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A Sampling of Some of the Lands Currently For Sale
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Time to Change an Ecologically Unsustainable ‘Political Reality’

“...It becomes increasingly difficult to say what are practical suggestions, when one’s research tends to show that what is politically feasible is usually too minor to make any difference, while changes significant enough to be worthwhile are often unthinkable in practical political terms.”

—World Resources Institute

The single most important step we can take to assure the long-term ecological and evolutionary integrity of the Northern Forest is the establishment of large connected ecological reserves that are adequately buffered from anthropogenic disturbance. This requires the acquisition of millions of acres of corporately-owned Northern Forest lands from willing-sellers.

The Forum is one of 22 conservation groups calling for the acquisition of “Endangered Jewels of the Northern Forest.” We believe the purchase of these 10,000 acres represents a necessary, but not sufficient, step in protecting the natural systems that support life in the Northern Forest region. As we report in this issue, wolves and cougars appear to be returning to Maine independently of human restoration efforts. For viable populations of these two endangered native predators, we will probably need reserves throughout the 26 million acre Northern Forest region that encompass approximately 50 percent of the region and are connected to other large reserves in neighboring regions.

Predictably, the high priests of political pragmatism will dismiss this last statement as “naive” and “politically impossible.” They will trot out all the old chestnuts that masquerade as “political wisdom” around these parts. Sadly, such thinking is, in reality, the orthodoxy of the status quo—unexamined assumptions that fail the tests of logic, physical reality, and, ultimately, of political reality itself.

Let us, for a moment, imagine it is New Year’s Day 1984. How would our “political pragmatists” view the next ten years? Would they have predicted the downfall of the Communist Party in the USSR? The breaching of the Berlin Wall? The end of Apartheid in South Africa? The handover between Yasser Arafat and the Prime Minister of Israel?

Would these pragmatists have predicted that public outrage over clearcuts and other abusive practices of industrial forestry would lead to the enactment of stringent forest practices regulations well before the end of the century? Did they predict that the paper industry would redirect its investment strategy to the Southeast, leaving Northern Forest mills significantly less competitive? (If they did foresee this development, why did they not act to shelter the regional economy via diversification, promotion of value-added manufacturing, and the restriction of raw log exports?)

Did the pragmatists predict that millions of acres of absentee corporate and large family holdings would be offered for sale? Or that additional millions of acres would be identified as “non-strategic” to long-term corporate interests?

Did the pragmatists evince an understanding of the global ecological crisis? Did they recognize that growth-at-any-cost industrial civilization has exceeded the physical limits of Planet Earth, and that the bill has come due for centuries of reaping resources from future generations?

Did these pragmatists show any compassion for the human and non-human victims of these crazy economic policies? Hardly. Instead, they used “pragmatism” to defeat or water down all measures designed to address the suffering caused by industrial “pragmatism.”

The role of the prophets of political realism is to defend the vested interests of the status quo—regardless of the costs to democracy, economic sustainability, the environment or simple truth. What is practical, in their world-view, is to ignore the limits of physical reality, to subvert democracy, and to corrupt market forces and government regulation to their own ends.

Self-appointed “political realists” who oppose land acquisition for Northern Forest ecological reserves will claim:

* We don’t know enough to act now; conservation biology is “unproved theory.” This is a half-truth that is utterly hypocritical. We will never know everything about the ecology of the Northern Forests, but, as Professor Steve Trombulak, Dr. David Publicover, Dr. Reed Noss, and numerous other respected ecologists have often said, we know more than enough to act now and act decisively. The call for more research is a phony ploy to delay protection and restoration efforts. The industry flacks who want absolute, irrefutable proof that reserves are necessary have never subjected forestry or the paper industry to similar scrutiny. Will they agree to no further logging anywhere in the Northern Forests until independent scientists can prove absolutely and irrefutably that logging benefits ecosystem integrity? Will they insist that their paper mills cease operations until independent scientists provide irrefutable proof that dioxin and other organochlorines benefit human and non-human organisms? Unless industrial advocates are willing to subject their practices to the same scrutiny they demand of protection strategies, they should drop this argument.

* We don’t need reserves; private property and industry are protecting biodiversity just fine. While white-tail deer may concur, neotropical migratory songbirds, salamanders, salmon, wolves, cougars, mycorrhizal fungi, old growth forests, and independent scientists say this is nonsense.

* We can’t afford to buy so much land in this age of deficits. This is an awfully plausible-sounding objection, but only if unexamined in its proper context. This is a favorite argument of the same elements of the timber industry who shamelessly lobby for even greater subsidies than they currently receive. These folk have shamelessly lobbied the Northern Forest Lands Study and the Northern Forest Lands Council (NFLC) for capital gains, estate tax and further property tax breaks. (While property taxes on small, non-industrial owners who live on their land may be excessive and in need of equitable reform, it is difficult to make a similar case for absentee, billion dollar transnationals that pay 19 cents [$0.19] per acre in property taxes in the unincorporated townships of Coos County, NH.)

Curiously, these fiscal hypocrites inflate the cost of land acquisition yet ignore the cost to the federal and state treasuries of their favorite tax breaks. If we allocate $200 million a year for land acquisition in the region, we could purchase 8-10 million acres within ten years! Although the NFLC has thus far failed to tally the cost of rolling backs and cutbacks done by economist Spencer Phillips of The Wilderness Society suggests that it would conservatively cost the federal treasury $20 million a year, probably considerably more.

So there you have it: the champions of industry tax breaks have endorsed the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars to assist the struggling Northern Forest region. The choice we tax payers face boils down to: should we begin to secure permanent environmental protection or should we provide further subsidies to an industry that has fought every environmental protection effort, has degraded land, air and water, and has flourished at the expense of the natural and human communities of the region.
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Chlorine-Free Paper—Price is Higher but Costs are Lower

The Forum has just purchased a new shipment of chlorine-free paper from Cross Point that contains 20 percent recycled fiber. Regular issues of the Forum use chlorine-free paper for the cover and the centerfold. The remainder of the issue is printed on unbleached newsprint that is approximately 20 percent recycled.

Chlorine-free paper is very expensive. In fact, we probably are paying twice the price we would pay for similar paper that is bleached with chlorine gas or chlorine dioxide.

For an outfit with the limited resources of the Forum, it is not easy to pay so much more for paper. But, when I received the latest bill for the chlorine-free paper, I reminded myself that if the price we have to pay is more, the cost to nature is far less. No dioxins, furans or hundreds of other highly toxic organochlorines were discharged into a paper mill during the chlorine-free paper-making process. While we do not pretend that our chlorine-free paper is harmless to the environment, it is dramatically less harmful to fish, lobsters, fishermen, and nursing mothers.

Dioxins and other organochlorines damage human immune and reproductive systems and increase the risk of cancer. While the paper companies reap billions of dollars in subsidized profits and allow them to pass these reprehensible costs along to the public—they could not manufacture chlorine-bleached paper profitably and would convert to chlorine-free processes almost overnight. (See Andrew Whitaker's important essay on pages 22-23.)

As consumers, we must insist on chlorine-free paper that contains a high percentage of genuinely post-consumer recycled paper. (Note: recycled paper will contain chlorine residue because it was initially bleached with a chlorine process. Recycled chlorine-free paper means that no chlorine was used in the recycled phase of papermaking.)

We must boycott chlorine-bleached products. I remind my colleagues that it is an imperative that federal governments purchase only chlorine-free paper. Unfortunately, when the timid Clinton White House floated a proposal to do just that, Maine's Senator George Mitchell, the powerful Majority Leader, disgraced himself and subverted efforts to convert Maine's paper mills to chlorine-free production. At the bidding of his campaign's financial supporters in the paper industry, Mitchell persuaded the White House to squelch the chlorine-free initiative.

The irony is that although Senator Mitchell earned his campaign contributions by faithfully doing the paper industry's dirty work, he actually hurt the long-term best interests of the Maine paper mills that are finding it increasingly more difficult to compete with modern, more productive mills in the southeast United States and in Canada.

Endangered Bald Eagles are being poisoned by dioxin and other organochlorines in the tissues of the fish they eat in Maine and New Hampshire rivers. Photo by Bill Stiffler, Jr.

Newfoundland Cod Fisheries Collapse, Over-Population & Economic Growth-at-any-Cost

Especially in times of stubborn economic downturn such as now, we keep hearing the litany that "jobs come first." Environment is a "luxury" (which, and most importantly, "environmentalists exaggerate the dangers to serve their own ends; nothing really bad will happen anyway". (This has long been what I characterize as the Neanderthal editorial-page policy—not the hard news sections—of the Wall Street Journal, for example.)

Living, as we do, in northern New England, within range of Canadian news media, and reading and hearing the Newfoundland fishery story constantly, I'd say we have an excellent, if deeply tragic, example of a true, unaggerated contemporary 1993 environmental disaster right off the Northern Forest doorstep.

John Croshie, of Newfoundland, the last national Fisheries Minister in the late Mulroney Government, has called the cod collapse "Not just an environmental problem, but a major social and economic problem.

A CBC Radio report in November put it in even harder terms, one which any Gloucester or New Bedford fisherman would recognize instantly. A Canadian Government research vessel, dragging through the now-closed grounds off Newfoundland, an area that for five hundred years has been among the richest fishing grounds on earth reported: "In five towns [we] took twenty fish [small cod]." (Note, that's not "bushels," or "pens," or "barrels," or "hundreds," that's just twenty individual small fish, from an area that for years has helped feed Europe and North America.) "You have to be out there to see it, it's barren," said one fisheries scientist. Even with the current Canadian ban, there is no consensus at all on when the cod stocks will return, if ever.

At about the same time this news was breaking, media attention on world population issues referred to some "pro-growth experts" (i.e. "more human population, more economic growth experts") who see "grass exaggeration[s] by biologists and environmentalists" (in the latter's deep concern about the assaults on earth's carbon cycle and the species in the wake of over-expanding population). "Science and technology will come to the rescue..." according to quotes from these growth-optimists.

While I'd leave any direct connection between the Newfoundland cod collapse and burgeoning human population growth worldwide to experts, a quote from a Professor of UMass, Amherst is most haunting: "Whether [due to human population pressure] the extinction of various species will matter in practical human terms..." Let's just ask Newfoundlanders (many of whom tried to warn their government of the impending collapse) if environmental conservation issues "matter" to humans. There is no way out of this mess, and in our own country, let's give all thanks to President Clinton for restoring federal funds for population control programs, funds which George Bush, to his shame, for his own political ends, willfully eliminated.

Bren Whitaker
Brunswick, VT

ABIGAIL AVERY IN MEMORIAM

As we were going to press, we learned of the death of our good friend, long-time Sierra Club activist, Abigail Avery.

Abby was a loyal and devoted friend of the Forest Forum, and whose generosity and encouragement gave many of us our start. She always sought ways to defend the ecological integrity of the forests without polarizing the situation.

As we enter 1994, we must redouble our efforts to compensate for Abby's absence.

