the car pool meeting point re-enforce this. If the hike objective is to bag peaks as the first objective (after safety) then say this in the trip description and at the car pool point. But in my opinion, the objective of the vast majority of the hikes we lead should be for the majority of the participants to ENJOY the outing and want to come back for more and peak bagging is secondary. And this requires our leaders to think about why they are leading to include whose needs they are trying to satisfy (theirs or the majority of the participants). And then, the management committee needs to be partners with our leaders on the things leaders can do to make their outings more enjoyable.

What should we do to attract new active subscribers/members? The first two obvious things we need to do are entice those people who already hike to our peaks and go on our outings to join us. We have started to do this by placing little pads in each register can telling people who we are and how to join us. We are getting about one to two new members per week via this method. We have

updated our web site to make it an information source for hikers. The site has doubled in the number of people using it and we get about two to four new people per month from the web site. But, the single most important thing we can do is to have our leaders sign up new people up on their trips. We have provided our leaders with pre-trip kits with some of the tools they need to make their hikes more enjoyable and to help them sign up new people. I know that signing up new people on a trip can easily be done because I have personally signed up on average one person on every trip I have lead. The leaders are in a position to talk to the participants on their trips and see who would be likely new active subscribers. To get eager hikers to sign up is easy. All one needs to do is to have them fill out the little form from the register pad and get nine dollars from them. But, we have been less than successful getting our leaders to do this. If next year's board can make this happen it would be a great accomplishment.

So in summary, in my opinion, the greatest challenge to our club is attracting new active members. To do this we need to lead more hikes whose primary objective, besides safety, is to have the majority of our participants enjoy the hike and want to come back for more and more. And, just as importantly to have our leaders actively sign up new subscribers. I hope the board next year takes on these challenges and makes them happen.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to serve you this year. Much has been accomplished, but much more needs to be done to make our club all it can be. Hope to see you all in our beautiful mountains.



Our principle job as leaders is to provide foremost a safe hiking experience and secondarily an enjoyable one (for the participants). The concept that is least understood is leading a hike that the vast majority of hikers find enjoyable because enjoyment is a personal feeling. That is, what one person would enjoy another would dislike. Here are some examples: Someone loves to do fast paced hikes that are long, difficult and above everything else bags peaks listed on the trip description. This person would be disappointed if the hike was advertised as fast paced and was significantly slowed down by a very slow hiker and the trip objectives were not met. On the other hand another hiker loves to hike at a moderate pace on trail and hates going through brush. The trip was advertised as a trail hike, but the leader changed it without telling the participants and they went up a steep, very brushy ridge. This person might be very dissatisfied with the trip. The trip is advertised as a moderate hike. If a person who loves to hike at a tiger pace shows up and does not understand that

the hike is a moderate one, that person might not enjoy the hike. In the writer's opinion, two of the most important things to achieve a safe and enjoyable trip are: In your trip description, at your carpool meeting point and again at the trail head insure that everyone understands the difficulty of the trip including intended pace (e.g. moderate, tiger) and terrain (e.g. trail, steep rocky cross country). If someone is not up to the trip, weed the person out before the trip begins. This one item can make the difference of having a trip where all of the peaks are obtained and nobody significantly slows down the group. Obviously, this starts with the trip description that is published in the Schedule/Lookout. Making this description as complete as possible will go along ways to insure qualified people and only qualified people show up. Keep the group together.

How do you know if the group is staying together and the pace is not a killer one? I have found that by looking around every few minutes, the leader should be able to see the entire group. If you can't see everyone, then you are probably hiking too fast. Further, if the pace is too fast, most people can't talk. So if you hear a lot of talking you are probably going at a good pace for the group. If you hear no talking, you could be hiking too fast. Remember that most groups have a few very strong hikers while most of the remaining group members are moderate hikers (unless you advertise the hike for tigers only). So don't be tempted to satisfy the needs of the few tigers and go at a pace they like leaving the majority behind. This is especially difficult because the tigers seem to always be up at the front pushing the leader to go faster and faster. Finally, I have found that by keeping the entire group together usually results in a shorter trip time and a more enjoyable hike for most of the participants. There are a number of reasons for this. Here are a few: Many slower people usually have trouble deciding where to place their feet especially on rocky down hills. If there is someone in front of them then they don't have to stop to think about where to go next. Group dynamics seems to pull a slower hiker to keep up with the rest of the group. But, if they are separated from the group they then tend to hike at their own slower pace. This causes the group to wait longer at rest stops (waiting for the slow person to catch-up and then rest), which in turn causes the hike to take longer. If you hike at a pace that everyone can maintain for the length of the hike, you will have less of a need to stop more often and your stops will usually not be as long. As an example, if you hike at a pace that is not maintainable for the entire group you will end up stopping more often than say once an hour and your stops will be for longer periods of time. The few additional stops, each longer than if you set a slower pace, can add up to considerable length of time. So in summary, weed out those people who

would have difficulty with the trip through "truth in advertising" in your trip description, at the carpool meeting point and again at the trail head. And, keep the group together. Doing these two items will tend to make the trip safer and more enjoyable for all.

Leaders Column

If one looks at the statistics of when a HPS member gets seriously hurt, most of the time is when they are hiking alone or when they are separated from the group (private and public). Our principle job as leaders is to provide foremost a safe hiking experience and secondarily an enjoyable one. In the writers opinion, the most important things to do to achieve a safe and enjoyable trip is to: In your trip description and at your carpool meeting point insure that everyone understands the difficulty of the trip including intended pace (e.g. moderate, tiger) and terrain (e.g. trail, steep rocky cross country) . If someone is not up to the trip, weed him out before the trip begins. This one item can make the difference of having a trip where all of the peaks are obtained and nobody significantly slows down the group. Keep the group together. There are times when a group needs to split up and there are ways to minimize problems when this occurs (this is a subject for a future article). But, unless there is a very overpowering reason, keep the group together. Hike at a pace where the entire group is kept together and nobody hikes to exhaustion. How do you know if the group is staying together and the pace is not a killer one? I have found that by looking around every few minutes, the leader should be able to see the entire group. If you can't see everyone, then you are probably hiking to fast. Further, if the pace is to fast, most people can't talk. So if you hear a lot of talking you are probably going at a good pace for the group. If you hear no talking, you could be hiking to fast. Remember that most groups have a few very strong hikers while most of the remaining group members are moderate hikers (unless you advertise the hike for tigers only). So don't be tempted to satisfy the needs of the few tigers and go at a pace they like leaving the majority behind. This is especially difficult because the tigers seem to always be up at the front pushing the leader to go faster and faster. Finally, I have found that by keeping the entire group together usually results in a shorter trip time and a more enjoyable hike for most of the participants. Here is why. Many slower people usually have trouble deciding where to place their feet especially on rocky down hills. If there is someone in front of them then they don't have to stop to think about where to go next. Finally, group dynamics seems to pull a slower hiker to keep up with the rest of the group. But, if they are separated from the group they then tend to hike at their own slower pace. This

causes the group to wait longer at it's resting stops which in turn causes the hike to take longer. So in summary, weed out those people who would have difficulty with the trip through "truth in advertising" in your trip description and again at the carpool meeting point (at the trailhead it is usually to late). And, whenever possible keep the group together. Doing these two items will tend to make the trip safer and more enjoyable for all. The New Hikers Column By Byron Prinzmetal

A common question that is asked by new hikers is, "what should I carry?" What you need to carry should not depend if the outing is a public or private hike. You need to carry those things that allow you to complete the trip safely and have enough extras in case of an emergency to include surviving a night in the area you are hiking in. Below is the list of ten essentials that most hiking organizations consider the minimal set of items you need to carry. Most trip leaders require that you carry at least the Ten Essentials and some require you to take additional items.

There are many excellent books and classes that will help teach you how to enjoy and survive in the wilderness. I highly recommend the WTC (wilderness travel course) put on by the Angeles Chapter. The book, "Freedom of the Hills", is an excellent source of information.

The Ten Essentials

Some Suggestions

Extra clothing layer(s)

One losses most of ones heat through ones head. I recommend that you take a warm head covering, warm gloves, rain gear and xyz. Learn what type of clothing materials keep you warm when wet (not cotton.) Wearing clothes that retain your body heat when wet vs. wearing clothes that don't can make the difference of surviving the night. I will talk about the different kinds of materials in the next column.

Map of area (in waterproof case)

You should learn to use a map and compass. They are not much good if you don't know how to use them. The Angeles Chapter has an excellent beginner map and compass course held several times a year. The Chapter also has an excellent navigation course for those who want to learn how to navigate off trail by map and compass.

Compass

Food and Drinking water

As far as food is concerned you should take enough for the hike and to survive an extra day. The most important ingredient in your food as far as day hiking is concerned is carbohydrate. As a minimum you should consider carrying enough food with at least 100 grams of carbohydrates. For water, you should consider at a minimum to carry at least one quart for every thousand feet you are climbing (or at least one

quart for every two hours of vigorous activity) plus one quart extra. Before a hike begins I drink one quart and then carry what I recommend above as a minimum. The amount carried depends also upon the weather (if it is hot you should take more), available sources of water, and your particular water requirements. It is always better to have more water than needed than not enough!!!!

Headlamp or flashlight (with extra batteries/ bulbs)
It is very difficult to hike at night without a flashlight. It is also hard to do the necessary things at an emergency overnight site if you can't see.

First-aid kit

Having a first aid kit without knowing how to use it is problematical. I would recommend that you take the advance first aid course put on by the American Red Cross or other similar courses. The Angeles Chapter has an excellent Wilderness First Aid Course that I highly recommend. But, it is very popular and one needs to sign up sometimes a year in advance. There are other equivalent courses that are also excellent.

Pocketknife

Sunscreen and Sun glasses (with retaining strap)

Matches (in waterproof container)

Being able to start a fire to stay warm could make the difference of surviving the night.

Fire starter

- Matches alone are not enough. One needs material to help start a fire in wet and windy conditions. It takes skill to start a fire in difficult conditions.

One last point, hiking alone can be very dangerous especially if you are hiking the peaks on the HPS list or other areas where you are alone. Even peaks that are short distances from the highway (e.g. Throop) can be dangerous. If you get hurt and nobody comes by to help you, you might find yourself in a most difficult life-threatening situation. Most of the very serious accidents on HPS peaks have occurred with experienced hikers hiking alone. Don't let the above scare you. Many millions of people hike and enjoy the experience. The more you know the more you will enjoy your outings and the safer they will be. I hope the above helps. Until the next Lookout.

Voting Procedure for Members Only

It is time for members to vote for next year's management committee, and for or against five peak additions and eight de-listings. You will receive in a separate mailing your ballot, candidate statements, and pro/con arguments for the peak additions/deletions. Please take the time to read the statements, cast your ballot and return it using the provided envelope to be received by December 1st. Also, in the package you will find a questionnaire to

help us understand more about your hiking activities and how we can make the HPS better serve your needs. Please complete the questionnaire and return it also in the provided envelope.

Finally, in the package is a form for making your reservations for our banquet. You may also buy your raffle tickets using this form. Those buying raffle tickets and sending the completed reservation form with your ballot and questionnaire (to be received by December 1st) will receive three tickets for every two you buy. Last year we had great prizes including gift certificates from some of the finest outdoor stores in Los Angeles. We hope to have similar great prizes this year. So increase your chances of winning, buy your raffle tickets now using our 3 for 2 program.

As mentioned elsewhere the banquet will be held on Saturday January 22nd. Please join us as we celebrate with friends, family and hiking buddies another wonderful year of hiking in our beloved mountain ranges of Southern California. Experience the passion and exhilaration of world renowned guide (Kurt Wedberg) as he guides us through his multi-media presentation, "ON TOP OF THE WORLD: A Journey to the Top of Mt. Everest." Our celebration starts at 5PM (no host bar and raffle), dinner at 6:30 PM followed by the program at Taix Restaurant, 1911 Sunset Blvd. in Echo Park.

So please vote, complete the questionnaire, and join us at our upcoming banquet.
Hope to see you at our banquet.

Raffle Tickets

Most of you don't know this, but raffle ticket sales, in the past, has made a tremendous difference in the financial success of our banquet. As we have mentioned in the past, our annual dues do not cover all of our expenses. So contributions in one form or another is very important to our success.

We, therefore, ask that you help us in our banquet raffle program by donating items that you believe would be of interest to our members. Many corporations will also contribute. If you work for a company that will do this please ask them to help. Last year, for instance, REI contributed \$500 worth of gift certificates. Here are some examples of things you might consider donating: Unused gift certificates, Unused hiking gear (e.g. day packs, poncho's, pots, pans, stoves, hiking poles, compasses, GPS', etc.). hiking books and maps, Fairly new working computer and software.

If you or your company will donate money, great. We can either give the money away or buy gift certificates.

Please call Janet Bartel at (818) 247-4099 and let her know what you are planning to donate. You can either bring the item to the banquet or send it to Janet

at 833 Olmsted, Glendale, Ca 91202.

And, finally, please come to our banquet on the 22nd of January and buy raffle tickets.

36th Hundred Peaks Section Annual Awards Banquet

Please join us as we celebrate with friends, family and hiking buddies another wonderful year of hiking in our beloved mountain ranges of Southern California. Experience the passion and exhilaration of world renowned guide (Kurt Wedberg) as he guides us through his multi-media presentation, "ON TOP OF THE WORLD: A Journey to the Top of Mt. Everest." Our celebration starts at 5PM (no host bar and raffle), dinner at 6:30 PM followed by the program at Taix Restaurant, 1911 Sunset Blvd. in Echo Park.

Seating is limited so please sign up early. You can make your reservations by sending a sase with choice of entree (beef, fish, vegetarian or chicken) and \$29/person to Jim Fleming (538 Yarrow Drive, Simi Valley, CA 93065).

Angeles Chapter Ex-Comm Election

By Byron Prinzmetal

The Hundred Peaks Management Committee urges each of our members and subscribers to vote in the upcoming election for the Angeles Chapter Executive Committee. We feel that our outing section, and perhaps other outing sections, can be positively or negatively affected by the actions of the Angeles Chapter Executive Committee. While no one single issue should be the deciding issue in determining whom you vote for, we feel that the following issues are of the utmost importance to our section and should be considered in your selection process:

1. Since we are an outings section we would like the board to understand our issues and concerns. One of the best ways to do this is to vote for those candidates who go regularly on hiking/climbing outings.