Thanks Abby. We miss you.
The Northern Forest region faces tremendous forces of change. Changing dynamics in the forest products industry, increases in land speculation and subdivision and increasingly intensified harvesting pressures have altered the fundamental character of the Great Northern Forest. Today, hundreds of thousands of acres in the Northern Forest are for sale. The threats these “fire sale” circumstances pose to the ecological integrity of these lands is only dampened by the on-going economic recession of the Northeast.

The Northern Forest Area does not have significant division-wide programs to purchase and protect these lands. Some states have modest land protection funds, but not enough to meet the needs. The only source of federal funds to the region is an impoverished Land and Water Conservation Fund and a woefully underfunded Forest Legacy program.

The sponsoring organizations of this report hope that by highlighting these significant tracts of land worthy of protection for future generations, greater public attention will be drawn to the urgency for public funding and action. These landowners want to sell—if only we were prepared to buy. Our unified call for protection of these lands is in New Year’s Resolution for all generations and for all of the new years to come.

As important lands are put on the market by willing-sellers and large private corporations are reconsidering the fate of their lands, the federally funded Northern Forest Lands Council is preparing to issue its public policy report to Congress. The 1994 Northern Forest Lands Council report and recommendations to Congress provide a unique opportunity to promote funding for these natural resource jewels of the Great Northern Forest while providing a sustainable future to its industries and local communities.

Conservationists engaged in protecting ecologically significant areas recognize that the Northern Forest Lands Council must take a comprehensive approach to the ecological, social and economic needs of the region. To accomplish this broad objective, a strategy of wildland reserves, sustainable forestry and strong local economies must be pursued. A well-managed forestry system for the Great Northern Forest with appropriate tax incentives can help ensure that forest practices are ecologically and economically sound. Strong local economies coupled with sustainable forestry will not only provide for the people of the Northern Forest but also, in doing so, play a significant role in protecting the special places listed in this report.

For the past several years, our organizations called upon our federal and state government leaders to establish land acquisition and conservation easement funds to protect large tracts of critical lands for-sale, or protected for-sale, in the near future. Some of these lands, like the Raquette River Tract in the Adirondacks, have been protected, while others have changed ownership. Land acquisition from willing-sellers for public good remains the most successful conservation tradition in America since the days of President Theodore Roosevelt. Today, this conservation tool is augmented with the innovative use of conservation easements, which enable land-owners to keep land in forest production and/or agricultural use through a private/public partnership. Protection of these lands for sustainable economic use can greatly assist local economies while protecting the region’s natural resources. The Northern Forest Lands Council must recognize that these natural resource wonders provide the cornerstone to the ecological and economic spirit of the region.

However, the land listed represents only a snapshot of the large private lands which will be on the open-market this decade. The region’s multinational corporations are faced with serious long-term economic decisions regarding their land holdings. Certain large land purchases have been transacted from one forest company to another with the goal of remaining in forest production, if not eventually purchased by another company. Some of the lands listed in this report.

For the past several years, our organizations called upon our federal and state government leaders to establish land acquisition and conservation easement funds to protect large tracts of critical lands for-sale, or protected for-sale, in the near future. Some of these lands, like the Raquette River Tract in the Adirondacks, have been protected, while others have changed ownership. Land acquisition from willing-sellers for public good remains the most successful conservation tradition in America since the days of President Theodore Roosevelt. Today, this conservation tool is augmented with the innovative use of conservation easements, which enable land-owners to keep land in forest production and/or agricultural use through a private/public partnership. Protection of these lands for sustainable economic use can greatly assist local economies while protecting the region’s natural resources. The Northern Forest Lands Council must recognize that these natural resource wonders provide the cornerstone to the ecological and economic spirit of the region.

However, the land listed represents only a snapshot of the large private lands which will be on the open-market this decade. The region’s multinational corporations are faced with serious long-term economic decisions regarding their land holdings. Certain large land purchases have been transacted from one forest company to another with the goal of remaining in forest production, if not eventually purchased by another company. Some of the lands listed in this report.

The Northern Forest Lands Council acknowledges the purchase of interests in land from willing-sellers as a tool to protect critical sites. In 1990, the four-state Governor’s Task Force of the Northern Forest Lands Study recommended an annual federal appropriation to the states of $25 million for land acquisition for each of the following four years. But the Task Force recommendation went unheeded, and the number of parcels on the market, as well as the costs to permanently protect them, is growing.

The people of the region, and all those who value the Great Northern Forest must not continue to ignore the opportunity to conserve several significant land parcels in the region. There is an on-going need for better statewide and regional planning so agencies can anticipate when lands are to be put on the open-market, and to purchase it at a fair price before others do.

Endangered Jewels of the Northern Forest

Large Tracts of Land now, or suspected soon to be offered, for sale or easement in the Northern Forest Region from Willing Sellers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearst Estate</td>
<td>Adirondacks</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Pending Sale to State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney Tract</td>
<td>Adirondacks</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Fate Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follenley Pond</td>
<td>Adirondacks</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>Fate Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan/White/Bird</td>
<td>Adirondacks</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Pending Sale to State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons Faith Pulp and Paper</td>
<td>Adirondacks/Tug Hill</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Fate Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion Non-Strat.Lands</td>
<td>Adirondacks</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>Fate Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domtar International</td>
<td>Adirondacks</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>Easement Offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Paper Lands</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>For Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Corp. Lands Holdings</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Fate Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Jay</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Fate Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIH Corp. Lands</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>Fate Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Bog</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>Easement Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilkenny Tract</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Sold to Timber Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katabidin Iron Works</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>Sold to Timber Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inl. Paper Mahouse Mins.</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>For Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearst Corp. Machius Lands</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>Fate Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESTIMATED TOTAL ACREAGE AT RISK $89,900

ACREAGE SAVED IN 1993 20,000**

* Approximate New England and New York Corporate Holdings currently or suspected to be offered for sale or easement in the future.

** This represents the International Paper Raquette River Tract in the Adirondacks.
rather than today's more reactive approach. In the long run, conservation of the ecological and economic integrity of the Northern Forest will require a mix of economic incentives for private landowners; sensible and fair land use regulations; and public acquisition of key lands. The latter will not be a reality for many of the jewels in the Great Northern Forest unless the federal government reverses its present trend of reduced federal or state acquisition programs.

The following sections outline today's concerns for large tracts of forestland in the Great Northern Forest. While there is cause for celebration with the donation of the Raquette River Tract in the Adirondacks, most of the lands we have listed for the past three years are no closer to protection and stewardship. With the list of lands available for acquisition and easements growing, our hope is that our united call for action will ensure an investment of public dollars before it is too late.

Adirondacks

In the Adirondack Park, there are several large tracts of land with willing-sellers who are open to the possibility of state acquisition of fee titles or easements. Key tracts have been identified by numerous public and private reports in the past several years. Last year, Champion International identified 95,000 acres of non-strategic forest lands which they may put on the market in the future. More recently, Domtar International announced its desire to sell conservation easements on all 105,000 acres of its Adirondack lands. The landowners of these jewels and other potential acquisition/restitution sites in the Adirondacks have had discussions on the protection of their lands at some governmental levels, and many of the parcels are highlighted in New York State's Open Space Plan. In July of 1993, New York State passed the Environmental Protection Fund, which provides funds for land acquisition and conservation easements. However, further matching dollars from the federal government is needed if all of these jewels are to be saved.

International Paper Company's Raquette River Tract

Saved: The Raquette River Tract saved by donation a year ago consists of approximately 20,000 acres of low-elevation hardwoods, spruce flats, swamps, mixed coniferous forests, and hardwood hills in the northwestern Adirondacks. Eleven miles of the Raquette River, including 22 miles of shoreline, lie in the southwestern corner of the tract and form the connecting link between Tupper Lake and Carry Falls Reservoir, a popular historic canoe route. The Raquette is classified as a scenic river in the state's Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers System. Protection of this tract was provided for by a private donation of the land by International Paper to the non-profit Conservation Fund. A jewel has been saved for future generations to enjoy.

Heurich Estate

Pending Sale to State: A pristine area on the shore of Lake Champlain. This tract provides wildlife and recreational opportunities. It is scheduled to be one of the first Adirondack projects under the new State Protection Fund. The property includes three miles of shoreline and encompasses 2,200 acres of land. This scenic parcel is currently held by the Open Space Institute in anticipation of its sale to the state.

Whitney Estate

Fate Unknown: A true gem of 50,000 acres in the central Adirondacks. This property would be the cornerstone for the creation of a new wildland reserve in the Adirondacks, which has been named by many as the proposed Oswegatchie Wilderness. Without federal matching dollars, we may not have enough to save this magnificent jewel.

The over 800,000 acres of prime forest land listed will never be more affordable and can be protected today through easements and fee acquisitions. During the next decade, several hundred million dollars will need to be earmarked as other large parcels are put on the market by willing-sellers. Indeed, the costs to the nation if they are lost to subdivision and developments are inestimable.

Follensby Pond

Fate Unknown: The owner of this 14,000 acre tract has shown interest in selling the property to the state and extended the state's option through 1994. One of the largest, undeveloped, privately-owned waterbodies in the Adirondacks, Follensby Pond would be a logical adjacent to the popular Raquette River canoe route between Long Lake and Tupper Lake. Follensby Pond, known in history as the wilderness setting for the famous 1858 philosophers' camp of Ralph Waldo Emerson and other Boston luminaries, should be a top priority of the state's new Environmental Protection Fund.

The Morgan/White/Bird Properties on Lake George

Pending Sale to State: These holdings include three miles of shoreline on northern Lake George, the last significant stretch of undisturbed private land on this "Queen of American Lakes." While the southern end of Lake George has been transformed by development, the northern basin can still be saved if this wild shoreline can be preserved in its natural state. The Morgan portion of the holding, including a mile of pristine lakefront, is being held by the Nature Conservancy with hopes of purchase by New York State with the newly enacted Environmental Protection Fund.

Lyons Falls Pulp and Paper Lands

Fate Unknown: This large tract of industrial timberland put on the market last year consisted of 15,000 acres of prime forest on the headwaters of the Salmon River in the Tug Hill Region and 5,000 acres on the headwaters of the Moose River in the Adirondacks. These areas are noted for their migratory bird habitat. Later in 1993, these lands were taken off the market when working capital loans were receivied. The long term fate of the property is unknown.

Northern Vermont & Green Mountains

The Vermont portion of the Northern Forest has the lowest proportion of large, contiguous tracts of public or private land. This has made it critical to protect the integrity of existing large tracts of private land, and to consolidate public ownership in already authorized public land units.

Northeast Kingdom International Paper Land

For Sale: This tract includes 30,000 acres of forestland adjacent to Cow Mountain Pond Forest Legacy Project in Granby and also adjacent to
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Easonment Pendency: This 5,900 acre tract was part of the land that was sold to real estate speculator Claude Rancourt in the 1988 Diamond International sale. On the east, it abuts the publicly-owned 41,000 acre Nash Stream Forest; on the west, it is adjacent to 1,200 privately-owned acres under conservation easement. All of these lands are less than 10 miles from the White Mountain National Forest.

Stratford Bog

Stratford Bog has outstanding public value, including wildlife habitat, productive forests and opportunities for outdoor recreation. Owner Raymond Hartshorn is negotiating the sale of a conservation easement with the State of New Hampshire and the U.S. Forest Service, under the Forest Legacy Program. At present, he intends to retain 200 acres for development. In the past year, Mr. Hartshorn has conducted heavy logging operations on this tract including a three-quarter mile long clear-cut for a proposed air plane landing strip. He has also constructed a new road into the bog.

These negotiations are only possible because Congress provided the funds for continued funding of the Forest Legacy Program. There is no other apparent way to protect this strategically located parcel. Now that Congress has done its part, we can only hope for a successful conclusion by the responsible agencies.

Kilkenny Tract

Sold to Timber Group: This 15,000 acre tract in Randolph, New Hampshire, links two important regions of the White Mountain National Forest: The Presidential Range and the Kilkenny Range. The Kilkenny tract was recently purchased from Diamond Occidental Forest Industries, Inc., a partially owned subsidiary of James River, Inc., by John Hancock Timber Resources Group, a division of John Hancock Financial Services, Inc., an investment firm with long-term forest-management objectives.

Kilkenny Tract

Stratford Bog

Northern New Hampshire

The northernmost portion of New Hampshire is dominated by a half-million acres of timberland owned by giant, transnational, forest-products companies. Now, these lands are threatened by major changes in the forest-products industry. Below are important ownerships which represent endangered jewels of New Hampshire’s Northern Forest.

The James River Lands

Fate Unknown: Stretching from Wentworth’s Location to Whitefield, James River Timber Corporation, a subsidiary of Richmond, Virginia-based James River Corporation, manages some 80,000 acres of forest land in New Hampshire’s Coos County. The James River Corporation owns a significant percentage of the holding company, Diamond Occidental Forest Industries, which owns these lands. In 1993, an additional 63,000 acres of forestland was sold by the holding company to Hancock Timber Resources Group.

These properties combined contain numerous outstanding lakes, streams, and wetlands. They are important to the public—and to local people in particular—as backcountry where one can not only work for the forest products industry, but also find solitude for hiking, hunting, snowmobiling, camping, fishing and a variety of other recreational pursuits. These lands include some 7,900 acres within the boundaries of the new Lake Umbagog National Wildlife Refuge, approximately 5,000 acres of holdings in the White Mountain National Forest, and much of the western slope of the scenic Mahoosuc Range, which was originally included in the White Mountain National Forest boundary. In addition, the lands abut the Appalachian Trail.

Hancock Timber Resources Group and James River Corporation have not ruled out exploring the possibility of selling conservation easements or fee title on some of these lands in the future. If these companies decide to sell certain lands, public acquisition of some or all of these lands for addition to the White Mountain National Forest, or other federal or state land units, would ensure lasting protection and provide for the full range of land uses. A wildlife reserve could be created with certain parcels linked with lands on the market across the Maine border.

Pondicherry

The ponds are managed by the New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game. The Audubon Society of New Hampshire owns the Pondicherry Wildlife Refuge which consists of the land immediately surrounding the ponds. While the ponds and immediate shoreline are protected from development, the wide array of wildlife habitat and associated wetlands and streams that make this area a haven is subject to the needs of private timberland owners. Ownership recently transferred to John Hancock Timber Resources Group, a division of John Hancock Financial Services, Inc. and an opportunity exists to unite the protected areas around Little Cherry Pond and Pondicherry Pond with the broader diverse habitat in the valley and make the Pondicherry region a true refuge for wildlife. Acquisition and/or easement tools need to be explored.

The Maine Woods

Maine has the largest share of the Northern Forest (58%) and the lowest proportion of public ownership in the Northeast (5%). Several tracts in the Maine Woods that represent some of the best and most vulnerable wild lands left in Maine, are currently at risk and their future is unknown.

Katyak Iron Works

Sold to Timber Group: This area encompasses numerous remote ponds and mountain peaks, miles of undeveloped river and stream shoreline, and nearly the entire watershed of the West Branch Pleasant River above Silver Lake. It borders Hermitage, an old-growth pine stand owned by The Nature Conservancy and the Gulf Hagas, a registered national landmark; and the Appalachian Trail, which bisects the property just southwest of the Nahmakanta watershed which was purchased by public conservation agencies several years ago.

Brighton Municipal Forest and Willoughby State Forest in Vermont. The property includes McConnell Pond and the headwaters of Granby Stream. International Paper recently put these 30,000 acres on the market. They could be considered part of a wildland strategy for the Northeast Kingdom.

Other Corporate Holdings in the Northeast Kingdom

Fate Unknown: In addition to International Paper, there are several other large corporate holdings in Vermont’s Northeast Kingdom, which is the most remote and undeveloped portion of the state corporate timberlands, including Champion and Hancock Timber Resource Group. Approximately 200,000 acres could be on the market before the turn of the century. Opportunities to purchase key tracts of these lands may be forthcoming, thus protecting the public values of the Northeast Kingdom.
Of the approximately 70,000 acres in the Katahdin Iron Works Area, 32,000 acres were sold by James River Corporation/Diamond Occidental Forest, Inc. in 1993 to Hancock Timber Resource Group. Hancock Timber Resources Group is open to future public acquisition or conservation easement strategies. Abutting parcels are owned by Champion International Corporation, which has indicated some interest in selling their land in the area.

The Katahdin Iron Works lands should be protected for the full array of advantages for public values. Public ownership along the Appalachian Trail could be expanded, and, in the short term, sensitive areas (shorelands, ridgetops, deer yards, endangered plant sites, etc.) could be protected through full-fee ownership or conservation easements held by public agencies. In the long term, full-fee public acquisition from willing-sellers of all of the KI lands would give the strongest assurance for safeguarding the public value of the area.

**Mahoosuc Mountains**

**For Sale:** During the summer of 1993, International Paper Company (IP) quietly put 30,833 acres of forestland in Maine near the New Hampshire border on the market for $7.9 million. The property encompasses four parcels, ranging from a hundred acres to more than 1,240 acres, including some of the wildest stretches within the viewshed of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail. The Mahoosucs have long been deemed to be a high priority area for public land protection. Nearby, there is already a mix of state (public reserve, state park) and federal (national forest, Appalachian Trail, National Wildlife Refuge) lands.

Some of the most spectacular of the IP lands are directly threatened by development. One of the largest ski resorts in the Northeast has proposed to buy over a thousand acres to build a lake, to expand alpine skiing trails and equipment, and to construct a lodge, hotel, village and other commercial and residential facilities in this area. The IP lands sale presents an extraordinary opportunity to permanently protect key wildlife and forest habitats in western Maine and connect them with a potential wildland reserve across the New Hampshire border to the west and with the White Mountain National Forest to the South.

**Hearst Corporation's Machias Lands**

**Fate Unknown:** This large tract owned by Hearst Corporation includes 27,000 acres of land in Wesley and T25 Township, Maine including the Machias River, Little Mopang Stream, and Old Stream. Hearst Corporation has sold most of its Maine holdings over the last several years and this unique property is their only remaining holding in the state. The Machias is one of Maine's most important recreational rivers for canoeing, kayaking and rafting. It is also one of Maine's few natural salmon breeding rivers. The 27,000 acres include the immediate watershed of all three rivers and is currently undeveloped. The state of Maine is interested in acquiring the parcel but stymied by the purchase price. Acquisition funds would ensure the protection of this jewel of the Maine Woods.

**Conclusion**

The cost of protecting these jewels is in the range of $75 to 100 million dollars, based on the average market price across the region. The cost at this time can only be a range with a distribution of title fee acquisition and conservation easements still to be determined. The over 800,000 acres of prime forest land listed will never be more affordable and can be protected today through easements and fee acquisitions. During the next decade, several hundred million dollars will need to be earmarked as other large parcels are put on the market by willing-sellers. Indeed, the costs to the nation if they are lost to subdivision and developments without other large parcels are put on the market by willing-sellers. Indeed, the costs to the nation if they are lost to subdivision and developments are inestimable. These costs will also be a major burden to local communities. A movement to revise federal Land and Water Conservation Fund priorities and further develop new funding mechanisms such as the Forest Legacy Program offer an unprecedented opportunity to purchase these valuable lands at affordable prices.

Without leadership from our state houses and Congress, these hopes for the New Year will turn into development nightmares with new condominium complexes and other developments changing the character and, in most cases, the traditional uses of the region. These lands provide examples of the endangered natural resource jewels of our Northern Forest and point out the need for our resolution to state and federal governments to provide land-protection funding. These jewels will be lost or preserved by our action today, and the outcome, good or bad, will be a permanent legacy for generations to come.

**22 Conservation Groups Support Public Acquisition**

The following 22 conservation groups urge citizens from across the region to join us to protect these other jewels through this Northern Forest New Year's Resolution:

- *The Adirondack Council*
- *Adirondack Mountain Club*
- *Appalachian Mountain Club*
- *Appalachian Trail Conference*
- *Association for the Protection of the Adirondacks*
- *Audubon Society of New Hampshire*
- *The Conservation Law Foundation*
- *Environmental Air Force*
- *Environmental Planning Lobby*
- *The Green Mountain Club*
- *National Audubon Society*
- *National Wildlife Federation*
- *Natural Resources Defense Council*
- *New Hampshire Wildlife Federation*
- *New York Rivers United*
- *The Northern Forest Forum*
- *RESTORE: The North Woods*
- *Sierra Club*
- *Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests*
- *Trust for Public Lands*
- *Vermont Natural Resources Council*
- *The Wilderness Society*
Diamond Land Conversion: Has Council Missed Something?

by Mitch Lansky

The sale of the Diamond Occidental lands to developers in New Hampshire and Vermont was a major spur to the formation of the Northern Forest Lands Study. Most of the Diamond lands in Maine were sold to Fraser, James River, Hancock, or others in the forest industry. But does this mean that the Diamond land sales in Maine are not a problem?

A Pattern?

My curiosity over the subject was first aroused by a call I received from a St. Albans, Maine resident who informed me that a few thousand acres of Diamond lands there had been sold to a large contractor. The caller, who was himself a part-time logger, was concerned with the intensity of the cutting. The operation was obviously directed toward liquidating the commercially-valuable timber to get a quick payback on the purchase.

Soon afterward, I noticed that another large contractor had purchased Diamond lands in nearby Drew Plantation, and was cutting this rather heavily (though the cutting would not qualify under the Maine Forest Service's definition of a "clearcut" because it left slightly more than 30 square feet basal area per acre of trees). This contractor is a representative in the Maine legislature.

A few months later, another caller informed me that a Canadian contractor had purchased over a thousand acres from Diamond near the Seeley/Holden border. Much of the wood cut was shipped to Canadian mills.

And then someone called to tell me that a large contractor had purchased a Diamond lot in Kessuth and had cut almost anything with value, including deer yards and aquatic buffer strips. The caller had told him how much the land cost and how much wood was cut. Apparently, despite the LURC fine, the contractor got 100% return on his investment in just one and a half months and still had the land to sell.