2. The outing sections are in many ways dependent upon the Schedule and leader's insurance. The Schedule is paid for out of income derived from the chapter reserves (some call it our endowment, some disagree that the money is an endowment. But, no matter what you call this money it generates income). Further, the Chapter pays considerable money to National to pay its share of the leaders insurance, also out of income from our reserves. If the reserves were to be spent down so there was no or little income there would be tremendous pressure on the management committee to stop funding non conservation related items (i.e. The Schedule) so that

the conservation action items could continue. Therefore, your management committee recommends that you look to candidates who are financially conservative to insure that the income stream continues from our reserves to pay for outing related items.

3. Finally, we asked twice each ex-comm nominee to respond to our questions. All but four showed enough interest in our issues to take the time to respond. We thank them. However, four did not respond (Finney, Fowler, Hanscom, and Mintzer). We suggest that you take this into consideration in deciding whom to vote for.

Again please vote. And please consider the above issues in your selection of candidates that receive your vote.

Argument FOR de-Listing eight drive-up peaks.

By Byron Prinzmetal

These peaks are all drive-ups! While some will argue that you can hike them, the vast majority of Hundred Peakers drive up to these peaks and step out of their car to bag them. Some even bag these peaks multiple times on each drive-up occasion by tapping their car, walking a few yards to the peak thus bagging it and walking back to their car and then repeating the process over and over again. Without getting too personal, I have done this myself. I learned this process from some of our most esteemed members who practice this peak bagging method AND who are most undoubtedly arguing to keep these peaks!!!

So why should we de-list these drive-ups? The first question you should ask yourself is the following, "would you vote to add these peaks to the list?" If you would NOT vote to add them then you should vote to DE-LIST them.

So then the question is why would you not vote to add them. Here are some of the major reasons: They are long drives. Some of the drives are over 400 miles!!! We belong to the greatest conservation club in the world. We should not be using our precious resources when all we are doing is driving up to a peak. The world has drastically changed since these peaks were added to our list. For example, our new monster 4x4 suv vehicles (with air conditioning, power seats, and all of the other comforts of home) have tamed and neutralized the exploration that our founding fathers felt when they added these peaks to the list. Today you just jump into your suv and bag these peaks...little adventure...just wasted gas, time, and money. Each of these peaks has little added scenic value. Each has a nearby HPS peak that provides at least the same or better opportunity to

view the area around the drive-up. Our list has grown long over the years. Some people will not vote to add great new peaks because of the size of our list. I don't blame them. So de-listing some not so great peaks so we can add some great new ones makes sense to me.

If you are still not convinced, then read on about some of the reasons to de-list each of the specific peaks: Indian Peak-One can see the same area as one sees from Black Mountain. In fact the view from Black Mountain is much better. The road to Indian is full of buck thorn. I have known people to CLIP the road in order to not destroy their suv's paint job. I even know some very smart people who have rented suvs to bag this peak so as avoid deep buck thorn marks being engraved into the sides of their vehicles. Ranger Peak-There used to be two walking routes. They have disappeared in the brush. The routes were developed to by-pass the private road to the peak. Now all you can do is drive the private road unless you want to give lots of blood to the mountain buck thorn gods, hoping at the same time to avoid the rattle snakes. Rouse Hill-This is a long drive from Thomas Mountain. The view from Thomas is better. The mound of dirt called Rouse Hill is certainly named correctly as one does not really know when one is on top of this hill. It is certainly not much of a mountain that Hundred Peakers can be proud of bagging. Sugarpine, Monument and Cleghorn-They are long dirt drives. The view from Cajon Mtn is certainly just as good as the view from any of these peaks. These peaks add no value to our list unless one likes to drive. Peak and McPherson-These two peaks require you to drive almost 400 miles to BAG them. The top of McPherson is becoming a major electronic site. So one gets to drive all day to see a bunch of antennas!!! One can see many of the same mountains from Samon and Caliente.

So are we destroying the HPS by de-listing eight drive-ups and asking you to add five great new peaks? Is the world going to end? I think not. I think that those who love to explore and enjoy our mountain ranges will find the change a very positive one and one long over due.

PS. And, if all of the above is not enough to convince you to de-list these peaks then consider the following. There is nothing preventing you from bagging these peaks after they are de-listed. And, of course they are such great peaks you will bag them over and over again and tell all of your friends how great they are!!! Well, lets get real, you and I both know that we will not bag them again because they are not great peaks, so should they really be on our list?

Conservation Report

By Ruth Lee Dobos

NEWS FLASH! The Sierra Club Board of Directors on September 25 directed the Club's Conservation Governance Committee to formulate and implement a plan to educate Club members and the general public, and convince Congress, of the need to restore adequate funding for recreational services to the public lands, and to terminate the Federal Recreation Fee Demonstration Program, being administered in Southern California under the name "Adventure Pass".

In the opinion of your Conservation Chair the most important conservation issue of the year as it relates to the HPS is the Federal Recreation Fee. In Southern California this fee is called the Adventure Pass.

On August 14th the Angeles Chapter successfully staged a protest against the Adventure Pass in the San Gabriel Mountain. Sierra Club members stationed themselves at various well traveled areas in the mountains passing out flyers, talking to the visitors and Forest Rangers. Petitions in protest of the Adventure Pass were signed by many of these people. No one we talked to was opposed to our action, most were in agreement and object to the fee. There was an other protest on the first week of October, and one more is planned on Saturday November 6th. The Angeles Chapter needs volunteers for this final day of protest of the year. We need to get our HPS members to join in this protest, as we are the main Section effected by this fee.

The Sierra Club wishes to halt the Adventure Pass fee. We need Congress to restore the moneys to the National Forest Service so they can maintain their campgrounds and facilities. The fees collected from the Adventure Pass are minimal to maintain the services of the Forest Service. The potential for commercialization in the mountains is even greater, the changes we may see in our beautiful mountains is something I prefer not to contemplate. Potentially, we may lose the very things that draw us to the mountains, the quiet and serene beauty as opposed to the crowded and noisy city in which we live.

Join the protest! Write your Senators. Their address is Senator Boxer, or Senator Feinstein: US Senate, Washington DC, 20510. Your Representatives, name, House of Representatives, Washington DC 20515. Write to our President and Vice President and let them know how you feel.

For additional information read the Southern Sierran. Call me or email me if I can be of any assistant to you in this matter.

Eco-Contradictions

Carl Pope, Sierra Club Executive Director responds to essay by Virginia Postrel, editor of Reason Magazine.

In what is decidedly becoming a hot issue, the editor of the free-market advocacy Reason Magazine and the Executive Director of America's largest environmental organization exchange ideas about Industrial Strength Recreation.

ECO-CONTRADICTIONS

By Virginia Postrel

In October Eco-Terrorists struck in Colorado. Their target wasn't a traditional bad guy: not a logging operation, an oil rig, a dam or a whaling ship. It was a ski resort.

The Earth Liberation Front claimed responsibility for a \$12 million fire that destroyed a restaurant, a ski patrol office and four chair lifts at the Vail Resort. The group vowed that "we will be back if this greedy corporation continues to trespass into wild and unroaded areas."

"Wild and unroaded areas" are dear to the hearts of American environmentalists. But so are outdoor sports, including skiing. Recreation has long been the green alternative to such economic activities as logging or mining. In much of the western U.S., tourism and recreation indeed dwarf traditional extractive industries.

Now environmentalists are getting disillusioned with recreation. It attracts crowds. It requires infrastructure—ski lifts, accessible campgrounds. It encourages beautiful landscapes rather than authenticity or biodiversity or other ecological goals. It brings "sprawl."

These anti-recreation views aren't limited to a terrorist fringe. They're widespread. I heard them again and again at a recent conference with a bunch of mostly sensible, innovative, open-minded environmentalists.

"Now that the timber industry is practically dead on the national forests, many environmentalists are demonizing 'industrial recreation' on public lands," says Randal O'Toole, director of the Thoreau Institute in Oregon and an iconoclastic environmentalist who has long criticized the U.S. Forest Service. "Basically the attitude is that no one should be allowed on public lands unless they can get there under their own power."

This sort of thinking could destroy the popular base on which environmentalists depend. Suburban Sierra Club supporters aren't about to give up their skis and four-by-fours—much less their vacations in the great outdoors, where beauty and adventure are as important as ecological preservation.

Despite its ascetic ideology, the environmental movement thrives on wealth and pleasure.

Jet skis, snowmobiles and powerboats have long been green bêtes noires. They're noisy, macho and blue collar—not the choice of the cappuccino crowd. But the latest target of environmentalist scorn is decidedly upscale: the high-priced helicopter flights that show tourists the glories of the Grand Canyon and Hawaii's volcanoes. Under pressure from greens, Senators Daniel Akaka (D-Hawaii) and John McCain (R-Ariz.) have backed legislation to restrict the tours.

Helicopter tours appeal to visitors with more money than time, those who aren't in shape for long hikes, those who prefer air-conditioned comfort and those who want a bird's-eye view of these spectacular sites. The flights offend people who believe they have a right to contemplate nature undisturbed. "We must move quickly to save our parks from the din of machinery," former Senator Gaylord Nelson, the founder of Earth Day, writes in the Los Angeles Times.

Blocking the majority of taxpayers from enjoying the parks they supposedly own may please those who prefer a nonpowered approach to nature. But these more physical types may have their fun threatened, too.

Today's outdoor enthusiasts don't just enjoy nature. They lust after gear: high-tech rock-climbing equipment, "technical" clothing, ingenious backpacks, weatherproof cameras. Purists sniff at such consumerist technophilia. Under the umbrella of "Teaming with Wildlife," nearly 3,000 environmental groups are campaigning for a 5% federal excise tax on outdoor equipment, with the money to go to state conservation programs. They sell the idea as a "user fee," but it's really a sin tax. Most backpacks, cameras and sport-utility vehicles never make it to the mountains. And if you camp without fancy gear, you get the benefit without paying the "fee."

Despite its ascetic ideology, the environmental movement thrives on wealth and pleasure. Its great power comes from the joy that affluent, leisure-rich people take in the outdoors. "The environment" is a cherished consumer good.

Republican politicians have learned that lesson the hard way. Greens may be next.

Virginia Postrel is the editor of Reason Magazine and a columnist for Forbes. Her book, *The Future and its Enemies*, has just been published by the Free Press. E-mail: vpostrel@reason.com This article appeared in Forbes Magazine on November 30, 1998. © 1998 Forbes Inc.

Letter to the Editor: Forbes Magazine
Written by Carl Pope, Executive Director Sierra Club
Dear Editor:

The November 30, 1998 article, "ECO-CONTRADICTIONS" by Virginia Postrel contains a number of distortions, mistaken assumptions, and fallacies that require a response.

First, the "grabber" of this article may have led readers to believe that the recent arson of a ski resort in Vail was somehow indicative of the actions of environmental groups. This is patently false. The Sierra Club loudly and repeatedly condemned the arson. The arson was an act of terrorism, not environmentalism. The Sierra Club, and other mainstream environmental organizations, deplore such acts of violence and will continue to condemn them.

Second, Postrel mistakenly asserts that "environmentalists are getting disillusioned with recreation." The responsible and broader environmentalist segment recognizes a need for recreation AND the increasing need to weigh what the consuming public demands against the protection of our natural environment. The nurturing and survival of this environment means the survival of the planet, and ultimately that same consuming public.

Many environmentalists are concerned that backers of jet skis, snowmobiles, powerboats, and other forms of motorized recreation would see the use of these vehicles expanded on public lands with little regard for local environments. I, for one, would look forward to seeing a responsibly conducted, inclusive analysis of the effect motorized recreation has on the rights of others and on the ecosystems on which they intrude.

The real eco-contradiction is not about the public using public lands. It's about corporate America assuming operational control of public lands so a privileged FEW of the public may use them. In recent years federal recreational land managers have had to endure severe funding cuts. This funding is being replaced by partnerships with private industry, which are a first step in privatizing the stewardship of public lands. It is a fair assumption that the private industry members of these partnerships are motivated by profit, and it is not a far stretch to conclude that motorized recreation is far more profitable than non-motorized.

I would be remiss if I didn't add that the Sierra Club is concerned about two things: First, that there will be pressure from these commercial partners to "Disney-fy" public lands and parks with minimum consideration to the short and long-term effects on the environment. Second, that the driving force behind Fee Demo is advocating use fees for low impact users, not to cover expenses, but for whatever the traffic will bear to line the pockets of private

corporations. While Postrel asserts that the "environmental movement thrives on wealth and pleasure" the OPPOSITE is true. The environmental movement thrives on the "blood, sweat, and tears" of volunteers, many of whom, if not most, are NOT leisure-rich or affluent. Rather, they are average Americans who would like their grandchildren to be able to grow up in a country where there are still some mountains unscarred by ski runs, and where lakes teem with wildlife rather than with motorboats and jet skis.

The environment is more than a "cherished consumer good," as Ms. Postrel concludes. It is our natural heritage. Our very survival depends on it.

Sincerely,

Carl Pope, Executive Director Sierra Club

H. R. 786 A Bill to terminate the participation of the Forest Service in the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 23, 1999

Mrs. BONO (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COOK, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. DEFAZIO) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the 'Forest Tax Relief Act'.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF RECREATIONAL FEE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR THE FOREST SERVICE.

(a) ~~TERMINATION-~~ On and after the effective date of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture may not impose or collect any fee under the authority of the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program authorized by section 315 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (section 101(c) of Public Law 104-134; 16 U.S.C. 460i-6a note). Amounts collected before that date shall continue to be used by the Secretary in the manner provided in that section.

(b) ~~CONFORMING AMENDMENTS-~~ Section 315 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (section 101(c) of Public Law 104-134; 16 U.S.C. 460i-6a note), is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), by striking 'and the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Forest Service) shall each' and inserting 'shall'. (2) In subsection (b), by striking 'appropriate Secretary' and inserting 'Secretary'. (2) In subsection (e), by striking 'and the Secretary of Agriculture'.