Implications

I did not solicit any of these calls. Indeed, I have made no major effort to research this subject, so it is quite possible that these examples, involving thousands of acres, represent just the tip of an iceberg, an iceberg that includes sales of non-strategic parcels by other industrial landowners to their contractors. If so, it may mean that the Council's statistics on land conversion are missing something important. There are thousands of acres of parcels that are still under current-use tax, they are still being "managed," but the intention of the "management" is forest liquidation and sale. Until the land is subdivided or sold for development, this type of practice does not show up in land-conversion figures.

The purchase and liquidation of former industrial timber tracts by large contractors is attractive for several major reasons:

1. Purchase price of the land is less than the value of the standing timber plus the value of the cleared land.
2. There are no forest-practices regulations to prevent a landowner from rapidly liquidating the most valuable timber.
3. There are no regulations in Maine to prevent rapid resale of purchased land.
4. Even if the land is not rapidly resold, the current-use tax (around a dollar per acre) is so low that holding on to non-productive land is only a minor burden at most.

Ironically, the Council has chosen not to directly confront forest practices, even though lack of regulations is a major factor allowing land conversion. The Council has also been lobbying for lower land taxes, even though low land taxes with no silvicultural strings attached make forest liquidation a more profitable endeavor. If the Council does not address these crucial issues, it may end up offering solutions that may become part of the problem.

Cougar-Like Animal Kills Bobcat in Eastern Maine

by Jamie Sayen

In November a hunter in eastern Maine witnessed a battle between a bobcat and a large, brown animal, thought to be a cougar, that left the bobcat mortally wounded. The Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (DIFW) is conducting tests on the bobcat carcass and samples of fur and blood found at the site of the battle to see if, indeed, this was a cougar. Test results will not be available for a few months.

Anthony Fuscaldo was hunting in woods near Columbia Falls when he heard "something that sounded like a woman screaming in pain. I've never heard anything like that before," he told the Maine Times. He walked over a rise and spotted a large, brown, tawny animal shaking something with its head about 15 feet away. He guessed that the animal was about four feet long and weighed about 80 pounds.

When the animal turned around, he saw a "big angry head—about the size of an average human head." It "let out a big snarl," and, after a few moments it dropped the bobcat and "took three tremendous long leaps" and disappeared into the brush. After killing the mortally wounded bobcat, Fuscaldo notified DIFW.

Ken Elowe, a wildlife biologist with DIFW reported that claw and bite marks appeared to be the correct size for a cougar. "We don't know what it was," said Elowe, "but whatever it was big enough to kill a bobcat.

The last known killing of a cougar in Maine occurred in 1938 along the St. John River. There are 20-30 sightings every year, and some of them are very convincing. In 1992 cougar hair was collected in New Brunswick.

Following this sighting, Fuscaldo received several phone calls from other people who thought they had seen this big cat, including one man who said he made an imprint of its track after it attacked a moose.

Although the Eastern Cougar is considered extinct, it is listed as an endangered species. Currently, the burden of proof is on the beast to demonstrate that it is back. The time has come for us to commit to protecting adequate cougar habitat—as the spirit, if not the letter of the Endangered Species Act requires—even if we still don't have irrefutable proof of viable populations of cougars returning to this region.

Current policies permit continued habitat degradation which works to retard the return of viable populations. Ethics and ecology dictate that we commit to habitat protection regardless of the current population levels of this endangered species. This will accelerate the re-establishment of viable cougar populations. It will provide immeasurable benefits to a wide variety of other species and communities throughout the region.

Cougar Reintroduction & Eastern Cougar Conference

Dear Forum:

Has anybody given any thought to the reintroduction of the panther/catamount/mountain lion/cougar? I don't know how widely it was distributed, but I've seen the hooks on which "the last panther shot in Pelham, Massachusetts" (near Amherst) was hung.

The possibility of reintroducing such large predators and the consideration of why and how they were exterminated raises the question of the indirect effect that animal husbandry has on the environment.

Jim Romer
Unity, NH

Forum Responds: On June 3, 4, and 5, 1994, Cannon University in Erie, Pennsylvania will host an Eastern Cougar Conference. The purpose of the conference is to convene experts and private citizens with an interest in the eastern cougar—the third day of the proceedings will be devoted to discussion of restoration dynamics.

Registration is limited to 300. For more information, please contact:

Jay W. Tischendorf
American Ecological Research Institute—AERIE
PO BOX 340
Fort Collins, Colorado 80522
(303) 224-5307
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Wolf-Like Creature Shot in Western Maine in Late August

by Stephen Gorman

A "wolf-like" animal was shot by a bear hunter in the Maine woods west of Baxter State Park on August 31. The animal had been seen by campers and state wildlife officials on August 26 and again on August 28. The shooting comes as a surprise to wildlife managers and conservationists as the wolf has been officially extinct in Maine for over a century.

"All outward appearances say it is a wolf," said George Matula, Head of Research for the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (IFW). "All of its measurements are very wolf-like. The animal is definitely not a coyote. It is a black female weighing 67 pounds—much heavier than any female coyote on record, at least here in Maine."

The animal's head has been sent to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) forensics laboratory in Ashland, Oregon. According to Matula, scientists will examine the animal to make a positive identification and determine whether it is a pure wolf or a wolf-coyote hybrid. A report is due in about a month, he said.

Wolf sightings are on the increase in northern New England. For six months in 1991 a large wolf-like animal was seen repeatedly in the Perry Stream watershed of northern New Hampshire, where Maine, New Hampshire and Quebec meet. Two winters ago, in a remote area of the Maine woods far from human habitation, Maine wildlife researchers studying pine marten repeatedly came upon candle tracks large enough to be those of a wolf. They say there is little likelihood the tracks were made by a domestic dog.

Matula speculates that the animal killed by the bear hunter in the Maine woods far from human habitation, Maine wildlife researchers studying pine marten repeatedly came upon candle tracks large enough to be those of a wolf. They say there is little likelihood the tracks were made by a domestic dog.

Matula mentioned that the animal may have crossed the frozen Saint Lawrence River during the winter. The animal might then have traveled through the settled agricultural region along the river's south shore to the Maine woods.

"If the Canadian wolves knew how much food was available down here, more of them might make the trip," said Matula, citing Maine's abundant deer, moose, and beaver populations that would provide the animals with a healthy food base.

When asked if Maine had a position on the reintroduction of the wolf, a move that is supported by some conservationists, Matula said that any attempts to reestablish the wolf must proceed cautiously. He said his department would prefer to see the animal return on its own, as it may be doing. "All of us would be overjoyed to see it back," he said, "but how much of an effort can we afford to devote to it?"

Citing his slashed budget, Matula said that reintroduction raises questions about cost. He also said that private property issues would complicate the situation. "There is not much state or federal land in this region" he said.

The wolf is on the endangered species list. The USFWS has designated the Maine woods as a suitable range for the eastern timber wolf.
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"If the Canadian wolves knew how much food was available down here, more of them might make the trip," said Matula, citing Maine's abundant deer, moose, and beaver populations that would provide the animals with a healthy food base.

When asked if Maine had a position on the reintroduction of the wolf, a move that is supported by some conservationists, Matula said that any attempts to reestablish the wolf must proceed cautiously. He said his department would prefer to see the animal return on its own, as it may be doing. "All of us would be overjoyed to see it back," he said, "but how much of an effort can we afford to devote to it?"

Citing his slashed budget, Matula said that reintroduction raises questions about cost. He also said that private property issues would complicate the situation. "There is not much state or federal land in this region" he said.
by Mitch Lanskyn

Introduction

Need for Survey: Representatives from the forest industry and environmental groups have been frustrated by the lack of adequate data about changes in the Maine Woods. It is hard to have a debate on forest policy if you do not know the status of the forest and the direction in which it is changing. Over the last 15 years, the forest has been subjected to such impacts as a major spruce budworm outbreak, massive mechanized clearcuts, herbicide spraying, and residential development. What effect did these impacts have on the volume, species ratio, quality, stocking, age structure, and health and vigor of the forest?

The last complete forest survey by the U.S. Forest Service was in 1980 (published in 1982). The Maine Forest Service did its own Midcycle Resurvey in 1986, but this report focused primarily on the spruce-fir resource. In 1990, the MFS initiated another resurvey, which was finally published in late November of 1993.

Gaps: This latest survey did not attempt to answer all questions. It did not give any estimates of the stocking (degree of occupancy by the land by trees or seedlings) of the current forest. It did not give figures on the percentage of rough, rotten, or dead trees, nor did it attempt to determine the degree of fragmentation of the forest. It did not estimate the rate of growth of different forest types. Indeed, it did not even estimate changes in forest types (past surveys, for example, have shown a decline in the spruce-fir type), though it gave a rough estimate of the percentage of forest in softwood, mixedwood, hardwood, or "regenerating."

Highlights

Landscape: The survey team used satellite photos and computers to estimate total forest acreage. Despite a boom decade of residential development in the north woods, total forest acreage appears to have increased due to natural reforestation of abandoned farmland. The MFS, however, does not fully trust its methodology yet, so it assumed that forest acreage has remained stable over the last ten years.

MFS contractors, using satellite photos, classified 2.4 million acres as "regenerating," but suggested that some of this category actually had considerable wood on it. Indeed, the average acre classified as "regenerating" had 11 cords, whereas the average acre for all forest types had 14.6 cords (down from 17 cords per acre in 1980). Since landowners admitted clearcutting about 1.2 million acres during the ten year period between surveys, this implies that the remaining 1.2 million of the 2.4 million acres "regenerating" averaged 22 cords. That researchers would classify stands with so much wood as "regenerating" seems highly unlikely.

Rotations: The MFS contractors estimated that the rotation for softwoods in Aroostook and Washington Counties was around 40 years. Such a short rotation could have drastic consequences for wildlife dependent on older forest types. This system of estimating, however, is currently very unreliable. Indeed, all of the following statistics are subject to large error factors (some over 300%) and should not be fully trusted as "fact.

Timber Volumes: The MFS estimates that total volume of trees over 5 inches has declined by 15% over the last decade. Most of this decline was with softwoods which were reduced by 22% in just 10 years. Most of the decline in softwoods was due to a drop in average diameter, which tended to rise in the late 1980s. For all of these species, the figures may not be comparable as the figures may not match exactly due to possible changes in classification.
Maine's Forest Practices Act: Is it Working?

by Mitch Lansky

One reason the Northern Forest Lands Council did not directly address forest practices through a separate sub-committee, is, supposedly, because the individual states are already dealing with this issue. Those who support this line of reasoning can point to Maine's 1989 Forest Practices Act (FPA) and 1990 Forest Clearcutting and Regeneration Standards. The Standards, they claim, are working.

Since 1989, when reported clearcuts peaked at 145,357 acres, clearcut acreage has steadily fallen. In 1992, "only" 59,602 acres were reported clearcut—a drop of 59%. More dramatically, clearcuts as a percentage of all cuts went from 44.6% in 1989 to 12.8% in 1992.

How much of this drop, however, is due to the Forest Practices Act? Is management improving? Has the FPA succeeded in fulfilling its mandate?

The Mandate

The FPA mandated that the clearcutting standards among other things "provide a healthy and sustainable forest," and "address adverse impacts on wildlife habitat." The standards, however, theoretically allow landowners to remove most of the volume of timber in a township in a matter of decades. The FPA does not mandate a reduction in clearcut acreage. It only limits the size and distribution of clearcuts. Theoretically, landowners, if they wish, can clear as many or even more acres than they did before the rules were passed.