(c) ~~EFFECTIVE DATE-~~ This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Statements of Candidates for the 2000 Hundred Peaks Section Management Committee

Lynda Hill

My first hike to an HPS peak was June 1972, Mt Markham, where I discovered how difficult it is to avoid yucca. Since that time I have learned a lot more about our peaks (and about yucca), and recently achieved the 100 Peak Emblem. Now I want to contribute back to the group. Paying dues is not always just a matter of money.

I am not a strong hiker, and I don't think I will ever be a 'tiger,' but I do enjoy being outdoors. Recent HPS Management teams have been dominated by strong hikers. If elected, I will make it my job to voice opinions for the hikers who want to get to their peaks, but with moderation and enjoyment.

George Wysup

Since last year at this time I have a year of service on the HPS board as treasurer. I have completed the HPS list and have learned a lot about the workings of our section. I believe I can do a good job for another year as treasurer, or in whatever position. I am pleased with the progress made by this year's board in increasing membership, improving the outings program, and in the website. I want to see the quality of our list improve, but without increasing the total number of peaks on the list. We must add at least the three peaks to honor our prominent past members and remove at least a like number of embarrassingly ugly "peaks".

John Connerly

I did my first peak on the list in 1967-Mount Baldy. I loved it so much it took me fifteen years to get number two; but since 1982, I've set a blistering pace and I am down to nine more to finish the list as I write this. Not that I'm counting.

I have two things I'd like to promote for the club in the next year or two: First, let's get Toro peak back on the list. Many of us have hiked to the highest peak in the Santa Rosas as a private trip. We heard many years ago that the tribe considers it private property. (So is Cuyapaipe for that matter.) Al Holden, a San Diego list finisher, leads this peak annually for the San Diego Chapter, going up from the East side and reports that he's never had any problems. It's a good case of "don't ask don't tell." I suggest that the worst thing that could befall us by putting it back on the list, is the extreme remote possibility of being turned back.

Second, I think it would be a fitting memorial to Sam Fink, if we re-signed his original route to

Antsell Rock, by improvising a similar tin marker. It would be relatively easy to do, with the help of some veteran leaders (Frank, Carleton, Joe Young, et al) and someone with the skills to make the signs.

Finally, I'm grateful to the HPS and particularly many of the leaders who have helped get to the top of about 265 peaks, give or take. I hope to help carry on a fine tradition and strengthen a great organization.

Ray Wolfe

I did my first HPS hike in 1987, had a long absence in the middle, and am now back hiking with the intent of finishing the list and having fun doing it. I'm an engineer by profession, and believe I can bring creativity and business management experience to the job.

My objectives as a member of the HPS management committee would be to:

Achieve a higher level of enjoyment of hiking by better matching the difficulty of the hike to the capability and determination of the hiker. I believe this can be done in trip writeups by mentioning such things as brush, difficult cross country, anticipated pace and time as well as the existing distance and gain. Some hikes have to be led at a rapid pace to get done by dark, the writeups for such hikes should not attract unsuspecting new hikers or normal, non-compulsive persons.

Improve the writeups and maps, with the objective of making them work as well as a hiking guide sold in a bookstore.

Market the HPS as the leading southern California hiking group on the web. This would include cross linking with other hiking groups, some effort at coming out well in search engines, and adding a bit more motivational material.

Work to improve the "list", with the guideline of "would we include this peak if we were going to publish the peaks list?" This should be done gradually out of respect to hikers with an investment of time and energy in the present list. Prudence indeed will dictate that customs long established should not be cast aside for light or transient reasons.

The purpose of all of this is both to keep hiking enjoyable for existing members, who like things pretty much the way they are, and also to attract new people as first time hikers and eventually as members.

Tom Hill

I have enjoyed serving in 1999 with a dedicated and no-nonsense Chair who has led by example. Within any organization, much needs to be done even to remain in the same place. To bring forth

some new ideas that seem to be working, without rocking the boat, requires even more effort. My fervent hope is for the next Committee to build upon these small changes, to nurture them and allow the HPS to remain the strong and vigorous hiking club it has proven to be, and I would be honored to serve on such a Committee.

Barbara and Howard Eyerly

Barbara has been a home maker for the past 25 years and Howard has recently retired from the Jet Propulsion Laboratory where he held management positions that were associated with the development of space flight scientific instruments. We have been Sierra Club members since 1989 and HPS members since 1991. In addition we are members of the SPS, California Mountaineering Club, graduates of the WTC, and former members of the DPS (as time now permits we will again become active in the DPS). Barbara is a HPS emblem holder and an O rated leader. At the time of this writing Howard is finishing up his first 100 HPS Peaks (2 to go) and has scheduled his O rating provisional lead. If elected to the management team we will try to achieve more diversity in the offered HPS hikes; that is more scheduled hikes in the outlying areas and some slow hikes. The slow hikes would be targeted for beginners, families, and older folks.

Virgil Popescu

Like most of you I love the mountains and the natural wilderness. Later I joined the Sierra Club when I realized that in parallel to our hiking activities, we have to protect our wild places and natural ecosystems. For the past two years, I have enjoyed being on the HPS Management as part of my commitment and concern about conservation and environment.

As a Program Chair, I did my best to bring new and different presentations that would attract more members. Now as an Outings Chair I am working on an outing program which will help our new members to finish the HPS List in the next five years. So I look forward to continue this outing program next year and many more.

Peter Doggett

Recently I learned that 30% of our neighbors are overweight. However, most HPS members are healthy, but I expect that there will be increasing pressure to avoid exercise and to take the easiest route through life. We need to help our fellow man and show them that exercise isn't always painful. As we continue to "DO" our HPS List, I hope that we can bring others along. I also want to help keep the HPS operating smoothly.



SIERRA CLUB YEAR 2000 CALENDARS

Item	Price	#	Total
Wilderness Calendar 2000	\$11.95	_____	_____
Engagement Calendar 2000	\$12.95	_____	_____
Wildlife Calendar 2000	\$12.95	_____	_____
Pocket Calendar 2000	\$4.99	_____	_____
Birds Calendar 2000	\$11.95	_____	_____
Wildflowers Calendar 2000	\$11.95	_____	_____
Oceans Calendar 2000	\$11.95	_____	_____
	Subtotal		_____
	Shipping (5% of subtotal)		_____
	Sales tax		_____
	Grand Total		_____

Ship To:

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ ZIP _____

Telephone _____

Make checks payable to Sierra Club and mail to the return address shown on your newsletter

HPS Members Sound Off on Peak Additions and Deletions

[From our Website!]

(Byron Prinzmetal): The hike from our proposed Russell Peak to Backus Peak, in my opinion, would be one of the best on this list. The views are fantastic and the hike takes good route finding skills to avoid the beautiful cliffs along the route. It took me, Mars and Dorothy three hours to cover the two miles between the peaks. Ranger This used to be a short nice walk. The two trails are completely overgrown and snake infested. The only remaining ways in are by helicopter or by trespassing on a short private road. This peak adds no value to our list, in my opinion. Indian-Danger Buck Thorn If you would like stripes on your car permanently etched (deep grooves) do Indian. The buck thorn is perfect for this...can't be avoided. The peak adds no value to our list, in the writers opinion, unless you want to support your local car paint shop or your 4x4 car rental company. Rouse Hill Here is a great one. Some will say that the hike is simply beautiful. But, I would guess that most people do this via a 4x4 car. And most are glad it was not their's. This peak, again in the writers sole opinion, does not represent the other many fine peaks on our list and its sole function is to give business to car repair companies. My vote is to add some really beautiful peaks and remove some of the drive-ups. How do you feel about this?

(Erik Siering) adds/drops Deletions: Lose the dreg drive-ups, in particular Hot Springs; ambivalent about Ranger, Indian, Cleghorn. Let Harvard be, as it's a nice ridge romp from Yale. Keep Rouse, Peak, and McPherson, as there are good route alternatives to the driving. Additions: Sure, add Drury and Dragon Head. They're off the beaten track, and offer fine views of the dominant peaks. The proposed Backus and Russell peaks are pleasant. Could even name the intervening highpoint (6661') for Sam Fink.

(Asher Waxman) list changes keep Peak & McPherson (I'll think more about the others).

(George Wysup) Harvard, Peak, McPherson, etc. Leave Harvard alone. At least it's not a drive up. There is a nice walk from Apple Canyon campground to McPherson. Peak Mtn is a piece of junk, but it has an interesting name (named after Rufus Q. Peak, a local rancher, trapper, and florist). Cleghorn is a long drive on a bad road, but it has a great view of I-15. Hot Springs is a county high point, which means it can be on someone else's list. Rouse Hill--maybe most people do drive it, but the fact remains that there is a nice trail from E. of Hemet.

(Southern Courtney) Remove drive-ups Date: 16 Apr 1999 Drive-up should not count. If there is reasonable way to hike the peak OK but it should count only if one does the hike (By reasonable I mean mostly by trail or cross-country, not up some long road.) Harvard is OK not great but OK.

(Byron Prinzmetal) Russell and Backus Peaks and the hike in between. Yesterday (4/18/99), we did the exploratory to the two peaks. The hike, in my opinion, compares with the best on the list in terms of wonderful views, grandness of the area, great cross country trekking, etc. The hike well represents all of the best of what the Hps stands for. Naming these two grand peaks after some of our most important founders/leaders is a wonderful and appropriate thing to do, in my opinion. Joe Young and others spoke about each's accomplishments in our moment of silence at the top of each peak. The day was a most wonderful day.

(Gabriele Rau) Hot Springs Mountain: Should be deleted, drive up and entrance fee. Harvard: We should keep this peak on the list. Many routes to get there, Harvard and Yale as neighbors. Peak Mtn: We should keep at least one peak on this ridge, the views are excellent. McPherson should be deleted, because of the fenced in towers, LO has been removed for a long time. Backus Peak: Should be added, good desert hike, outstanding views. Russell Peak should be added to the list, good desert hike, either alone or in combination with Backus Peak. Rouse Hill, Indian Mountain, Ranger, Cleghorn Should all be removed, drive-ups with no particular scenic features.

(Joe Young) Proposed additions, deletions. I support de-Listing Ranger and Indian. They are worthless. Harvard is historic, so I would have trouble with de-Listing it. Rouse Hill, Peak, McPherson can be hiked quite nicely. Rouse has an impressive 270° view. Cleghorn and Hot Springs? I could be persuaded either way. I support ALL proposed additions. Dragon Head, in particular, has deserved HPS List status for over 20 years. As far as remarks about drive-ups go...I quote from the original memo from 1946 re The Hundred Peaks Idea: "The only rules in the Hundred Peaks Game are: 1. It counts one, if you reach a peak by foot, horseback, car or helicopter.." That memo was signed by Luella Todd, Jack Bascom, and Weldon Heald. We should NOT remove peaks simply because they are drive-ups. The adventure of peakbagging extends to the entire logistics of the outing.

(Southern Courtney) Re: Joe's Memo on ride ups: The Hundred Peaks memo perhaps sounded like fun to whomever wrote it. Today the HPS is looked on as a hiking section not a ride or fly section.

(Bob Sumner) Re: Additions/Deletions: No objection to the five proposed for addition. Deletions: Agree with Hot Springs Mtn. Disagree with Harvard. Ambivalent about the others.

(Martin Feather) Criteria for adding/deleting peaks: I'd like peaks to be added only if they encourage us to explore new areas and/or new routes. E.g., yet another peak in the vicinity of, say, San Geronio, doesn't seem to me to fit this criteria. Recent years' additions that I have greatly enjoyed include Ken Pt, Skinner, Snow, Weldon, all of which led me to hike new and enjoyable routes. I'd like peaks to be removed only if they are on private land and/or in practice have no redeeming features. E.g., Rouse Hill has an excellent hiking route (via the S. Fork San Jacinto River Trail), and so should NOT qualify for removal, despite the drive-up route to it. Just my opinion...

(Larry Hoak) Proposed Deletion of Mt Harvard Mt Harvard is a fine hike, 4,400 feet of gain, up Little Santa Anita Cyn from Sierra Madre. If Harvard is struck off, then Mt Wilson should be deleted. It seems to me that drive ups should not count towards finishing the list if we are going to be purists about the process. If there are peaks that can be feasibly reached only by driving up them, they should be struck off. Doing a peak via a drive up route would not count towards list completion. Therefore, peaks with only drive up routes should be deleted.

(Dave Garrison) New Peak Discussion I did Cleghorn Mt. in April, 1999. The road was not that well maintained and we parked pretty low down the mountain. The hike as you know is fire road. The view from the summit was memorable due to the view of the Cucamonga, Three T's, Baldy to Wright Mt. ridge, which was snow covered and spectacular. While I'm unlikely to climb this peak again (we did Sugarpine, but left Cajon until later) Our group, which included two beginners seemed to enjoy the day. But for status as a Hundred Peak, Cleghorn would be quickly dismissed. If one of the purposes of the Section is to get people out where they otherwise would not usually hike, I think the Section should keep Cleghorn on the list. I look forward to the Section's determination.

(Jon Sheldon) New Peak Discussion I have a couple of concerns about the proposed addition of unnamed bumps to our list. First off, I think that John Backus, Sam Fink and Bill T. Russell were all legends and contributed greatly to making the HPS what it is today. But we have already honored each of these individuals by naming awards after them. If the peaks are truly worthy of being added to the list (and meet all the criteria in Section 6.4 of the By-Laws), then by all means place them for a vote of the membership,

using the designation officially adopted by the U.S. Board of Geographic names. I also recommend that proposed peaks NOT be given an official number until they are voted on by the membership. Designating the peaks as 1K, 1L and 28P, gives the false impression that they are in fact on the list. Save the numbering until after the vote.

(Eric Sieke) New Peak Discussion Let's Talk About the HPS Peaks! That's probably the most important aspect of this proposal - more people are spending more time and energy thinking, talking and writing about the HPS and the HPS peaks than at anytime in recent memory. But don't delist the peaks with good hiking routes - McPherson, Rouse and Harvard. Don't delist the SD County Highpoint Hot Springs - while literally true that it is on private property (an Indian reservation) and requires a fee, I recall that there is usually someone there to collect that fee and grant permission. Instead, let's try to reinstate Toro Peak, a fine peak even with the antennae! Cleghorn is OK, but forget Indian, Ranger and Peak. I dirt road hike can be nice, but these aren't. But don't judge a peak by the dents in your car.

(Miriam Romero) New Peak Discussion REPLY TO SOUTHERN COURTNEY RE: WHOMEVER In 1965, I wrote a history of the HPS for the years 1954-1965. The other day I pulled up on the 'Net the discussions of peak additions and deletions. We had the same kinds of discussions in the early '60's!! I have contacted Byron and will write more to him re: HPS history. I take issue with the short comment by Southern Courtney re: Joe Young's April 22, 1999 comment about the quotation of Weldon Heald regarding the object of the game. Courtney says: "perhaps sounded like fun to whomever wrote it. Today the HPS is looked on as a hiking section not a ride or fly section" First, the whomever wrote it was the founder of the HPS section, Weldon Heald, a person highly respected by the early members and founders of the HPS. Second: the complete quotation by Weldon Heald was: The object of the game is to reach the top of 100 Peaks of the 192 named summits over 5,000' elevation from the Tehachapi Range to the Mexican border. The summits may be reached by foot, auto, horseback or helicopter--its real value is not just in bagging peaks, but for Sierrans to know intimately the mountain country within a day's trip of their garages. HPS was started as a game, and those of us who climbed in those early days did have a lot of fun and camaraderie. And, yes, we were a hiking group. Which brings me to the third comment: HPS has always been a hiking group. The comment about helicopters and horseback was a tongue-in-cheek comment meant to emphasize the importance of getting to know the mountain ranges in So. Calif. intimately. Weldon Heald and signers of the

first By-Laws never thought of the group as anything but a hiking group. Bob Marshall who was Chairman of the Executive committee of the Angeles Chapter in 1965, wrote an article for my historical account of the Section. He says, and I quote: "The whole idea of climbing a hundred peaks is delicate, and can be destroyed simply by taking it too seriously. The originators of the Section looked upon it as a game, and they had the right idea. If it becomes more sober than this, the absurdities take over. Of course, if we go too far the other way, we run the danger of turning the Section into nothing at all. There is a careful balance which has to be held if the Hundred Peaks idea is to make sense. The Section is entirely unique and has to be. So are the mountains we climb." How true. And, oh, yes, we hiked and climbed. Did we ever!! I received my emblem in Dec. 1964. I still belong to the Sierra Club, have been since 1961, and am now 74 years old. The discussion re: deletions and additions is healthy for the section, always has been, always will be. And, finally, one last comment unrelated to the Courtney comment: When I was climbing, both the men and the women members of the Section regarded the early female founders of the HPS with great respect and awe. What those gals accomplished!! I have stories from them which are so interesting. But I see no efforts to name peaks after these gals. Perhaps some effort could be made in that direction. My choices: Freda Walbrecht Peak, Luella Todd Peak. Louise Werner Peak. Irene Charnock Peak. Alice Bates Peak. Peggy McLean Peak. Hazel Elbinger Peak.

Perhaps naming a few of the peaks after these particular HPS founders and early climbers would give current HPS-ers more of a sense of history of the section and these early founders would not be relegated to whomever wrote it. I say all this with due respect to S. Courtney. I just feel a sense of history and appreciation of the founders of the Section is missing. Hopefully, I am mistaken. Good climbing and have fun at this wonderful game.

(Southern Courtney) New Peak Discussion Reply to Miriam Romero: Comments: I'm happy to see some one has read my remarks and reacted to them. Thank you Miriam for the history of early days of the HPS. If you knew me you would understand that I also think hiking should be for fun. Drive ups or long road hikes I don't think are much fun. Some the best hikers I know are women. Miriam how about some names of women hikers that the HPS should honor. By the way I'm 72. Why not join some of us older hikers on the every Weds. Local Hikes. See Schedule for time and place.

Eric Sieke: "More people are spending more time and energy thinking, talking and writing about the HPS and the HPS peaks than at anytime in recent memory"

(Miriam Romero) New Peak Discussion: REPLY TO SOUTHERN COURTNEY and suggestions to Byron P. This posting will discuss my suggestions for peak deletions and additions. This kind of discussion has been going on forever in the Section. We had these kinds of discussions in the early '60's. I have given this some thought. Here are some suggestions which the Section might want to consider: 1) those peaks which are on private property or which can only be attained by traversing private property and for which the property owner will not give permission to traverse, eliminate. 2) those peaks which can only be attained by traversing private property and for which permission to traverse can be obtained by the property owner, and are not drive-ups, are keepers. 3) those peaks which have satellite dishes, towers, antennae, telescopes on top, usually have a road leading to the top. Some of these facilities are closed to the public. Eliminate these. If the facilities do not deter access to the sign-in log, make this restriction on adding to the list--some of these peaks have alternate hiking routes to the top, off-road, either on trail or bush-whacking. Mt. Wilson would be a good example. The peak can only be counted if the off-road, alternate, more difficult route to the top was used to achieve the peak. Perhaps a specific route could be assigned to the peak in order to count it as one of the hundred peaks. Of course, it almost goes without saying, that a sense of integrity is needed here. But I always found that those who counted the peaks were honest about it. What is the point of it otherwise? Perhaps

this kind of peak to be counted could only be achieved on a HPS sanctioned group hike up the alternate route. There would not be too many of these on the list and a group hike listed in the Lookout once or twice a year would give hikers a chance to climb the peak on the alternate route. I would prefer the honor system be used, however. This kind of listing would eliminate gaining the peak cluttered on top by "stuff" by a drive-up, but keeping the peak as a hike-up on an alternate route. As for those peaks which are drive-ups which are cluttered on top and for which no alternate route up is feasible, eliminate that peak. 4) Some of the peaks which are drive-ups were not drive-ups when originally listed many years ago. There is an easy drive-up next to the highway which name escapes me now, which Irene Charnock used to tell me was a real dog to climb. They bush-whacked all the way up from Pasadena and only the strongest hikers could make the peak. Eventually the road was built to go right by the peak, but the peak was retained on the list. I propose a separate listing for those historically significant peaks--i.e., significant to the history of the HPS. Someone could go down to

Club Hdqtrs in LA and go thru old Southern Sierran copies to find out which peaks were once hike-ups before roads were added. Trip write-ups could be of help. A separate listing could be added to the Hundred Peaks list. These could be peaks of historical value, which are now drive-ups. A new category could be added to the Emblem--Emblem with an asterisk. The asterisk would denote that the emblem achiever had signed in on those historical peaks. All would have to be signed in to achieve the asterisk. But these peaks would not count towards the emblem. A hiker could choose to drive up or not, to sign in or not. The asterisk after the emblem holder's name would denote signing in on all designated historically significant peaks. Perhaps a series of articles in the Lookout could explain how these peaks were climbed at one time, giving hikers a sense of respect for those early HPS-ers who climbed the drive-ups the difficult way, and also give a sense of continuity in the Section and a link to those early members. If you chose, you could add a few other historically significant peaks which are now drive-ups, say like Santiago and Modjeska. They would qualify for the asterisk, but not the emblem. Those peaks which have always been drive-ups, and for which there is no alternative hike-up, eliminate. As for whether the drive-ups are fun for some and not fun for others, &fun" is a very subjective quality. I think criteria based on something else other than &fun" should be used. 5) High points in counties should be kept, as long as no private property has to be traversed over which owners will not give permission to climb. There are just a few of them. Many people try to achieve the high point in as many of the States as they can; I don't see them NOT counting the driveups. Let's not be hard-nosed about this. 6) those peaks which can be achieved by hiking dirt roads. Make a separate section for those. Allow only 5 (five) of those to be counted towards the emblem. There might be 25 on the list, but allow only 5 to be counted towards the emblem. Any five would do. If there is an alternate, more difficult off-road route up the peak, the peak can only be counted over and above the 5 if the off-road route is used. Here again, a sense of honor is necessary. Otherwise just 5 can count. 7) that leaves those peaks which can still be climbed, are not drive-ups, have no particular historical significance to the Section, etc. The route has been degraded for some reason, the view from the top looks into a landfill or whatever, parking and leaving the cars is a problem, or whatever. I think there are several peaks that almost everyone could agree should be removed for these kinds of reasons. But after applying the criteria of those peaks in my sections 1 thru 6 above, there should not be too many left to quibble about. Have a pro and con discussion about keeping or eliminating those peaks in the Lookout. Have sanctioned, listed outings to those

peaks for evaluation, and have the write-ups for coming hikes state that the purpose of the hike is for evaluation. Let those who climb the peak vote on whether to keep it or not. This way if there is a listed posted hike, those interested in either keeping it or dumping it can go on the hike and vote. Put up or shut up. 8) For additions, don't add any drive-ups, or you are back to square one again. Don't add peaks with clutter on top, for same reason. Don't add peaks over which private property owners might in the future deny permission to cross. Same reason. Don't add dirt road hikes, unless you put them on the list of such for which only 5 can be counted. Etc. Now, this is a long discussion, but I have given it much thought. It just seems to me that looking at the problem from a slightly different perspective would be beneficial and would result in new criteria, new qualifications for which hundred can be counted. I hope you forgive the long posting. Perhaps being a member of the Club for just about 40 years gives me some slack to be loquacious on the subject. As for joining you, Courtney, on your Wed. hikes, I no longer live in So. Calif. or Calif. for that matter. But thanks for the info and have fun. For all, enjoy the game. I will be interested to know if any consideration will be given to my suggestions.

(Michael Sallwasser) New Peak Discussion Deletion of Indian and Ranger Although I would be disappointed to lose ground, (I have 78 peaks and if these two were deleted I would only have 76. Losing Harvard, my first peak, would leave me with 75.) I would never 'hike' these peaks again. It cost me \$300 to repair the crushed oil pan driving to Indian. While climbing Ranger, I lost a piece of equipment that was ripped from the hip pack when I resorted to crawling through thick brush. Not much fun.

(Bob Latter) New Peak Discussion Keep Cleghom and Harvard Comments: Cleghom may be a long drive, but the view is spectacular. There are no other listed peaks near it. I don't understand why Harvard is being considered for delisting. If it is because it is simply an appendage to Wilson, well Sugarloaf Peak is just an appendage to Ontario and Dobbs is a ridge extending out from Jepson. Are we considering delisting them too?

(Lew Amack) New Peak Discussion Adding/Delisting Peaks Comments: The HPS should not acquiesce to property owners or developers without a struggle. Otherwise, every mountain may soon be off-limits. Furthermore, credit should be granted for attaining a summit by any transportational mode, in accordance with the founders' stance. The disabled, elderly, or lazy who cannot hike should be encouraged to visit and explore the remaining wilderness, whether by motorized vehicle or otherwise. Miriam Romero

suggests that the HPS should separately list drive-ups, historically significant peaks, clutter[ed] peaks, inter alia, is laudable, but I'm disinclined, since the goal of a conservation organization is not only to protect public land, but also to encourage--if not coerce--deprivatization of land. If deprivatization and protection of marginal wildlands is a common objective, then we should monitor as much land as possible, including the drive-ups, the trivial bumps, and the unpleasant brush-heaps. The only exception might be a peak which cannot possibly be climbed without trespassing illicitly. Consequently: (1) I support Eric Sieke's proposal to add Toro Peak to the list--even if requiring some negotiations with the local Indian tribe, (2) I am opposed to delisting any peak which can be reached legally, (3) I favor adding as many peaks > 5,000' (with > 1000' of gain and 1 mile from the nearest trailhead) as is reasonable (the sky's the limit), and (4) if undesignated, I suggest that we name future additions after our distinguished fellow mountaineers, beginning with a founding woman. If you have an opinion as to the best female candidate(s), please drop me a line at LalawMed@aol.com.

Additional Arguments Received Concerning Peak Additions and Deletions

(Peter Doggett) According to the HPS Bylaws, one purpose of the HPS is to encourage its members to explore and enjoy the mountain ranges of Southern California. All of the HPS peaks have fantastic views of the surrounding countryside and they can also be explored & enjoyed from inside a vehicle.

For those purists who don't want to drive to the summit, they can hike on many trails or travel on foot cross-country. On rainy days when we are recovering from previous battles with brush, driving to the summit can also be fun, especially if your car breaks down, gets stuck, or gets you hopelessly lost.

I have finished the HPS List six times over the past 8 yers and I feel that even our "most homely" peak should remain on the List. Only for safety & accessibility concerns should we de-List any of our peaks. In conclusion: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it!"

(Laura Quinn) I am a new subscriber to the Hundred Peaks Section newsletter who is hoping to complete the first 25 peaks within the next few months to become a member. Imagine my frustration upon learning that the section is currently considering dropping some of the less difficult and drive-to peaks from the list of 274 peaks.

It certainly seems reasonable to assume the Hundred Peaks Section will continue to recruit new members (subscribers) who may not possess the confidence to immediately launch themselves out on a 15-mile, 3000' elevation gain hike that begins at 8000'. I make that assumption because I am one of those subscribers.

Although completing a hike such as the one described above is a worthy, if not lofty, goal, I, for one, wish to work up to that after completing some of the less difficult peaks. If those peaks are dropped from the list, what will the section offer those of us who are just starting out?

(Tom Hill) General Ballot Argument: Peak Additions And Deletions: Each HPS member will have a different idea concerning the HPS, about what it stands for and the direction it should take. For example, I have my own vision, and in this peculiar vision it never occurred to me a few years ago when I voted for Dragon's Head and Drury Peak that the membership of the premier climbing organization devoted to Southern California would turn them down. Worthy peaks taller than ten thousand feet are scarce as hen's teeth in the Southland.

During the early days of the HPS, the membership and its leadership were actively and enthusiastically seeking out any peak at all that had a name, whether shown on a map or not. New Forest Service maps were put under a microscope. New Topo maps were a cause for rejoicing. New peaks were added to the list, and a wholesome, healthy game was born. Mind you, these peaks were often mere bumps. Some were drive ups even then. But with the march of progress and urbanization, more and more peaks are receiving names, to the point where naming ANY new peaks within a federal wilderness is actively discouraged. In a nutshell, there are now hundreds of eligible peaks in HPS territory, and perhaps the time has come for the HPS to become more selective in their Peak List. Consider these thoughts when you cast your vote in the coming election.