For those who wish to cut as aggressively as the law allows, the alternative to clearcutting in cookie-cutter patterns (clearcuts surrounded by buffers) can be heavy partial cuts that degrade the forest. The result in either case would be a forest that is neither healthy or sustainable.

The clearcutting standards provide wildlife with temporary corridors that are only 250 feet wide—enough interior habitat. In ten years, ten-year-old clearcuts can serve as corridors. The regulations may "address" wildlife (by mentioning the issue), but it is hardly ensuring that wildlife or their habitats will be protected.

Post Hoc Ergo Proper Hoc

Just because the FPA was passed in 1989 does not mean it caused the subsequent reduction in clearcutting. Indeed, the rules were not actually put in place until 1991, yet clearcutting in 1990 was down 36% from 1989. There are other factors at work.

Irritation

The rules, however, may have led to some reduction in clearcutting due to the irritation factor. If, according to state definitions, landowners clearcut, they have to deal with bureaucratic hassles. Indeed, for clearcuts over 50 acres, landowners need management plans—not ones that demonstrate best silvicultural practices, but ones that demonstrate bureaucratic compliance. If landowners conduct the clearcut according to the mandates of the law (i.e., how the clearcuts and separation zones will be distributed on the landscape), to avoid such hassles, many landowners are doing what used to be called "commercial clearcuts" (i.e., cutting most of the merchantable wood) but, according to the rules, are now not legally clearcutting. Many heavily-stocked softwood stands, for example, have 150 or more square feet of basal area per tree. The rules state that a cut is not a clearcut if the logger leaves more than 30 square feet basal area per tree. Thus a logger can remove nearly 80% of a stand without technically clearcutting it.

In 1989, when landowners reported that nearly 45% of their cuts were clearcuts, the average removal was 17 cords per acre. After the Forest Practices Act went into effect in 1991, when landowners reported that 17% of their cuts were clearcuts, the average removal was nearly 15 cords per acre. This means the average partial cut was still fairly intense. Critics of the definition of a clearcut (leaving trees that total less than 30 square feet basal area per acre) predicted that if landowners left behind 31 square feet basal area, the cut would not be classified as a clearcut.

Increased Reporting

The only reportable Maine Forest Service categories for cuts that are not clearcuts are "shelterwood" and "selection." While the acreage of clearcutting declined 59% from 1989 to 1992, the acreage of shelterwood cuts increased 65% and selection 15% over the same time period. One reason for this rapid increase in "selection" is that the FPA did influence many smaller landowners to start reporting their cutting activities, and smaller landowners are not as prone to clearcutting.

Landowners submitted 2,913 reports in 1990, 3,980 reports in 1991, and 4,314 reports in 1992. The increase in reporting made it appear that the percentage of selection was increasing and clearcuts decreasing much faster than may have been the actual case.

The term "selection," however, is unfortunate. Technically, very few of such cuts are actually selection cuts as defined by foresters, i.e., cuts that deliberately try to create stands that are high quality, well spaced, and have a desired distribution of many age classes. Most cuts reported as "selection" are what had previously been reported as either diameter-limit, or single-species cuts. These are more rules for removing trees than silvicultural methods for tending clearcutting.

The Spruce Budworm

One factor that led to reductions in clearcutting in the 1990s was the collapse of the spruce budworm outbreak in the mid 1980s. Much, but by no means all, of the clearcutting of spruce-fir stands was to salvage trees that were dead and dying. By 1990, the forest was starting to recover, and the excuse of "salvage" no longer made much sense.

Economics

Clearcutting for "economics" started making less sense as well. While clearcutting gives good payoffs in the short-term, managing what comes up after the clearcuts does not. Planting, thinning, and insecticide and herbicide spraying are expensive. Managers who require their companies to pay such expenses will not live long enough to see their returns.

On Crown Lands in New Brunswick, where such practices are standard, the province is losing millions of dollars a year because the annual expenses are greater than the annual stumpage revenues. Such practices are only viable on a large scale with subsidies.

Mechanization

One of the reasons landowners shifted to clearcutting (besides the bud­worm and short-term economics to pay off the costs of road building) was because of mechanization. Partly to avoid the growing costs of workers' compensation, companies started switching to mechanical harvesters which are both safer and employ fewer workers. Owners of these half-million dollar machines must cut enormous volumes of wood to pay back costs of purchase and repair. The easiest way to cut such huge volumes quickly is to tend clearcutting.

In the 1990s, some landowners discovered that it is possible to do partial cuts with feller harvesters and single­grip harvesters. Indeed, this mechanized partial cuts that consist in alternating clearswaths for the machines to drive on with wider swathes where a certain percentage of the trees are felled out, has become the standard cutting method in some parts of the state.

Leveraged Buy Out

In 1989, Great Northern Paper Company was the biggest clearcutter in the state. Some of their rolling clearcuts covered more than a township (36 square miles). The high level of clearcutting by Great Northern (and other companies as well) in the late 1980s may have been partly due to fears of corporate takeovers similar to the one that dismantled Diamond International. Sir James Goldsmith had determined that Diamond International was under­valued—the parts were worth more than the whole. Clearcutting was one way to make the land part of Great Northern worth less.

In 1990, Georgia-Pacific succeeded in buying out Great Northern anyway.

Continued on Page 12
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In 1991, the Great Northern Lands were sold to Bowater. Neither G-P nor Bowater cleared (or sprayed herbicides) to the degree that Great Northern had. This led to reductions in clearcuts for the state.

Timber Supply and the Economy

At the same time that the FPA went into effect, the economy went into recession with severe impacts on the paper industry. During the 1980s, the paper industry had built a global overcapacity. The combination of this overcapacity with an economic slump was serious. Many of the biggest industrial landowners have drastically reduced their level of cut and are purchasing more wood from other landowners. Since industrial landowners were the biggest clearcutters, this reduction of their cut has meant a reduction in clearcutting.

To compensate for the decline in spuce-fir as a source of pulpwood, paper mills have converted to use more hardwoods and hemlock in the pulpwood mix. From 1985 to 1991 and most of this change was within the last few years, the level of cut for spuce-fir pulp and logs declined by more than 700,000 cords. Paper mills are now using more hardwoods than softwoods. Since most clearcutting was focused on spruce-fir (hardwoods are usually cut by diameter-limit), this led to a major reduction in clearcutting.

Changing Consciousness

The public does not like clearcutting. This is no longer a local issue, it is an international issue, and landowners know it. The struggles over the clearcutting of old growth in the Pacific Northwest have had an impact on the cutting of second growth here. Satellite and aerial photos have exposed the scale of clearcutting that went on across this continent over the last decade. In just the last few years, the U.S. Forest Service has reduced clearcutting on national forests across the country.

Companies are trying to improve their images. They do not want an enraged public shutting down their operations. Although Maine's Forest Practices Act did not legislate a reduction in clearcutting, it sent a message to landowners that is what the public really wants.

Conclusion

The level of cut is determined by the market, not by the FPA. Maine's forest has been saved in the past by recessions and depressions, rather than regulations. As export markets increase, even local mill capacity is insufficient to prevent decline of the inventory. The limit then comes from increased prices for scarcer resources. As prices increase, marginal mills shut down. Demand goes to other regions with cheaper trees.

Survey

Continued from Page 10

dropped by 750,000 cords (a 35% reduction) since 1980.

Despite the crash of the spruce-fir pulpwood supply, the MFS offered some hope for the state's paper industry. The mills' wood supply problems can be mitigated through increased use of recycling, substitution of other species (such as hemlock and hardwoods), better utilization (use of smaller diameter wood, plus edging, sawdust, and shavings from the sawmill industry), and increases in intensive management.

There are problems with this strategy, however. Hardwoods and hemlock are already in decline. Because the spruce-fir sawmill industry is in decline, these edgings, and sawdust will go into decline. Intensive management now, even if it works as predicted (which is doubtful), will not produce marketable wood for decades.

Communities and Jobs: The paper industry is in a global recession. The industry in Maine built an overcapacity during the 1980s, and, as supplies start to shrink, it is starting to shut down the less efficient, less cost-effective machines (recent examples are Bowater and S.D. Warren, a division of Scott). These shut downs are a severe blow to timber dependent regions, even though they may make economic sense to the companies.

Each inventory, since 1959, has shown an increase in total wood cut. The increase in volume cut and manufactured has helped to offset job losses due to mechanization. This increase in cut can no longer be sustained. The impact of mechanization will be felt full force. Indeed, from 1984 to 1992, full-time wood jobs declined 40%. The impact of such job losses can be severe in remote rural towns with little economic diversity.

Technological Fixes: The timber industry has used its technologies to cut and use lower-diameter, poorer-quality wood rather than to improve the quality and health of residual stands. As spuce-fir declines, mills have used more hardwood and hemlock. As red maple and aspen increased, they have chopped more "junk" for biomass. The timber industry has thus used technology somewhat like the oil industry—to stretch out supplies and reach deeper deposits.

Market Fix: What is cut in Maine depends on international market forces. We currently have no policy to prevent increased market demand from resulting in a further decline in our forest. The level of cut is based on what the market, not the forest, will bear.

Maine's Media ignores Fate of Industrial Forest

The release of the new forest survey was a major story in itself. It was more than a year overdue. The Maine Forest Service held a highly press conference to release this statistical snapshot of Maine's most important resource. Only two reporters attended—two from the Bangor Daily News and one from the AP, showed up. The press was given ample warning prior to the press conference.

This lack of interest on the part of the Maine media speaks volumes about why the degradation of the woods can continue. If the inventory of the forest falls and nobody bears about it, does it make a sound?

The Maine Forest Service will be holding hearings on the inventory around the state in early 1994.
Why Restore the Wild Atlantic Salmon?

by George Wuerthner

New England’s rivers are the heart and arteries that thread the forested body of the land. The flash of a large fish in the depths of a pool quickens the pulse, whether one is a fisher or not. The loss of salmon in our rivers can be likened to the loss we might feel if we no longer heard the song of warblers in our forests. A deadly silence descends upon the land, and we are poorer for this loss.

On September 30, 1993, RESTORE: The North Woods, Biodiversity Legal Foundation, and Jeff Elliott filed a petition with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to list the wild Atlantic Salmon as an Endangered Species throughout its historic range in the United States. This petition represents several real biological, as well as philosophical, concerns.

The biological reality is that the salmon is truly endangered. Once hundred thousands of these fish jammed New England’s major rivers during spawning runs; today this silver hoard has dropped to an average of 4,000-7,000 fish across the entire region. Where once 134 Maine rivers supported salmon runs, only 13 do today.

In the few remaining runs, remnant fish populations are perilously close to extinction. Nearly all of the salmon returning to New England rivers today have been released from hatcheries. Recent genetic research on Pacific salmon has shown that individual drainages often have wild fish that are genetically adapted to that particular waterway; some water bodies host several genetic strains. Presumably Atlantic salmon once possessed similar diversity and adaptations to specific rivers. The tremendous biological loss caused by the extinction of many salmon runs cannot be mitigated by hatchery fish.

If the decline in fish stocks is unchecked, a threshold is reached where the likelihood of extinction caused by random events such as drought, a major flood, and Machias are at or below this critical level. This trend must be reversed. The loss of 200 adult fish is a significant loss of genetic diversity represents the greatest tragedy associated with the fish’s continued existence. According to some estimates, more than 50% of the river habitat is either unavailable or too degraded for salmon. Dams, for example, exact a major toll on fish. Upstream migrations are blocked or thwarted; the smolts migrating downstream must run the gauntlet of turbines that literally chop the fish to pieces. One study found that turbines on just one dam along the Connecticut River killed 27% of the downstream migrating smolts.

Water quality is another problem. New England is blessed with an abundance of fresh water. Unfortunately, perhaps as a result of this abundance, we have squandered this valuable resource, allowing our rivers to be degraded by logging practices, development, and agricultural and industrial pollution. Some recent studies suggest that pure, clean, fresh water may become the most valuable natural resource in the world, exceeding the present value of oil and other energy sources. Clean, high quality water is also necessary for salmon survival, hence restoration of salmon requires restoration of water quality.

Some argue that restoration of fish runs is occurring without listing under Continued on Page 30

Endangered Atlantic Salmon Tabloid Available

RESTORE: The North Woods recently published an excellent eight-page tabloid on the plight of the Endangered Atlantic Salmon. The tabloid contains articles on the life cycle of salmon, the impact of dams on salmon, an assessment of current (unsuccessful) efforts to restore salmon without inconveniencing dam operators, and a petition to US Fish & Wildlife Service to list wild Atlantic Salmon as endangered. This educational tool also tells you what you can do to help restore this magnificent fish. Please send $2.00 to RESTORE The North Woods P.O.B. 440 Concord, MA 01742
Professors Seymour & Hunter Respond to Forum Critique of Triad

Ed. Note: In the Winter Solstice 1992 issue of the Forum (vol. 1 #2) Mitch Lansky cited "New Forestry in Eastern Spruce-fir Forests: Principles and Applications to Maine" by Professors Robert Seymour and Malcolm Hunter of the University of Maine-Orono. In the Autumn Equinox 1993 issue of the Forum (vol. 2 #1) I reiterated some of Mitch's concerns in "Council Prompts Wrong 'Triad' System." Professors Seymour and Hunter have responded to this latter critique in their letter and my response to them.

Dear Jamie:

We were pleased to see in the Autumn Equinox issue of the Forum that the "triad" concept is serving its major function: providing a framework for discussion about how to allocate land to our different uses. We are writing to correct some misconceptions that appear in your critique of our model.

1. We have mentioned the 10-15% estimate suggested by the World Conservation Union (the international consortium of conservation groups formerly known as the IUCN). We do not know how much is enough; no one does; we're not even sure a "right" answer exists.

2. We do not know for certain that plantations are sustainable or that they will produce larger yields than the New Forestry systems that mimic natural disturbances over the long term. But models of sustainable agriculture give us some cause for optimism. There are many places in Europe and Asia where annual crops have been removed for millennia; surely we should be intelligent enough to sustain timber production that removes a crop only once every few decades. Incidentally, spruce plantations in Germany in which yields from second rotations were less than from first rotations are a frequently cited example of the phenomenon you fear, but in practice they are outnumbered by plantations in which second rotations outproduced first rotations, primarily because of more refined silvicultural practices.

3. We do not know of something that mimicking natural disturbance is not particularly relevant to plantations, any more than it is to potato fields, but it is fundamental to our vision of how most of our forests should be managed—the matrix in which reserves and plantations would be imbedded. These lands are critical to the goal of maintaining biodiversity as David Pablico emphasized in his article "Unmanaged Land is Necessary to Maintain Biodiversity" Autumn Equinox 1993, especially if they were to represent about 80% of our land base per the estimates calculated above. For some of these lands, those in which windstorms and budworm were major disturbance factors, irregular shelterwood cutting with permanent retention of some old trees offers a reasonable method for imitating natural disturbances.

5. You are right that it would not be easy to make a transition from where we are now to a future in which there are many more reserves and a few more plantations providing wood to compensate for the production we forgo in reserves. However, the fact that there are significant areas of forest which have been identified as non-strategic by their owners suggests there is some flexibility. Unfortunately, most of these non-strategic forests are on sites of marginal productivity (e.g. high altitudes, swamps, etc.) and to be truly representative of the array of ecological conditions some reserves on productive sites will be needed. These will be hard to obtain in the short-term except where access is limited.

6. The idea of net wood production remaining the same under a triad model—the fatal flaw in our idea you feel—is a simplifying assumption that we have made, realizing that environmentalists advocate reduction in demand and industrialists advocate increased production. It does not represent our personal preferences. We use it to make the triad easier to understand and to make it more likely that everyone will use the triad model as a framework for their discussion, rather than feeling that the model is stacked against their particular interests.

Sincerely yours,

Malcolm L. Hunter, Jr.
Libra Professor of Conservation Biology

Robert Seymour
Curtis Hutchins Professor of Silviculture

Forum Editor Replies

Dear Mac & Bob,

Thanks for your response to the latest forum critique of the Triad. I'll run your letter in the next issue along with a challenge to you and other readers to keep up the discussion on these and other points. I doubt you'll be surprised to find that I remain unwilling to accept Intensive Management (IM)—period. However, the model you propose represents a helpful step in the evolving discussion over forest policy.

Regarding your response to me:

#1. I especially appreciate your explicit acknowledgment that no one knows how much is enough. Our job now is to make sure that "too little" is not ridiculed as "too much."

#2. I wish I'd checked with you before writing the 30-40% figure. It seems to me that in a conversation with Mac in the past year and a half I've been quoted at some rough percentages, and the 30-40% figure is what I recall. However, I apologize if my memory invented that conversation. And, I am glad that you pointed out to me the importance of explaining how you would figure out a percentage for IM.

#3. What are the "more refined silvicultural practices" you refer to in the last sentence? Does this include herbicides?

#4. I see your point about plantations not mimicking natural disturbance regimes any more than potato fields do. I don't much like potato fields that dump tons of pesticides into soils and rivers. I think we have to produce our wood fiber from forests that are as natural as possible. This is another reason I dislike IM.

#5. Excellent point. One of our top priorities should be to begin identifying productive sites that can be incorporated into reserves. Mitch Lansky's concerns that we will have to wait 40 years (while the fruits of IM mature) and then buy recently cut over land for reserves remains unaddressed, and is, I think, pertinent to this point.

#6. Thank you for explaining the rationale behind your assumption. My fear is that this explanation gets lost in the shuffle, and the notion that industry will continue to harvest at existing levels gets the attention. It might be useful to do a couple of additional tests, perhaps involving an economist, in which we: (1) uncritically accept industry's unchecked demand projections for the next 50-100 years, and (2) we stringently reduce demand along the lines I've outlined (using recycling, elimination of wasteful end products, ending raw log exports, and promotion of much, much more value added processing within the region). In the first instance, there probably will be no room for reserves and significantly more than 8-10% of the forest will be under IM. In the second instance, I suspect that we could put 40-50% into reserves, refrain from IM and still provide a decent economy that meets the genuine needs of the local communities. I'm less worried about the needs of the corporate bean counters, the Wall Street gamblers, junk mail aficionados, and Monsanto.

In any case, I wish that you would be a bit more explicit about the possibility for different approaches, depending on whether or not we are a society opting for genuine recycling and secondary and tertiary processing locally, or if we instead choose by default to continue with our slowly way.

Sincerely,

Jamie Sayen

Allagash Clearcuts. Large clearcuts are the first step of intensive management. Plantations and herbicide spraying follow. Photo by Stephen Gorman
Clinton Plan Sacrifices Pacific Northwest Ancient Forest Ecosystems

by Jim Britell & Tim Hermach

[Ed. Note: The following comments on the Clinton Forest Plan—"Option 9"—were sent to Robert Jacobs, Interagency SEIS Team Leader (the "team") was composed of representatives from the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Land Management, US Fish & Wildlife Service, and university scientists], by Jim Britell, Conservation Chair of the Kalymposis Audubon Society, PO Box 1349, Prescott, AZ 86301, October 9, 1993. The Clinton admin­istered large portions of the remaining shreds of Ancient Forests on public lands (while failing to provide perma­nent protection for any of these lands) has successfully divided the environ­mental groups of the Pacific Northwest. Britell and Hermach have led the resis­tance to Option 9 and are currently suing the Clinton Administration to block its implementation. While these comments may appear quite technical because of this, the following Report of the Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team ("FEMAT Report") and the following chart shows a sum of federal lands, by extending protective reserves and changes in management to some private lands.

General Observations on the Plan
If one disregards Option 9, the Report of the Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team (FEMAT Report) itself is an excellent case for not cutting any federal lands. For a number of years the Native Forest Council has advocated the abolition of logging on public lands, a posi­tion usually referred to as the "zero cut" Option. While we have presented a number of economic arguments to support our position, we have never fully documented the ecological argument for this position. The FEMAT Report, while not disclosing the ecological effects on all species of a "no cut" alternative, does provide strong information to strongly suggest that our alternative may be the best approach to complying with existing National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and National Forest Management Act (NFMA) requirements regarding species protec­tion on public lands. We surmise this is true because, although the species viability ratings were not disclosed for this alternative, it is clear that the less logging and the more reserve, the higher the species viability ratings.

If one regresses the data in the Draft Supplemental Impact Statement (DSEIS), implied alternatives appear to the left of Option 1, which we would like described. Forest size increases and harvest level decreases as one moves down numerically though the alternatives—and the species viability increases. If one assumed that the reserve could increase to greater than the sum of federal lands by including private lands and that the harvest could become a minus number by buying back sales and restricting private land logging, then at some reserve size and harvest level we could, at least theoretically, provide for 95% species viability of some greatly increased number of species. We see no reason why these potential alternatives could not be dis­played. Moreover, we believe it is a clear requirement of present law to truly disclose a "no change" or "no action" alternative, and that the DSEIS is flawed by its absence.

The following chart shows a regression of the data to determine what Late Successional reserve size might insure a well distributed viability for all the 1100+ species analyzed in the FEMAT Report. A reserve of approxi­mately 13 million acres might provide well distributed populations for all species. This would required the matrix land in Option 1 to be added to the reserve in Option 1, and an additional 1.5 million acres of other (State or private) land to also be added.

Problems With The Plan
The Clinton Forest Plan is a wickedly political "attractive nuisance". While ostensibly a pre-decisional docu­ment in the form of a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS), the document actually presents as "science" a decision made months ago and much of the remaining Ancient Forest, roadless areas, and species in the Pacific Northwest must be sacrificed. To pack­age this decision as sound ecological science it presents data in a way that understimates the amount of Ancient Forest that will be placed at risk, underestimates the benefits of creating reserves, but overes­timates the benefits of logging. It arrays data so that it cannot be compared with previous reports, and assumes the suc­cess of major projects neither funded nor designed. The process records and meeting minutes are sealed or nonexis­tent, and the methodology received inadequate peer review. The Plan's technical and legal construction is so weak and species protection so poor it probably wouldn't survive a legal chal­lenge.