OUTING NOT IN SCHEDULE

Nov 6 Sat

O: Vetter (5908'), Mt Mooney (5840'): Easy 3.5 mi rt, 950' gain. A provisional hike to which you can bring friends and neighbors. Meet 8:00 AM at the La Cañada rideshare point. Bring water, lunch. Leader: Roxana Lewis. Co-lead: Frank Dobos.

Current Trip Reports

Dragon's Head-An Adventure

Byron Prinzmetal

When the rest of the hard working, non-retired folks were sweltering in the heat of one of the hottest days of September, four poor soles were trudging their way up to Dagon's Head. You ask who were these poor soles and where the heck is Dragon's Head (it is not even on the list)? Well, the poor soles were Dorothy Danziger, George Wysup, Southern Courtney, and myself (Byron P.) Not exactly the young bunch, and some might consider us ready for the geriatric ward! So you ask, where is Dragon's Head? You never heard of it? It is not even on the list, why do it? Well, it is the 10,866' peak you see with the head of a dragon to the south east of San Gorgonio. It is the one with the spinney ridge that leads to the top with steep drop offs (meaning beautiful cliffs) on both sides of the ridge.

So you ask, why should we and perhaps you do this peak? Well, it is there—who said that? It is the peak with perhaps the best view of any peak on or off the HPS list. One can see the following even with failing old man eyes: Snow, Kitching, Little San Gorgonio, Wilshire Peak, Cedar Mtn, most of the Santa Rosa's, Sam Fink Peak, San Jacinto, the Fuller Ridge Peaks, the two peaks in Orange County, many of the San Diego peaks, Dobbs, San Gorgonio, Jepson, many of the peaks on the San Bernardino Ridge, the Mt Baldy high peaks, to name a few. Also, one looks down spectacularly onto the desert floor almost two vertical miles below and sees Palm Springs and many of the peaks in Joshua Tree.

So, should you do this peak? Do it only if you like high adventure, exploration, fantastic views, and off trail travel/route finding.

Should you vote to add this peak to the list? Add Dragon's Head only if you want the list to cover all of the finest peaks in Southern California.

Should you consider voting no? Vote no only if you are you a wimp, if you are scared out of your mind doing 5000' vertical feet on trail and cross-country (only 3000' via Fish Creek), and don't like beautiful wild places?

But, no matter how the vote comes out: Bag Dragon's Head!!!!!! It is a wonderful peak.

Heald Peak, Nicolls Peak

May 30, 1999

Leaders: Byron Prinzmetal, Tom Hill

By Tom Hill

Seldom-led Heald Peak is the hardest HPS peak in Area 2 (Southern Sierra South of Hwy 178)

and one of the prettiest. Our route went up the steep, open western slopes to the saddle between Heald and Nicolls. We then climbed the rugged north face of Heald Peak and returned to the saddle the same way. We still had enough energy after this challenging peak to continue on to Nicolls, thanks to our moderate pace, and arrived back at our vehicles at 6:15 PM.

Byron had arrived early Sunday morning, fresh from a motel in Ridgecrest. The rest of us groundhogs spent the night at Walker Pass Campground. At 6 AM sharp we caravanned over to follow Joe Young's revised driving directions to the trailhead. Good job, Joe.

The ascent of Heald Peak was straightforward. We found several sections of Class 2 rock, many steep stretches of faint trail, and moderate brushwhacking. Clippers were helpful. One striking landmark is Bump 6805, a mixture of frenzied reds and tans formed into an imposing and picturesque rockpile.

The summit register contains the original dedication book. The dedication plaque itself is underneath the register rock. We cut back the obscuring branches to read: "Hundred Peaks Section/ In memory of our founder, Weldon Heald (1901-1967)". We noted that Mars Bonfire had signed in three times on the previous register page and that the most recent HPS trip was conducted on May 31, 1997.

After lunch on Heald came the crux of the outing. My purpose in scheduling this particular trip was to lead the peak before losing my vivid memories of an ill-fated previous HPS trip to Heald and Nicolls.....A long hike on a warm day, with seven participants out of water before Nicolls was reached. Some went scurrying back to the vehicles in desperation or sat quietly waiting at the saddle as night fell. I remember one famous comment: "I'm drinking my last water. So what? Why save it? Studies have shown that there's no reason to ration your water. Drink up!"

So here we were, 1999, trying to find the route down from the edge of Heald's summit plateau. Deja vu. On that previous trip the same problem occurred, with much gnashing of teeth as the leaders tried to figure it out. I'll tell you, this part is not easy to find! The Tangle Oak forest amidst many rocky choices just doesn't hold a trail very well.

Nicolls was a cakewalk after Heald. Note that the benchmark and register are on the westernmost bump. Byron suggested descending a variation that he had tried, which worked very well, coming down a gully along the west side of the standard ascent ridge, traversing alongside the ridge, then crossing over and voila! the final approach to the Heald-Nicolls saddle.

Success at last. Our weather was gorgeous, around 65-70 all day, gentle breezes, no clouds. We spent 4 hrs from the saddle to Heald, 3 hrs return to the saddle, all other segments 4 hrs. Everyone made both peaks.

Participants: Janet Yang, Dorothy Danziger, Ray Wolfe, George Wysup, Robert True, and Bob Wafer.

Spur of the Moment Hike to Drury, Jean, and Marion

Sept. 2, 1999
by George Wysup

It was Wednesday evening and I was itching for a hike tomorrow. So, who do ya call? Prinzmetal! A fellow retired old geezer. Byron is actually much younger than I, but he looks much older.

What to hike? Considering the fires and the weather, we decided on San Jacinto area. We had never hiked to Drury Peak, which may be up for addition to The List (again). I proposed we try for Folly, Drury, Jean, and Marion; a nice looking cluster on the map. Byron was agreeable, despite his having hiked for 4 consecutive days. OK!

We selected Fuller Ridge trail as the approach. Neither of us had ever hiked this part of the PCT beyond Castle Rocks. Unable to get an early start (Byron's busy schedule precluded it), we arrived at the trail head (7700' elev) and started hiking at 1030. This did not bode well for bagging our entire goal. We soon noticed that this trail had a nasty tendency to go downhill a lot, which was contrary to our druthers, and we decided to eschew Folly in the interest of saving money on flashlight batteries.

Byron had done some homework. He called Tom Hill for route ideas, and loaded some waypoints into his trusty Garmin. If I had done my homework, I would have noticed that the Fuller Ridge trail has over 1000' of downhill in the 5 miles (or so) to the Deer Springs trail junction. A better trail would have been Marion Mountain. This trail starts lower (6400') but includes virtually zero downhill and gets to the Deer Springs junction in only 3.2 miles. The round trip saving would have been about 700' elevation gain and 3.6 miles. Both trails are aesthetically pleasing.

Anyhow, we proceeded to a point on the Deer Springs trail just below Little Round Valley, where going off trail looked to provide clear access (i.e., not too much chinquapin) to Drury from the West. This short route went well—class 1 all the way—and we were soon on the summit. And, a pleasant summit it is. Plenty of granite boulders and good views of Folly, Jean, Marion, and a panorama to the West. There was a register in place, provided by a party from San Diego Chapter in 1995. An entry by Carleton and Hanna Shay described Drury as a "minor wart". If it is

indeed that, then our HPS list includes many little warts, moles, pimples, what have you, that are much less impressive. All in all, Drury is a very nice wart.

If there is a reason not to add Drury to the HPS list, it is that Drury is too close to Jean—less than a mile. (Such a criterion does not disqualify others, e.g., Dawson Peak). In this philosopher's view, a reason NOT to add any mountain to the list (or, even to delete some) is that a peak need not be on a list to be climbed and enjoyed.

We proceeded to Jean by crossing the saddle to the Northeast (this avoided brush), then going up Jean's Northwest ridge to the summit. The register can was nowhere to be found (yes, we were at the correct summit). Byron lightened his pack by leaving a "pipe bomb" type enclosure with pad and pencil.

Two down, one to go. But it is getting late. Both of us being somewhat on the wimpy side, we agreed on a turn-back time of 5 p.m. We expected the end of hikable light to occur at about 7:40. We set out for Marion and bagged it without incident. We were ready to leave at 4:45.

We came down directly from Marion to the trail without retracing our steps. Tom Hill told Byron that this had not been done before (to his knowledge). If this did not go, we were in for a lot of flashlit hiking. To accomplish this we headed North for a way, then deviated to Northwest, traversing our way around the West side of a minor bump and simultaneously picking our way down the hill toward the trail. Heading directly down seemed an inferior route because the chinquapin is quite heavy there, and we might come off below the desired trail junction. The route was class 1 all the way. It may have been easier to go directly over the aforementioned minor bump.

We scampered back to the vehicle, arriving at 7:50, just as the last vestigial glow in the West had disappeared. We decided against bagging Castle Rocks on the way down, though it was tempting to add this one to our "Peaks Bagged In the Dark" lists.

Round trip statistics, based on TOPO software elevation profile are: About 15 to 16 miles with perhaps as much as 5900' elevation gain in somewhat over 9 hours. (TOPO! software says even more gain and fewer miles. I took the liberty of adding a squiggle factor for switchbacks, and reducing elevation because of hiccups in plotting the lines). I had predicted less than 4000' gain. Warning: think twice before following this leader!

Addition of Folly and San Jacinto would have increased the round trip statistics by about 2 miles and 1000' elevation gain. Choosing the Marion Mountain trail probably would have let us include Folly Peak in our folly of a hike. Of course, one could always take the tram, and maybe throw in Cornell with the savings in footsteps. Two old geezers arrived safely home, well spent, to our appreciative wives who greatly admire our exploits. Sure, they do!

Cedar Mountain, Birch Mtn, Allen Peak

June 27, 1999

**Leaders: Byron Prinzmetal, Tom Hill, Joe Young
By Tom Hill**

There have been many HPS outings to Yucaipa Ridge that have attempted to complete all six peaks between Little San Geronio and Allen, with mixed success. After Hugh Blanchard scouted and solved the private access, it became possible to split the ridge into two segments. This hike covered the lower segment, from Pilgrim Pines Camp in Oak Glen to Bear Paw Camp/Audubon Society Wildlife Preserve.

This outing was unusual because both the beginning and ending of the hike occurred on private campgrounds. To maintain goodwill for future trips, we were courteous and quiet while on their grounds and nearby.

The outing leaders stationed two vehicles at the Mill Creek exit point before the 7 AM meeting at Mill Creek Ranger Station east of Redlands. It's 8.5 miles from the Ranger Station to the beginning trailhead in Oak Glen, and 7 miles from the Ranger Station to the ending trailhead on Mill Creek, making for a 15 mile car shuttle on paved roads.

We ascended the Ford Canyon Trail from Pilgrim Pines. This trail is primitive, steep, and somewhat loose in spots. After 3200' gain on this trail we reached Cedar Mtn. We then strolled over to Birch Mtn, mainly downhill, and had lunch, with most of the gain behind us. After lunch we continued descending to the Bear Paw road junction in a saddle, enjoyed a 600' gain side trip up to elusive Allen Peak, then dropped down to Mill Creek on gentle forest road.

Back at the shuttle vehicles, we found surprise notes on both windshields: "You have parked on private property, clearly posted. Your license plate numbers have been noted." The Audubon Society is serious.

We celebrated at a fine Mexican food place in Oak Glen, joined shortly by Robert True, who had hiked independently of us and had discovered a brushy cross-country route down from Birch Mtn

Participants: Peter Doggett, Erich Fickle, Roxana Lewis, David Zalewski, and Janet Yang.

Cucamonga Peak

August 28, 1999

By Bill Gaskill

14 miles, 9 hrs, 4000 ft gain. Long but lovely hike. This was a combined International Sierra Club Section and HPS hike. Twelve hardy hikers arrived at 7:30, three who were training to climb Mt. Whitney in one day (21 miles, 14000 ft peak). The weather was cool, considering L.A. had 82 degree temperatures at

the base of the mountain. Cucamonga offers a 270 degree view, and Catalina Island was seen with ease. The group left at 7:30 AM and arrived back at the cars at 4:00 PM. Of the 12 people (2 French, 1 Ukrainian, 1 Vietnamese and 8 "Quasi-Californians") only 3 checked out. The group was both pleasant and good hikers.

Tehachapi Mtn, Double Mtn

August 22, 1999

**Leaders: Tom Hill, Byron Prinzmetal
By Tom Hill**

Nine hikers gathered at Sylmar at 6:30 AM and another was picked up at our alternate meeting point, 8 AM at the Chevron station near the south edge of the town of Mojave (gasoline, mini-mart, and restrooms are excellent, and the vacant lot in the back alley is convenient for rendezvous). Our goal: the highpoints of the Tehachapi Range.

The HPS formerly had several more summits in the range. Private property hassles over the years have reduced us down to three peaks. One of these, Black Mtn #3, has been a source of friction with a certain mining operation resulting from stubborn hikers using their private road. In my own case, I always walk through the subdivision to Black Mtn #3, and each time I feel an element of stealth creeping over me, against my will, as I enter the adjoining undeveloped lots. This outing to Tehachapi and Double ended up with much the same flavor.

The group proceeded easily along the standard route to Tehachapi Mtn, and then into the unposted, unfenced south slopes toward the saddle leading to Double Mtn. On this particular day, a pickup truck was parked on the dirt road that meets the saddle from the east. The gentleman who came up to talk with us seemed as surprised to see us as we were to see him. He asserted ownership of the land and that his sister was the owner of Double Mtn. Eventually he turned amicable enough (we didn't exactly look like your typical guerrilla army), and after suitable polite exchanges we were given permission to continue our hike.

There are two adjacent summits—naturally—to Double Mtn, each with an elevation of 7981ft. Together they mark the Tehachapi Mountains highpoint. Half the group visited the nearby eastern summit (electronic site) and then joined the rest of us on the undeveloped western summit where the register can is found.

After enjoying the balmy weather and unlimited views, we proceeded back to the cars. This time we made a prudent adjustment, turning onto our cross-country route to Tehachapi Mtn as soon as physically possible. We urge future HPS outings to adopt the same strategy, in both directions.

Participants: Edith Liu, Roxana Lewis, Kurt Levens, Jerry Blackwill, Dorothy Danziger, George Wysup, Ping Pfeffer, and Joanne Griego.