Option 9, the preferred option, trades protection of 60% of the remain­ing multiple-canopy Ancient Forest for clear cutting the other 40%. If imple­mented, it will rely on the logging of Ancient Forests for over half the timber volumes projected in the Plan into the indefinite future. The Plan tries to pre­sent the continued liquidation of the forests in the Pacific Northwest in the best possible light; nevertheless, the impact of the Plan's annual 1.2 billion board feet of logging is painfully obvi­ous. Logging abuses on the Northwest's forests are of such magnitude that even the timber industry, which according to the document itself is most restrictive of logging (scientists call this "the big green alternative"), is inadequate to pre­vent the viability of many species within the forests.

The effects of the preferred alterna­tive are not fully described because the location and magnitude of logging depends on future studies and processes not yet designed. Specifically, the amount and effects of thinning and sal­vage, and of the roads that will be built are not disclosed. Much of the logging will be done after watershed analyses, which according to the science data suggests is not even men­tioned in the report: except thinning for restoration and fire prevention, further logging in the Pacific Northwest is highly controversial, and more than 50% of board feet more of timber cannot be cut in the Pacific Northwest National Forests unless a number of environmen­tal laws are repealed.

Despite 1800 pages we still have no answer to the basic question that should have been asked: what is the maximum amount of species protection that is yet possible on federal lands? The com­pletion of the document suggests is not even men­tioned in the report: except thinning for restoration and fire prevention, further logging in the Pacific Northwest is highly controversial, and more than 50% of board feet more of timber cannot be cut in the Pacific Northwest National Forests unless a number of environmen­tal laws are repealed.

As a practical matter, this report may be consigned to the dumpster by a current timber industry lawsuit. The briefs and affirmations that suit allegation widespread illegal administrative procedures by the DSEIS and FEMAT teams. Lawyers familiar with the suit say the timber industry case is strong.

The fast track this DSEIS is on guarantees that the public comment period is a sham. A report of a meeting of Forest Service supervisors on 9/1/93 says that the Final SEIS will be filed with the EPA on 11/9/93. How can the team possibly assimilate and weigh the comments that arrive during the legal comment period when the schedule it follows requires that final decisions are made before the comment period ends on 12/9/93? The response of the inter­agency DSEIS team to phone calls asking that the comment period, which began 7/26/93, be extended because so many people received the SEIS late or not at all was that the Final Record Of Decision must be ready for Judge Dwyer by 12/21/93. It is just one of the plan's many ironies that the interagency DSEIS team顺应 and break NEPA rules to get the document to Judge Dwyer; yet the reason
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The whole issue of adherence to NEPA involves the question of species viability, yet DSEIS reviewers have no access to process records or minutes of deliberations, and so cannot know the identity of species viability rates. Since the scientists individual species ratings are not given, only averages of panels are provided, reviewers do not know the ranges of viability ratings for individual species. Displaying averages leads to some very misleading and overconfident predictions. For example, we are told that the 80% viability rating for spotted owls was an average of four scientists’ opinions. One of the raters was an industry scientist who ranked Option 9’s ability to protect Northern Spotted Owls at 100%. Two other scientists gave estimates of only 60%. So 80% is just an average of widely divergent numbers. If the divergence in ratings is widespread, this would indicate that the model and methodology are probably flawed and should not be considered as accurate.

No credible peer review of the document was done. One scientist said that the FEMAT research methodology was too poor to be published in a scientific journal. Usually in a scientific process the results and methodology are sent to an independent scientific body or journal who then chooses the scientists who will do the peer review. While the authors can suggest the peer reviewers, they don’t actually select them. The peer reviewers, gave them little or no time to comment, and won’t release their comments. This is not a new phenomenon.

The Nrmthern Forest Service and BLM have historically refused to subject the models, methodology and conclusion of their scientific studies to bona fide peer review. It is unlikely the scientific community will ever formally object to this since logging, directly or indirectly, funds much of the “research and science” at state, federal and university level.

While the many process violations of this report are disturbing, it is the substance that is truly appalling. One thing that jumps out of the report is the several thousand viability ratings that show Option 1 protects every species better than Option 9; but, when the writers rank all the Options together, miraculously, Option 9 does better than Option 1 in terms of the entire ecosystem. How can this be? Is Option 9 a neutron bomb that destroys species without harming the ecosystem?

The key to understanding this plan is to tease out the underlying drivers behind the viability ratings that implicitly or explicitly treat Option 9’s high logging levels as a plus for the ecosystem and Option 1’s inviolate reserves as bad for the ecosystem. (Option 1 produces the lowest timber volume available for continued cutting and the largest reserves. It is similar to Option 14C in the Gang of Four report, but with better stream buffers.)

One alleged plus for Option 9 was to posit that the forest is so damaged silvicultural restoration is necessary to restore its function. Since the biggest reserves are in Option 1, and they are assumed to be closed to “restoration”, this means that even thinning plantations to protect against fire is not possible in Option 1. On the other hand, Option 9 allows “restoration” activities in reserves.

Another imagined plus, only in Option 9, is Adaptive Management Areas (AMA’s). Now, though AMA’s might arrive as quickly as merely turning forests over to the same locals that caused the problems in the first place; the scientists who did the research assumed they could somehow trade reduced protection on federal lands in AMA’s for increased protections on adjacent private lands. Clearly, the FEMAT Management Areas represent the triumph of hope over experience. The Appetlague Project, which served as a model for this idea, is still in its honeymoon stage, and hasn’t proved anything except that injunctions make the industry sit down and talk. A better model would have been any of the unsuccessful experiments like the Illinois River Basin or the Shasta Costa Roadless Area, or any of the several other community planning efforts that have come to impasse and failure. This sham public participation in this DSEIS/FEMAT process is probably a harbinger of what can be expected in the AMA public participation process.

Another assumed plus for Option 9 is the assumption that long term ecosystem health is contingent on forest ecologist’s logging experiments! They appear unaccredited in advance the fewish edge scientists expect to gain about ecosystems from AMA’s and incorporated this dubious rationale into the rating scheme. In numerous places in the plan they admit they have very little knowledge edge about old growth ecosystems and it will be a long time before they acquire it. How many trees will be left standing by the time they acquire this knowledge?

Finally, the ratings assumed that large amounts of money would be coming for restoration and AMA’s, and that these experiments would succeed. These speculations were then used to offset the problems Option 9’s high logging levels might cause. From a process point of view the report should clearly explain the effect that future funding assumptions had on the ratings. If expected ecosystem funding was delayed or reduced, the numbers in the report will be wrong. Also, if the “experiments” fail the numbers will be off. Viability ratings should not be inflated up by assuming funding not yet allocations, studies not yet designed, and oversight by agencies not yet reform.

Further problems include the disturbing reports that Option 1 reserves were deliberately and sloppily drawn to increase the amount of old growth available for logging. Also, Option 9’s rankings and ratings were allegedly done at different times and by different people than the other Options.

In the past they had claimed such enormous real or imagined benefits for thinning in reserves, silvicultural restoration and AMA’s, the proper, logical, and legal actions for the scientists who drafted Option 9 would have been to create a new alternative for comparative purposes. That alternative should have presents each of these species would fare if all logging of National Forest was stopped, except to convert plantations and fire suppressed stands back to their natural uneven aged condition. This other alternative could have displayed the effects of no logging at all in National Forests. This would have been a more appropriate, not to mention legal, way to satisfy the NEPA require notice that a “no action” alternative be considered in writing EIS’s. As it is, the “no action” alternative in the DSEIS (Option 7) assumes implementing existing Forest Plans. This is an oxymoron if there ever was one since the report’s analysis assumes the projects are doing nothing for species and doesn’t mention NFMA, or NEPA. How could this constitute the alternative that shows the decision maker what the results of “no action” would be?

A Distressing Development

The FEMAT team leaders have said repeatedly that all species cannot be saved. What have they been wearing when they say this: scientist? politician? acting chief of the Forest Service? What assumptions lie behind this? A danger is that is to their fellow citizens to at least lay out an alternative that shows what is possible on public and private lands.

Finally the FEMAT report displays public opinion polls showing that the American public and the citizens of the Pacific Northwest clearly want strong protection for federal forests. The issue is not whether all species can be saved or that some species depend on public land over which the Forest Service has no control: the issue is how much protection? It can be found for species that depend on federal land.

Confusion has arisen about how many species are evaluated in the DSEIS, and how they fare under Options 1 and 9. Some have said that 1000 species were rated and 100 were put at risk from Option 9. Actually, many thousands of species were rated and Option 9 creates problems for many hundreds of them. Confusion arises because, in the long lists of species, some individual entries are really groups of species. For example, Lichens: table IV-18 rates only 16 Lichens, but these represent 125 different species. Fungi: table IV-17 rates 48 Fungi, but this represents almost 600 individual species. An overall assessment of the Clinton Plan’s effect on species needs to be done.

We can tell from even a cursory review that there is no question that Option 9 is much worse than the Ancient Forest dependent species than Option 1. For example, 46 species of Lichens, which show over a 50% chance of surviving in a well distributed unit under Option 1, have less than a 50% chance under Option 9. 62 species of Fungi have a better than 50% average of surviving well distributed under Option 1, but less than 50% under Option 9. 71 species of Mollusks drop from better than 50% under Option 9, 62 species of Fungi have a better than 50% average of surviving well distributed under Option 1, but less than 50% under Option 9. 71 species of Mollusks drop from better than 50% under Option 7, 62 species of Fungi have a better than 50% average of surviving well distributed under Option 1, but less than 50% under Option 9. Not many species that scientists call “low life” are affected, most fish ratings drop from 80% under Option 1 to 65% under Option 9. The specific question is whether it is possible to save all species, but why can’t we try to save the ones we still have?
The answer appears to be that the Forest Service views forests as merely an agricultural commodity, the extraction of which is hindered by inconvenient rules on endangered species. The Forest Service receives the bulk of its money for administering programs, everything from restoring fish runs to planning for future cutting trees—they know it and so does everyone else. Some may assert that there’s much we don’t know about these forests and that if scientists can’t do logging experiments the ecosystem is put at mortal risk, but we now know enough to know that deforestation is bad for many species. The real threat to our forests is that our leading scientists still refuse to say so.

How Did The Clinton Forest Plan Go Off Track?

The problems with this DSEIS began at the forest summit when historian Kimball MacColl was asked by the White House to tone down his prepared opening remarks because they were too critical of the timber industry. If the summit had been a real hearing that followed the rules of evidence, the anguished and heartbreak ing testimony about mill closures would have been followed by cross-examination. We would have learned the real reasons the mills closed; e.g., that the mill in Arcata was replaced by one in Chile.

That Dillard, Oregon, where the heartbreak ing pictures of a displaced timber family were taken, is a town dominated by Roseburg Forest Products, a company that exports wood chips to Japan.

The Mayor of Hoquiam, Washington said the largest mill in her town closed because of injunctions over federal tim berland by a local government reported by the largest mill in her town closed because of injunctions over federal timberland by a local government.