Dragon's Head -- Private Exploratory

September 26, 1999

by George Wysup

"Oh, no," you say, "not another Dragon's Head article!" Well, it's a timing thing, what with addition of Dragon's Head to our list being on the ballot this edition. Please forgive me for inserting considerable personal opinion.

Southern Courtney, Dorothy Danziger, our eminent chairperson, and I decided to kill a hot fall Sunday by checking out this possible new peak in the San Gorgonio Wilderness so that we can vote intelligently. Getting right to the point, we are unanimous in our opinion that this is one FINE peak to have on the HPS list. It offers a lot:

- * pretty access route, up Vivian Creek trail plus appreciable cross country,
- * plenty of exercise, with 4900' elevation gain and about 16 miles rt,
- * fantastic view of most of our listed peaks in the area
- * solitude (few people bother to go here)
- * possible pathfinder routes are plentiful
- * distinctive and rather imposing in appearance from below

Dragon's Head would be in the top 20 scenic peaks on our list. And, it's not all that difficult to get to. At 10,866 feet it would be the third highest peak on the list. It is sufficiently far from other peaks in the area to be truly separate (unlike, e.g., Jepson and Shields).

We ascended the Vivian Creek trail, resting briefly at High Creek (9200'), to approximately the 10,100' contour on the map. We followed (approximately) this contour to the right of the trail, crossing the gully, then headed East up to the saddle (10,500'+) just North of the summit, then ascended the ridge to the summit. This ridge has a steep drop off to East Fork of the Whitewater on one side.

There is an old ammo box with register on the summit. The register has few sign-ins, almost all HPS explorers. Bobcat was there in 1975. We returned the same way, realizing that descending via the West ridge would not save us any energy.

The peak could be done in conjunction with Dobbs, or one could drop directly down from San Gorgonio.

Why would anyone want to keep Cleghorn on the list and not add Dragon's Head?

Another Adventure to Allison Mine

June 2, 1996

By Elmer Omohundro

This report is about Hugh Blanchard's experience [see Hugh's write-up "Misadventure on the Allison Trail" in the Sep - Oct 1999 issue of **THE LOOKOUT**] on his trip to the Allison Mine and my own experience several years earlier.

My first and only trip (up to now) to Allison could have been a disaster, but thankfully it was not as bad as Hugh's.

My friend (who is older than me, but a tiger) and I decided to go to the mine on the warm day of June 2, 1996. Even before reaching the saddle I had consumed a quart of my two-quart water supply. The temperature in the shade was 100 degrees. I had reservations of continuing to the mine, but my partner had been there 8 years before and assured me we would be able to get there without any difficulty.

The trail was very poorly marked with an occasional piece of thread and several side trips consumed valuable time and energy. The brush had been cut back many years ago and the newer leaves hid the dangerously sharp limbs. My arms still show the deep cuts (one over 3" long) I sustained when falling into the brush which I did regularly. I don't remember how many hours we spent getting to the mine, but by the time we arrived I was completely exhausted and out of water. I'm sure I would have died from the heat had there been no water there. I felt like dying anyway.

I guess I drank water from the stream too fast because I got sick. The flies were everywhere near the water and I was bitten badly before I could apply enough Deet. I still have scars from the fly bites as well as from the brush.

I was afraid that we would not be able to get out of the area before dark and I didn't want to get caught in that brush during the night, so we discussed the possibility of waiting until the next morning to walk out. The thought of reading in the newspaper of two old men having to be rescued from the mountains gave us the energy to find another way out.

My partner remembered a trail above the mine on the north side that he used when he was there before. We hiked up and down the side of the mountain for about an hour before finding a ribbon attached to a small bush and a slight trail. We followed the trail along the ridge until we thought it was the time to go down to the bottom of the canyon then slid down on rocks and gravel that tore our clothing.

At the bottom of the canyon we followed the stream to the joining of the East Fork where we met a couple who were camping. Thank goodness they were there or we might have gone in the wrong

direction to get out. We followed the river and crossed it so many times I lost count. I remember that I fell in four times though. Thank goodness it was not too dark at the time and we could find the trail most of the time.

When we finally reached our car, we took a photograph of each other. We looked terrible. Our shirts and pants were torn and blood was everywhere. I look at these pictures occasionally to remind myself to hike within my own ability and to remind myself that it gets hot in the mountains as well as in the flatland.

This trip wasn't as bad as Hugh's, but his story reminded me of my thoughts after my experience. I wanted to return to the mine the next year. My plan was to take my pruning shears and open the trail at least enough so that others would not take side trips that led to nowhere. However, my hiking friends all refused to accompany me. I was going to do the job myself, but before I could get started on the project, I developed a heel spur that has prevented me from hiking for 9 months now. Maybe I'll get there and again, maybe I won't. Only time will tell. I'm sure the mine will be there to test others for a long time.

A VIEW FROM THE HILL

By Tom Hill, Mountain Records/Safety Chair

OFFICIAL NOTICES

1. Leaders: Waiver/Sign-in Sheets. Effectively Immediately. These sheets are to be returned within 30 days of your outing to the HPS Safety Chair, Tom Hill, at 500 N Madison Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90004.

Many of the other outing sections require their leaders to return the sign-in sheets to their safety or outings chairs. Your HPS Management Committee has decided that this practice is a good one. It helps protect our leaders, our participants, the HPS, and the Chapter from needless problems.

Since the return of the sign-in sheets is now a required part of your outing, future recognition of our leaders at the Annual Banquet will be determined by the returned sheets.

The sign-in sheets will be kept by the HPS Safety Chair for three years in a confidential file and will be used only for official HPS or Angeles Chapter business.

2. Wildfire Closures: All nine peaks in Area 20 have restricted public access, and have therefore been suspended by the HPS Management Committee. The South Fork Trail to Rouse Hill was also burned, but the peak itself is still accessible by the standard drive-up route.

3. Other Access Closures: The route to **Cobblestone and White #2** via Hardluck Campground has been closed to the public until further notice, due to the effects of drought on the survival chances of the Southwestern arroyo toad. Climb these peaks using the standard route that goes past Sewart Mtn. (The old standard route to **Bare Mtn** remains closed, for the very same reason.) Note also that **Grays Peak** near Big Bear Lake is now closed to public entry from November 1 to April 1 each year to protect bald eagle winter nesting grounds.

HPS Suspends Nine Peaks

All nine peaks in Area 20 (Big Pine Flat Area) have been suspended by the HPS Management Committee, effective from September 19, 1999: Round Mtn, Luna Mtn, Rattlesnake Mtn, White Mtn #1, Deer Mtn, Shay Mtn, Little Shay Mtn, Ingham Peak, and Hawes Peak.

All of these peaks are located in the burn zone of the Willow Fire, a catastrophic wildfire NE of Lake Arrowhead that savaged 63500 acres (100 square miles) between August 28 and September 4. The BLM and the USFS have prohibited ALL public access to these peaks. NO VEHICLES and NO HIKERS are currently allowed into the area.

The HPS suspension will remain in effect on a peak-by-peak basis until public access is restored. According to the USFS some burn areas were severely impacted and may remain closed for a year or more.

These peaks remain on the HPS Peak List, so you may count them toward a 100 or 200 Peak Emblem achievement if you have climbed them. On the other hand, please don't sneak out into the ashes on a heroic quest for any of these peaks if you are trying to finish the List. Suspended peaks are not taken into account for purposes of list completion.

Upcoming Important Dates

November 11 Thursday Peakbaggers Social Meeting
"New Hiker Program" Have you ever wondered what to take on a day hike? Come listen to experienced HPS hikers describe what to carry, how to read a trip write-up, what to pay a rideshare driver, etc. Everyone welcome. Refreshments & socializing, something for everyone. 7:30 pm Griffith Park Ranger Sta Aud.

December 9 Thursday Management Meeting: The Management Committee of the Hundred Peaks Section meets to discuss management issues of the section. Everyone welcome. Refreshments & socializing, something for everyone. 7:30 pm Griffith Park Ranger Sta Aud

The following letter was sent to each candidate for the Angeles Chapter Executive Committee:

"Dear Angeles Chapter Management Nominee,

The Hundred Peaks Section is composed of about 500 members/subscribers, many of who belong to other Angeles Chapter outings sections. Our outings are very important to the HPS membership, as is the support the Angeles Chapter gives to its outings program, probably the best in the nation. Consequently, our members are very interested in your commitment to the continued support to the outings programs. Specifically, we would like your views regarding the questions below. We will publish your response (or lack thereof) in our section newsletter, **THE LOOKOUT**.

1. We would like to know a little about your current outing activities. Specifically, could you please tell us what type of outings do you participate in and about how often?

2. Many of our members believe that a strong outings program attracts interest in the Angeles Chapter. Do you consider outings activities important to the Chapter and if so why?

3. Currently the chapter supports and finances the publication of the Schedule of Activities at no additional cost to chapter members. Will you vote to continue this practice, including the cost to prepare, publish and distribute the schedule on a regular basis?

4. Do you support the continued funding of our current outings insurance (either at national or local chapter level)?

5. Presently, grants by the chapter are mostly limited to groups and the conservation committee. The HPS would like to see this expanded to include activities that would help educate our members about the environmental, economic, and historical values of the 273 peaks we hike to. How would you support such grants and activities?

6. We have been told that some people feel that our endowment should be spent down over a relatively short period of time vs. the current practice, which uses the interest to fund many Angeles Chapter programs. We feel that if this spend down were to occur many of the programs currently funded by the chapter (including those associated with outings) would cease, as we would no longer have the income from our endowment. What is your position regarding spending down of our endowment, and what impact would this have on our outings program?

To facilitate review/comparison by our members please respond to each of the above questions separately. Please send your entire response to be received no later than September 24, 1999 to appear in our November edition of our newsletter. If you would like your response to appear in both the November and September editions please send your response to be received no later than July 26th."

Al Sattler

1. Attending many Sierra Club meetings can definitely decrease a person's available time to go on outings! There was a time when I was going on Sierra Club hikes fairly frequently, including HPS, and was a member of SPS for a year, but that was more than 15 years ago. I took BMTC in the late 1970's and was an assistant leader in BMTC for several years. I took the RCS (Rock Climbing Section) class, and went on a few practice climbs. However, about this time I was elected to the Chapter ExCom and decided there was no point in rock-climbing if I didn't have time to do it right, so I stopped. I returned to help with WTC for one or two years about ten years ago. I finally got my O rating a few years ago, and make a point of talking about flora, fauna, and local political implications when I lead hikes, which seems to be about 2-3 times per year. Until the past few years, I was also frequently going on evening conditioning hikes with the PV-SB regional group.

2. Yes, I consider outings important to the Chapter. Outings are a key linchpin of "Explore, Enjoy, and Protect". Outings are very important in their own right, as a restorative for the spirit. And as has been said repeatedly, people won't be very concerned about protecting a natural area if they are not familiar with it. I look back upon my own example of being active in outings before I was active in Conservation issues, and assume that the same progression can apply for many other people.

3. Yes under almost any conceivable set of circumstances. The Schedule is an invaluable communications tool for the Chapter. Without a Chapter-wide Schedule of Activities, it is much more difficult for people to know about outings if they are not subscribers to that entity's newsletter. However, if the Chapter's finances were to become dire, then every possible means of saving expenses would have to be re-examined. Fortunately, there is presently some financial reserve for the Chapter. Recent efforts to produce the Schedule more economically have made it less of a target. Years ago, I think the Schedule broke even or made money, because of ad income. We should strive to return to that state.

4. Yes. It was a sad day for the Sierra Club when insurance for mountaineering activities became unavailable--it was like we had lost some of our soul. My understanding is that insurance for mountaineering activities has become available again, although there is a surcharge for participants. This is certainly better than nothing, and considering the small proportion of members who participate in such activities, I suppose it is justified.

5. For a start, it would help if the HPS would apply for a grant. To the best of my knowledge, no grant applications have been received from the HPS. The Conservation Reserve Fund grants are designed to support additive, non-routine conservation activities. It would be interesting to see what new activities the HPS would be interested in. GPS hardware and software to map proposed new Wilderness Areas is one possible subject I can think of, off the top of my head. I strongly recommend composing any grant application based on the Campaign Planning Matrix, as described in the Sierra Club Grassroots Organizing Training Manual. This excellent booklet is available in the Chapter office.

6. I oppose spending down our quasi-endowment, especially over 3-5 years, but we may not have much choice in the matter. This is because of IRS rules and interpretation of them by the Sierra Club and Sierra Club Foundation. Apparently bequests and gifts which have been restricted in their purpose, such as conservation, must be spent within 3-5 years. There is still debate about this, with discussions occurring between several Chapters and the national Sierra Club. Unrestricted gifts and bequests, we have been told, are less limited. For the future, any person intending that their gift or bequest fund an endowment should clearly state so. It is not clear what impact spending down our quasi-endowment would have on the outings program.

Questions to Candidates for ExCom

1. We would like to know a little about your current outings activities. Specifically, could you please tell us what type of outings do you participate in and about how often?

2. Many of our members believe that a strong outings program attracts interest in the Angeles Chapter. Do you consider outings activities important to the Chapter and if so why?

3. Currently the chapter supports and finances the publication of the Schedule of Activities at no additional cost to chapter members. Will you vote to continue this practice, including the cost to prepare, publish and distribute the schedule on a regular basis?

4. Do you support the continued funding of our current outings insurance (either at national or local chapter level)?

5. Presently, grants by the chapter are mostly limited to groups and the conservation committee. The HPS would like to see this expanded to include activities that would help educate our members about the environmental, economic, and historical values of the 273 peaks we hike to. How would you support such grants and activities?

6. We have been told that some people feel that our endowment should be spent down over a relatively short period of time vs. the current practice, which uses the interest to fund many Angeles Chapter programs. We feel that if this spend down were to occur many of the programs currently funded by the chapter (including those associated with outings) would cease, as we would no longer have the income from our endowment. What is your position regarding spending down of our endowment, and what impact would this have on our outings program?

Gordon Labetz

(1) I am a leader in the Conservation Outings Project, Sierra Stewards.

(2) Ofcourse. For the reasons you stated.

(3) Absolutely. I am publications manager. It is my job to see that the schedule is funded, that it gets out on time and that it is distributed outside the chapter as a means to recruit new members. The schedule is a very important part of my work in the Sierra Club. Our Outings Activities are the envy of the Sierra Club, so is our Schedule.

(4) Of course.

(5) Good idea. Apply for a grant. I sit on the committee. Let me know if you need help with the project.

(6) Wow. Who have you been talking to? The chapter has no endowment. (An endowment is a specific legal entity.) The chapter has a savings account of 3.5 million dollars. IRS rules and non profit guidelines make it necessary for us to spend this money as our donors intended. The National Board, our executive director and the Sierra Club Foundation have urged us to comply with these guidelines that all 501c(4) and 501c(3) organizations must follow.

My ex comm colleagues Marcia Hanscom, Debbie Cook and Michelle Syper have been advocating the spending of some of this money over three to five years until we have two years budget left in our savings (one million dollars). This is within the 501c(3) IRS guidelines.

We also favor raising money for a true endowment. The present majority of the ex comm disagrees with the legal advice we have gotten from National. They have criticized us with innuendoes that we want to bankrupt the chapter and other such political rhetoric.

It appears that the present ex comm majority is realizing that we must comply with the law. By the time you read this, this issue may be moot.

Thanks for your interest and thanks for making your section one of the strongest entities in the Chapter!

[This candidate did not respond to the second part of the last question.]

Bruce Monroe

(1) As a founder and leader of Sierra Stewards, I participate in conservation outings about 12 times/year.

(2) Yes, for the reason you noted. In addition attracting a wide mix of participants from singles to families gives us an opportunity to elicit interest in environmental causes. I especially view the inclusion of children in the family outings as a way to ensure participation of future generations in Sierra Club steward activities.

(3) If elected, I will vote to continue the practice.

(4) Yes, our stewards groups currently use the insurance provided and I would examine any efforts to curtail the coverage very carefully.

(5) If you have a valid grant request, you should submit it. I would review any grant applications using the same criteria that I currently use. These include: is the grant well written, is the budget thorough and well defined, are the objectives for the program achievable, is there an evaluation method to measure achievement of the objectives, does the request fit the Sierra Club's mission, etc.

(6) I think you have been misinformed about the reason for "spending down". It is not to spend money foolishly just to spend it. The reason is to bring the Chapter into compliance with federal and state requirements for a non-profit (501(c)(3)) organization. We have been given legal advice that we must do this and I believe we should do so. There are penalties involved if we do not do so, including loss our non-profit status.

Incidentally, the money we are talking about is not an endowment. At the present time the Club does not have an endowment although I certainly support those who believe we should work toward such a goal. If you have other questions, please let me know. I applaud your volunteer efforts to build your section and to grow our outings activities.

[This candidate did not respond to the second part of the last question.]

Jan Kidwell

1. My favorite area for hiking is the Angeles National Forest. I also went on hikes in the Santa Monica mountains, and around the rim of the SFV. In the last three years I have been concentrating on becoming more active in other ways. I have been chair of the Speakers Bureau for the Angeles Chapter since 1996, arranging for speakers and giving talks to adult groups as well as boy scouts to encourage them to get involved with our outings as a way to understand the value of the wilderness, and to increase our membership.

2. I believe outings are the single most important attractant of new members, and we cannot do enough to provide more opportunities for the general public to join us in our interest in preserving wilderness. I am a SC member since 1984, and only became more active as a conservationist in 1996. Since then I have earned a Master's degree in Urban and Regional Planning, taking most of the courses while working full time because I wanted to understand land use issues better to help protect wilderness.

3. I have always felt strongly that we should not charge SC members for the Activity Schedule. When I worked as the Angeles Chapter front desk Friday volunteer for 8 months at the beginning of 1996 I decided we should give the excess copies of each printing of the Schedule to schools and colleges (if it were my decision to make). The only question we need Ex-Comm to decide is how long do we wait into the four months. We need to encourage young people and newcomers to the region in particular to get involved in outings.

4. YES.

5. I would support the printing of literature, mailings, tabling at events and giving talks on outings. There should be some budget for these activities on a regular basis,

6. I have heard we have about \$3.5m earning interest for the Chapter. Our annual operating expenses are close to one tenth of that. I don't think we need that big of a cushion to fall back on. I think if those numbers are correct we should be open to considering spending more money.

[This candidate did not respond to the second part of the last question]

Ann Kramer

1. I am an "O" rated leader and a Hundred Peaks emblem holder. I am working on my "I" rating and on the HPS list, but very slowly right now, due to my other time commitments.

2. Outings are the most important thing we do. Outings are what make the Sierra Club different from other conservation organizations. John Muir started our outings program. Today, many of our most dedicated conservation and political activists started their Sierra Club involvement with outings participation. Outings are our best membership recruitment tool, and besides, they are fun.

3. Absolutely. I first ran for the Executive Committee in 1996, when the sitting Executive Committee decided to charge a subscription fee for the Schedule. After I got elected, it took me (and the others who ran with me) two years, but we did do away with the Schedule subscription fee. I firmly believe that a free Schedule is essential to a strong and vibrant outings program. A free Schedule is also essential for conservation and political activism; after all, how can activists organize when they don't have a directory of their own members?

4. Currently, our outings and mountaineering insurance is paid for by the national Sierra Club. I hope and expect that this practice will continue.

Recently, the national Outings Department has decided that participants on Chapter foreign trips should pay a \$5 per person per day insurance surcharge, to offset a part of the cost of the national insurance policy for foreign trips. I oppose this assessment. As I said in response to Question No. 2, I consider outings to be fundamental to the Sierra Club and its mission. I believe that the national Sierra Club and the Chapter Executive Committee have an affirmative duty to facilitate and encourage outings whenever possible. Assessing additional fees or charging for the Schedule are unconscionable acts which will only inhibit outings.

5. I think this is an interesting idea. There is no reason in principle to limit our grants to proposals that originate from groups and the Conservation Committee. I encourage the HPS to develop an eligible proposal and submit a grant request. I will support it.

6. SAVE THE ENDOWMENT! I am a strong supporter of our current endowment policies. In four years on the Chapter's Executive Committee, I have opposed every proposal to spend down our endowment. Interest income on the endowment supports many important Chapter projects, including two full time conservation staff people, a monthly SOUTHERN SIERRAN, the establishment of our Orange County Branch Office, and the free distribution of the Schedule to Chapter members.

This is the CRUCIAL ISSUE in this Chapter election. I suspect that it is the only major issue on which the candidates disagree. I know that HPS members don't particularly like Chapter politics. (I don't either!) But your involvement with this issue is critical to the future of the Angeles Chapter.

Please vote in this election for candidates who will VOTE TO SAVE THE ENDOWMENT!

David L. Underwood

Q1. I am a member of the Sierra Peaks Section. My most recent outing participation was on a Snow Training session given by Jon Fisher of Bishop in June at Tioga Pass. I have not been in condition to keep up with many of the SPS crowd recently as I stated before work and other demands have kept me from getting out as much as I would have liked. When I do participate in outings, it is with the SPS. Usually I climb with friends more my speed and a bit less demanding than the standard SPS climb. I also like to solo frequently. So far I have 122 peaks from the SPS list and have my Senior Emblem. Now that I am retired, I plan to go on outings with the HPS and the DPS.

Q2. I believe that outings are the core of membership in the Sierra Club. It is outings that get many people interested in conservation as well. Many times, it takes outings for people to realize just how much damage has been done to the environment. One of the really fine leaders that I climbed with was Bill T. Russell. Bill T. was also an ardent environmentalist as are most climbers. Outings bring people into the Club and are what keeps them coming back. I really feel however that the LTC does not offer enough courses through out the year and I feel that there needs to be a greater emphasis on encouraging more members to become leaders. Some

recent statistics seem to show that leaders are not being replaced at the same rate that they are being lost. Many of our present leaders are older and are not up to the rigors of leading as much as the once did. We need to encourage the younger members to become leaders in order to maintain our outings programs. I feel that the recent demands by National to place a member of each group on the EXCOM may result in a more effective LTC program. At least I hope that it does so. Also, although the Angeles Chapter has more outings than any other chapter in the country it is only eighth in outings per member. Also, the chapter is about in eighth place among chapter in members per population. Obviously, a more aggressive outings program would help to build up the membership of the chapter.

Q3. I am firmly in favor of the chapter bearing the cost of the activities schedule.

Past experience has shown that charging individuals for the schedule was a disaster and resulted in the loss of many members and if I am not mistaken, actually cost the chapter more money than it did to distribute it free in the first place. I was one of the first to join with Dave Bybee when he began his campaign to restore the free schedule.

Q4. I believe that it is the Nationals duty to provide blanket insurance for all outings by all Chapters.

Q5. Grants are a tricky issue here. The problem is in the California Corporation Code and how a Private Non Profit 403C Corporation can expend funds. While a member of the Conservation Committee, I supported the funding of outings and activities that were in accordance with the proper expenditure of such funds. I do not think that sections should be excluded from these funds. In fact, I encouraged the SPS to make use of this provision in funding to qualify for these funds. The sections have the same right to funding of educational and environmental funds as any other group or section. Your Conservation chair has the right to ask for and receive such funding as long as it is in line with the law regarding the use of such funds.

Q6. Fiscally I am quite conservative. I feel that Jim Schoedler did an excellent job as treasurer. It is my opinion that those endowment funds that were not specifically donated for a

[continued from previous page]

particular use need to be placed in managed accounts. There are several very good Professional Portfolio management Companies that specialize in managing endowment funds, pension funds, institutional funds, and other investments. Since the Sierra club is a Non-Profit Public Corporation, the interest gained from such investments is tax-free. An example of such a corporation is a company called Berkeley Capital Management. This company is one of the most conservative of the capital managers. Their long-term gains have exceeded 18% over the last 20 years. That means that your investment doubles every four years. If the Chapter were to invest with such managers, it could become self-supporting in a few years. Spending down endowments is in my estimation, quite foolish and can only result in financial crises in the long run. There will always be fires to fight. If we spend everything fighting the most recent fires, the opposition can simply wait us out. We all have our pet projects, but without financial restraints there are those who do not have the discipline to limit their spending. It is unfortunate but many "activists" seem to me to be quite short sighted in terms of financial responsibility. I believe that spending down endowments will only result in financial disaster. The same thing would happen if I were to spend down my own retirement funds.

HUNDRED PEAKS SECTION
Minutes of the Management Committee
Meeting
Thursday, July 8, 1999
Griffith Park Ranger Station Auditorium

The meeting was called to order at 6:04. Present were Janet, Charlotte, David, George, Tom, and Byron. It was m/s/a the 6/10 meeting minutes. It was m/s/a David's membership report. Peak changes. It was m/s/a adding three peaks to the ballot (Backus Peak, Russell Peak, Sam Fink Peak). We voted down adding Drury Peak and Dragon Head to the ballot. We decided to wait on making a decision for Keating Peak and Snow Peak until the road access issue is settled. Byron's peak deletion proposal was defeated. It was m/s/a the proposed letter to Angeles Chapter Ex-comm nominees. In order to insure the Lookout with this article is in the hands of our subscribers, the cut off for articles for the Nov/Dec issue needs to be 9/24. It was m/s/a that the elections committee will be composed of David, Ruth and Janet. It was m/s/a to send \$50 donations, to Search and Rescue organizations. George to accomplish this. It was m/s/a David's recommendations for giving our members an incentive to renew for longer periods of time and to discourage late renewals. George reported we had as of 6/30/1999 \$7292.53 in our treasury. Minutes/decisions for 7/8/1999 Hps Management Committee

HUNDRED PEAKS SECTION
Minutes of the Management Committee
Meeting
Thursday, August 12, 1999
Griffith Park Ranger Station Auditorium

The meeting was called to order at 6pm on 8/12/1999. Present were George, Virgil, Charlotte, Janet, and Byron. Absent were Tom and Jim. We M/S/A the July minutes with the addition that Virgil was present. We M/S/A to send out with the ballots the attached questionnaire. It was moved for reconsideration, seconded and approved to add Drury Peak and Dragon Head as proposed additional peaks to our fall ballot. The vote to add Kitching Peak and Snow Peak to our fall ballot was postponed until we know the status of the road. We accept the nominating committee report. The people they selected to run for our board are Tom Hill, George Wysup, Virgil Popescu, Lynda Hill, Peter Doggett, John Connelly, The Eyerly's (Barbara and Howard as a shared position), and Ray Wolfe. We thanked the nominating committee for their hard work. We M/S/A that all sign in sheets are to be returned to the safety chair who will keep them for three years. Further from 8/12/99 forward for a trip to count toward the trip leadership award the sign-in sheet must be returned. We also agreed (but no vote was taken) that the sheets are to be kept confidential and only used for official HPS business. These sheets can become invaluable in case a problem arises sometimes unknown at the time of the trip. It was M/S/A that we will print in the Lookout the same information as in the schedule for those HPS leaders that are currently leading. This is to facilitate those subscriber/members who are not members of the Angeles Chapter and thus do not receive the Schedule. It was M/S/A to donate \$100 to the Angeles Chapter per the request of Ann Kramer. We M/S/A David's membership report. It was agreed that the following people will attempt to obtain donations for our banquet raffle: Virgil-REI, Janet-Sports Chalet and try for more money. Byron-A-16, George-Big Five, Joe to try to have a HPS article published in the upcoming Southern Sierran Articles. Treasurer report was accepted. We M/S/A to adjourn the meeting at about 7:30 PM.

HUNDRED PEAKS SECTION
Minutes of the Management Committee Meeting (Unapproved)
Thursday, September 9, 1999
Griffith Park Ranger Station Auditorium

Voting members present were Janet, Jim, Tom and Byron plus non voting members present were David, Ruth and Joe. We M/S/A the minutes for our 8/12/99 meeting

Byron announced that he had sent out a second mailing to the five ex-comm nominees who had not yet responded to our first mailing. The board informally decided that a third mailing was not necessary.

We M/S/A the ex-comm issues statement that Byron wrote subject to Joe's English corrections to be published in the next edition of the Lookout.

We M/S/A Tom to research and suspend any of our peaks that are now closed to hiking/driving due to the recent fires. Tom is to write a short article for Nov/Dec edition of the Lookout informing our members of the suspensions.

We M/S/A the following items that relate to our peaks:

Voted on and approved separately the use names per by-law requirements for the following peaks:

7339' as Sam Fink Peak, 6651' as Backus Peak, 6696' as Russell Peak, 10160+ as Drury Peak, 10866 as Dragon's Head
Approved adding to our ballot the following peaks for de-listing as individual peaks (not as a set): Ranger Peak, Indian Mtn, Cleghorn Mtn, Monument Peak #2, Sugarpine Mtn, and High Point (LO).

Approved adding to our ballot the following peaks for de-listing as individual peaks (not as a set): Peak Mtn, McPherson Peak, and Rouse Hill. Note: All present voting members except for Jim voted yes for items b and c of the above. In addition, George gave his yes proxy for item c. All voted yes for item a. The non voting members who were present voiced much opposition to the allowing our members to have the opportunity to vote to de-list these peaks.

We M/S/A the following items as they relate to our fall balloting:

David will enter the results of each of the ballot into his computer using a number sequencing technique for audit purposes. Once all of the ballots have been entered the elections committee will audit the input and correct any mistakes. The computer program that David uses will then add up the votes for each item. The elections committee will present the results at our December meeting.

We will send out to our members a separate mailing that will include the ballot and ballot arguments, a cover letter, and on the back of the cover letter a questionnaire. The mailing will go out at approximately the same time as the Nov/Dec issue of the Lookout.

To make the above occur the following people will do the following:

Byron will write a draft cover letter and send it to the board for English and other corrections.

Byron will provide David with the cover letter and questionnaire.

Joe under the direction of the elections committee will produce the pages that include candidate statements, the pros and cons to the peak additions and de-listings and deliver this to the elections committee.

The elections committee will produce the ballot and make copies of the ballot, cover letter, questionnaire, candidate statements and pros and con statements together with mailing labels and envelopes.

The elections committee will deliver all of this to Carleton for envelop stuffing and mailing.

Byron will be glad to help the elections committee in any of the above.

The elections committee is to oversee all of the above.

We discussed and informally approved having unlimited length of nominee statements.

We M/S/A the membership report.

We M/S/A the re-printing of the post it pads. Byron will see if there is an advantage cost wise to print them 10 to a pad vs. 25. Byron to see if he can get them printed cheaper than the first printing.

Byron reminded everyone the dates for the March 1st through July 4 Schedule are as follows:

Outings Chair to send out Leaders' Meeting notices for 2nd week in October. Include information on how to submit write-up for Schedule.

Write-ups due to Outings chair-1st day of November

Program chair to submit write-ups for March, April, May, and June meetings to Outings chair

Due to Schedule editor-November 8, 1999

We accepted the treasurer's report.

After the management meeting we held the annual business meeting. At this meeting the following occurred:

We reviewed the proposed peak additions and de-listings.

We reviewed the list of people running for our board for next year.

We answered questions that the members had.

There were no partitions submitted. We closed the annual business meeting and had a fine presentation on how to do the Santa Rosa's hosted by Tom.

September 15, 1999

PROPOSED SIERRA CLUB REVISED POLICY ON USE OF FIXED ANCHORS IN WILDERNESS

Dear Sierra Club Activist:

The following proposed Sierra Club Policy is being forwarded to you for your information and comment. Please share this Proposed Policy with appropriate members of your Group, Chapter, Committee, or Section. The proposed policy is being circulated to as many Sierra Club entities as possible through mail and e-mail. If you know of someone who would be interested in the Proposed Policy but has not received a copy please pass one on. Chapter and Group leaders, please discuss the substance of the enclosed policy with your Executive Committees and relevant outings and conservation activists. The deadline for comments is December 1, 1999.

Thank you for your interest and consideration of the Proposed Policy. Contact Ken Cline or any of the Sierra Club Fixed Anchor Task Force members, if you have any questions. (See attachment for addresses of Task Force members.)

Comments can be sent by mail or e-mail to the following address.

Ken Cline (Chair of Sierra Club Fixed Anchor Task Force)

31 LedgeLawn Ave.

Bar Harbor, ME 04609 (207)288-5015 (Ext. 264)

E-MAIL:

"mailto:ken.cline@sierraclub.org"

ken.cline@sierraclub.org or

"mailto:ksc@ecology.coa.edu" or

"ksc@ecology.coa.edu"

BACKGROUND

Mountain climbing and wilderness protection have been at the heart of the Sierra Club since its birth over 100 years ago. Most of the early (and many present) Club leaders were active climbers and the climbing community (both inside and outside the Club) has been a vital champion of wilderness. Although climbers continue to be strong advocates for wilderness, recent developments in the recreational use of wilderness and in the sport of climbing threaten to fray the close-knit relationship of climbers and wilderness advocates.

Overall recreational use of wilderness and the impacts of this use have increased dramatically in recent years. Still besieged by threats from extractive industries, wilderness increasingly faces new threats from growing recreational uses (including climbing). The advent of "sport climbing" and the wider popularity of climbing generally means that the sport

is not as dominated by traditional climbers who are also ardent conservationists.

Wilderness can be and has been negatively impacted by some climbing activities. Of particular concern to wilderness advocates (and many climbers) is the proliferation of the use fixed anchors in Wilderness Areas. The term fixed anchor is a generic term that refers to protection devices not removed at the completion of a climb. Fixed anchors include such hardware as bolts, bolt hangers, pitons, and nylon webbing slings. Bolts, which are permanent pieces of protection driven into a hole that is drilled in a rock, are of particular concern. The Wilderness Act prohibits the use of power equipment, including climber's drills, for the placement of bolts in Wilderness. The Wilderness Act, however, does not explicitly address climbing activities or equipment that does not involve power tools.

As a result of discussions occurring in the California/Nevada Regional Conservation Committee, the Wild Planet Strategy Team (WPST) began to study the issue of fixed anchors use in Wilderness in early 1997. Over a six month period, the WPST, in consultation with Sierra Club members and entities, developed a draft Club policy. This draft policy was circulated Club-wide to Chapters and Groups and eventually approved, as modified in response to member comments, by the Conservation Governance Committee and the Board of Directors. The Board approved this policy at its May 9-10, 1998 meeting. (The May 9-10, 1998 policy is included as Attachment A.)

Subsequently, questions were raised at the Council of Club Leaders by Club members who felt that the Club's new fixed anchor policy was not sufficiently protective of wilderness. In September 1998, the Council of Club Leaders passed a resolution asking the Board of Directors to reconsider the Fixed Anchor Policy. The Board of Directors responded by directing the Conservation Governance Committee to appoint a Task Force to reexamine the issue. In January 1999, the Conservation Governance Committee appointed a Fixed Anchor Task Force (FATF) whose charge was to study the issue and to make recommendations to the Conservation Governance Committee. The FATF's membership was composed of Club members who represented a wide variety of perspectives on the fixed anchor question. (The membership of the FATF and the qualifications of the members is included as Attachment B.) The following draft revised policy is the result of the FATF's work over the past seven months.

In the initial policy discussion, some Sierra

Club members questioned the need for a Sierra Club policy on as specific of a topic as fixed anchors. The issue has since become part of a broader public debate for federal wilderness managers and other conservation groups. Most notably in May of 1998, the United States Forest Service proposed banning the placement of new fixed anchors in National Forest Wilderness Areas. Following a storm of controversy, the Forest Service withdrew the ban and proposed setting new regulations through a negotiated rulemaking process that would involve both conservation and climbing interests. The Sierra Club has been invited to participate in this rulemaking process. Your comments on the following proposed revised policy on the use of fixed anchors in wilderness will help guide the Sierra Club as it participates in the rulemaking process and guide the Club and its members on similar climbing issues nationwide.

THE PROPOSED REVISED POLICY ON THE USE OF FIXED ANCHORS IN WILDERNESS

Comments are due to Ken Cline by December 1, 1999. Thank you for your time and input.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth S. Cline
Chair, Sierra Club FATF

DRAFT FIXED ANCHOR POLICY 9/20/99

1. Preserving and protecting wilderness values for future generations is the primary purpose of Wilderness. All other uses are subject to this primary purpose. All management actions should enhance, rather than degrade, wilderness values as defined by the Wilderness Act of 1964.

2. Climbing, including the use of fixed anchors, is an historic and appropriate use of Wilderness and is consistent with the purposes of the Wilderness Act. However, fixed anchors that cannot be placed or removed without altering the environment were not specifically addressed during the passage of the Wilderness Act. These should be regulated as installations in Wilderness; their use in Wilderness may be authorized under Section 4 (c) of the Wilderness Act which provides that installations can be allowed where "necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act." Within designated Wilderness areas, or areas otherwise protected for their wilderness values, climbing including the use of fixed anchors, should be subject to the same standards as all other activities to ensure preservation of the wilderness character of these lands.

3. Climbing, including the use of fixed anchors, should be addressed in wilderness management plans, subject to public review, and managed as necessary to protect Wilderness resources. The full range of management options, including but not limited to resource monitoring, voluntary use limits, restrictions, permitting, area-specific prohibitions, and the establishment of Limits of Acceptable Change criteria for specific areas, should be considered and implemented as necessary to protect wilderness character when regulating climbing and the use of fixed anchors. Where climbing occurs, all relevant management plans, informational signs and wilderness permits should address guidelines for climbing and the use of fixed anchors.

4. Site-specific wilderness management plans should include certain minimum requirements for climbing. Climbing should not occur where fragile, rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species may be impacted, where human presence may interfere with essential wildlife behavioral patterns, where recreational activities may interfere with religious or cultural values, or where it would compromise the scenic resource. Fixed anchors should not be used where there is a removable equipment alternative. To minimize visual impacts, slings and other removable equipment should be removed whenever and wherever possible. The use of power drills is prohibited in wilderness areas. Any alteration of rock or removal of vegetation should be prohibited, except as minimally necessary for the placement of fixed anchors.

Sierra Club Policy adopted May 1998

14. Fixed Anchors in Wilderness

MSC (Snedden-Hengerson) The Board of Directors adopts the following Fixed Anchors in Wilderness Policy forwarded by the Planet Strategy Team, Outing Activities Governance Committee and Conservation Governance Committee.

Climbing is an appropriate use of wilderness. Within designated wilderness areas, or areas otherwise protected for their wilderness values, climbing, including the use of fixed anchors, should be subject to the same standards as other recreational activities to ensure preservation of the wilderness character of these lands.

Impacts on natural surroundings can be minimized by practicing clean climbing techniques. The use of power drills is prohibited in wilderness. However, fixed anchors may be used, but shall be subject to limitations on type, number, and location as determined by implementation of area-specific wilderness management plans.

The extent to which fixed anchors will be allowed in a specific wilderness area will be

determined by the wilderness manager who should ensure that their use will be minimized and substantially unnoticeable. Based on the findings of the wilderness planning process, management of fixed anchors and climbing in general, should be accomplished using the least amount of direct control necessary. Education is preferred over regulation, although the complete range of management options, including resource monitoring, voluntary use limits, restrictions, permitting, area-specific prohibitions, area closures, and removal, should be considered and implemented as necessary to preserve wilderness character.

Necessary management of climbing in wilderness should be based on clearly defined objectives that describe desired wilderness conditions and are set forth in individual area management plans prepared with full public involvement. Limits of acceptable change to the wilderness environment should be established, based upon objective data. These limits should be used to determine an acceptable level and type of fixed anchor use that preserves wilderness resources and values.

Aye: Berry, Cox, Dorsey, Eady, Ehrlich, Ferenstein, Hengerson,
Holmes, Gaines, Snedden, Perrault
- Nay: Brower
Abstain: Hanson, Werbach

Angeles Chapter Holds Third Annual Picnic

The Chapter picnic and outings fair will be held at the Crystal Springs Picnic area in Griffith Park on Saturday, November 13 from 10 AM to 3 PM. To attend please copy this coupon and mail to Picnic Tickets, Angeles Chapter Sierra Club, 3435 Wilshire Blvd, Suite #320, Los Angeles, CA 90010.

Angeles Chapter Picnic and Outings Fair

_____ Adults, \$7 each _____

_____ Children under 10, \$3 each _____

_____ Children under 5 free _____

_____ Total number of tickets _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip code _____

REGISTER BOX

By Jim Adler

Eight new missing registers were reported. Four registers were removed from the list as being reported found or non-deficient.

Reports were received from Peter Doggett, Joe Young, Carlton Shay, Steve Lunar, Richard Carey, Jerry Keating and Frank Dobos.

Missing and deficient registers:

9B	Iron Mtn.	missing	5-99
9C	Condor Peak	missing	5-99
12A	Mt. Deception	missing	5-99
12B	Disappointment	missing	5-99
12F	Occidental Peak	missing	5-99
13F	Mt. Williamson	missing	7-99
13I	Winston Ridge	deficient	4-96
14D	S. Mt. Hawkins	missing	8-97
14F	Mt. Hawkins	missing	7-99
14G	Throop Peak	missing	7-99
14H	Mt. Burnham	missing	7-99
16G	Telegraph Peak	missing	9-99
17B	Ontario Peak	missing	9-99
17E	Cucamonga Peak	missing	9-99
17F	Etiwanda Peak	missing	9-99
21F	Arctic Peak	missing	7-99
21G	Bertha Peak	missing	5-99
24B	San Bernardino	missing	7-99
24C	San Bernardino E.	deficient	7-99
24D	Anderson Peak	missing	7-98
26C	Quean Mtn.	missing	4-99
26D	Ryan Mtn.	missing	4-94
27A	Ranger Peak	missing	2-99
27E	Folly Peak	missing	9-99
27H	Jean Peak	missing	9-99
28F	Apache Peak	missing	9-99
28G	Spittler Peak	missing	9-99

If you are climbing any of the above peaks, please consider bringing a new register can and book. If you discover a peak which needs a new register can, please let me know by mail addressed to Jim Adler, 836 S. Alandale Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90036-4625, or telephone at (323) 931-6844 or e-mail at j adler la @aol.com. or from the HPS web site. Also, please advise if you have replaced any of the missing or deficient registers or discover that any of the above reports are erroneous or out of date. (Since register books and pencils are so easy to carry all the time, peaks where only books or pencils are needed are not listed.)