That Pacific Lumber and Shipping, whose representative Mr. Spence was very impressed by the need to resume federal log sales in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest where his company is a major buyer, is a major exporter of timber.

The DSEIS is the preferred Alternative. The Forest Plan is a program of economic development to ease the transition of rural communities impacted by the so called “timber crisis.” The intent is to fast track the awarding of hundreds of millions of dollars to rural counties and communities in the Pacific Northwest.

Rural development means condo’s, docks, RV parks, dams, gas lines, water mains, paid staff for the chamber of commerce. It is a template for the destruction of complex procedural pres criptions that require careful monitoring, clear evidence that the agencies are institutionally incapable of managing themselves. The volume mills claim they need to avoid shutdown can be found on the Pacific Northwest export docks, where the equivalent of 9 billion board feet of logs, chips and pulp is exported yearly.

11. The Clinton Forest Plan is not science. It is a template for the destruction of most of the Pacific Northwest’s remaining native forests — and will demoralize forest activists around the world.

A Final Note

The political process must reflect balance, as must a person or an ecosystem, but that does not mean that every part of the system must itself be in balance or take a balanced position. It is the overall system that must have balance. If you put a big fat person in the middle, then you will not create balance if you sit in the middle. You must sit far out at the other end. Powerful forces want it all, and are getting it.

Footnotes

1 The DSEIS includes the Forest Ecosystem Management, Ad Ecological, Economic and Social Assessment; the Report of the Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team (FEMAT Report); Option 9 of the DSEIS is the preferred Alternative.

2 The DSEIS classifies as late successional forest trees 21 inches in diameter and up. The amount of multi-story late successional forest is shown in table IV-10 as 4.5 million acres, and the report says that 20% of this is in the eastern (area for logging). But what activities took place on Ancient Forest—30-40 and larger multi-story canopy—certainly only 2.5 million acres. The real question is what percent of that is in the matrix? Data currently being compiled will probably show 20-40% of the true Ancient Forest is in the matrix. Another reason for the 20-40% discrepancy is that the grid used to calculate the percent of late successional forest were 40 acres in size and thus may have overlooked smaller stands and left them in the matrix. In any case, the estimates in the DSEIS are clearly labeled “estimate.”

3 The Plan’s 95% success figures as of 10 years hence were developed by the scientists who made the Plan’s 10 year old debate about what data to use in calculating success figures. These figures were developed for this Plan and are the best estimate that is 20-40% of the remaining Ancient Forest is at risk under this plan.

Continued on Page 18
As a native Oregonian now ensconced in the relative security of the Adirondack Park, I have read the last seven numbers of the Forum with growing trepidation and a sense that old growth forests are poised for another spasm of destruction. For a few years now, I have seen the growing number of forest consultants, the growing failure to recognize the biological and social values of old growth forests, and the growing approval of a coherent ethic of healing—and just as I have read the seven numbers of the Forum, so have I read the seven numbers of the Native Forest Council and Conservation Foundation (two organizations, respectively) with growing dismay at the story of escalating conflict and unabated attrition in the mountains of my youth. But I am only by growing sense of irony that however different the cultures and ecologies of the two regions may appear to be, the northern forests of New Hampshire, Maine, Vermont and New York and those of the Cascades and Rockies only occupy two different periods of the same old historical cycle: after and before the obvious end of unsustainable resource exploitation.

The circumstances "after" include forests so decimated and watersheds so damaged that it is not clear how one can even remotely imagine the "before". For then the forests and the watersheds were so impoverished after the capital and jobs have moved elsewhere that no sane person could deny that serious wrong has been done and that the wrong must change. Whereas these are the circumstances that enable the Forum to plausibly argue that "the environmental community and the timber industry work together not only for sustainable natural and human communities in the northern forests?" there is simply too much valuable, unprotected old growth timber remaining in the West (at least 3% of the pre-settlement stands) for industry's appetite to diminish, and the only way to protect any of it is to resort to administrative or litigation litigation. And this litigation must be waged against not just the industry itself, but against the Federal Government that is its staunch ally because the last fragments of merchantable old growth remain on National lands as publically-owned timber that has long been sold below cost by the Forest Service and BLM to enrich private interests (and by the way to sustain local economies...for as long as trees remain to be cut, that is.) Even the option of litigation to remain abreast of the Clinton Administration and Congress threaten "sufficiency legislation" to suspend the "integrated management" of the Clinton-preferred Option 9 calls only for "reserves" that will be open to sal­vaging and thinning. Under this plan, the eastern forests, more intensive cutting on the already-decimated "matrix" lands between the so-called "reserves," no prohibition on clearcutting in roadless watersheds or on ban on raw log exports, and relaxed restrictions on cut­ting private lands. Those who are will­fully ignorant of the past are indeed condemned to repeat its errors. The Northwest has much to learn from the history of the Northeast. I imagine that if the citizens of Roseburg, Oregon could trade places for six months with folks in Rumford Maine they might realize their own future and shape it to their children's benefit. But life is just not that wonderful. People only seem able—as enough New Yorkers did in the Adirondacks of the 1890s—to see the future in the present savaged landscape, and if they are students of human nature then they pro­scribe by constitutional covenant the commercial exploitation of some public lands.

Because my cynicism only seems confirmed as I learn to wear the bottom of my trousers rolled, I do not believe that biological integrity can be ade­quately protected by conservation easements or by existing-use zoning or even by full-flee public acquisition alone. History shows that they can be too readily subverted by the predictable aversion of special interest-driven legislation and too readily endorsed by a citizenry who have relinquished the control over their own destiny that is their birthright. I do believe, however, that the travails of both human and non-human citizens are tragically intertwined and my intuition tells me that the ways in which we treat the land are historically intertwined with the ways in which we treat one another by class, race, gender, and even age as communities, as families, and as neighbors.

Stay Informed
Two first-rate publications are essential reading to remain abreast of the unfolding tragedy in the Pacific Northwest:

Forest Voice
Native Forest Council
POB 2177
Eugene, OR 97402
Membership: $25/year

Wild Forest Review
Save the West, Inc.
3758 SE Milwaukee
Portland, OR 97202
$25/year (11 issues)

Olympic National Forest, Hood Canal Ranger District. Photo by Elizabeth Feryl
Old Growth in the East: A Survey

Mary Byrd Davis

Foreword by Robert T. Leverett

It is common knowledge that we have cut down over 99.9 percent of the old growth of the Northern Appalachians (compared with Brazil's cutting of perhaps 30 percent of its rain forests). What is not common knowledge is that there remain pockets of old growth scattered throughout the region that range in size from an acre to 5,000 and even one 30,000-acre tract in the Adirondacks.

In Old Growth in the East: A Survey, Mary Byrd Davis has performed heroic service by assembling the most exhaustive and detailed descriptions of all known old growth stands east of the Rockies. This extraordinary work is the product of a dedicated detective, and if it is already somewhat out of date, that is only because old growth sleuths such as Mary Davis and Robert T. Leverett have already uncovered additional old growth stands since this book was published in August 1993.

Leverett's excellent Foreword, "Eastern Old Growth: A New Perspective," traces the demise of the original eastern forest, discusses how much old growth remains and the thorny issue of defining old growth. He describes some old growth characteristics such as: old trees, dense canopy and understory, undisturbed soil, representative species distribution, and absence of human intervention. He then describes how an old growth sleuth can recognize old growth and discover additional tracts. He concludes with an assessment of the value of eastern old growth.

The remainder of the book is the survey of old growth region by region and state by state. Each state receives an introductory section, followed by descriptions of every known stand of old growth. Davis provides extensive scientific documentation along the way.

If you have any interest in Eastern old growth, this book is a must. With proper study, you can discover additional old growth stands for the second edition.

Old Growth in the East: A Survey is available for $20 (postpaid) from the publisher: Wild Earth, POB 455, Richmond, VT 05477.

Below, we offer selections from five Northern Appalachian states.

—Jamie Sayen

Maine

Big Reed Forest Preserve

North-central Maine (Piscataquis County)

Some 5,000 acres acquired by The Nature Conservancy in two transactions. The Conservancy's Keil Rockwell says that "most of the acreage is old growth. The 5,000 acres, which surround Big Reed Pond, constitute a natural mixed mosaic of the forest types in Maine, including spruce-fir, northern hardwoods, cedar swamps, and rich woods. In the whole range in one area, the site is unique, according to Lisa Widdow, who helped the Conservancy make its purchase. She feels that Big Reed Pond is "definitely the largest," mid- to low-elevation old growth in the state, and that it is probably virgin (1990). Cogbill reports that the "area has a documented history showing only spotty removal of scattered pine and cedar 110 to 70 years ago."

"The nature of the original landscape" in the Northeast "can perhaps best be seen" at the Preserve, according to Cogbill. The forest is approximately 45% softwoods, 25% hardwoods, 25% mixed woods, and 5% cedar swamps. Spruce and Sugar Maple are dominants. The area has suffered major disturbances, including a widespread fire in 1816, insect infestation in 1805-10 and 1916-21, a hurricane in 1815, and more recent blowdowns. Thus the forest illustrates that "northern forests were always extensively disturbed" (Cogbill 1995b).

During the last five years, the land around Big Reed Preserve has been logged by the company that owns it. According to Cogbill, whether or not any old growth was cut is unclear (1993a).

Massachusetts

Cold River Watershed

(Berkshire County)

-West of Black Brook. Between 150 and 200 acres of outstanding old growth dominated by Eastern Hemlock, Red Spruce, and northern hardwoods in Savoy Mountain State Forest. Trees that have become old and large include Eastern Hemlock, Red Spruce, White Ash, Yellow Birch, Sugar Maple, and Red Maple. Hemlocks date to 400 years. In addition to the primary acreage, the area offers at least another 200 acres of secondary old growth.

Marginal old growth exceeds 500 acres.

-East of Black Brook. Between 30 and 50 acres of Eastern Hemlock and northern hardwoods in Mohawk Trail State Forest. The old growth runs in an irregularly shaped band below the summit of the ridge. Red Spruce is present as a minor component. Like Cold River West, this tract contains large old trees. The area has excellent examples of old-growth Sweet Birch. Secondary old growth adds another 50 to 75 acres. Marginal old growth has not been determined.

New York

Five Ponds Wilderness, west-central Adirondacks

-Southern Five Ponds Wilderness (Herkimer and Hamilton Counties). The largest known contiguous tract of unlogged forest in the Northeast. Acreage figures differ. For example, George Davis describes as old growth the Red Pond of this Wilderness: 47,326 acres in Herkimer County; J. Roman describes 20,000 hectares or 49,421 acres in Herkimer and Hamilton Counties; and quotes the Commissioners of Fisheries, Game, and Forest writing in 1896 of a purchase of 50,125 acres (1980).

Roman, who studied the area for a 1980 doctoral dissertation, described four forest communities: poor fen, rich fen, upland conifer, and upland mixed. In the poor fens are Black Spruce, Red Spruce, Tamarack, and Balsam Fir. Red Spruce and Balsam Fir are almost the only trees in the rich fens. Upland conifer stands are dominated by White Pine, "some of which is huge and form a super-canopy." (Pine Ridge, south of High Falls, and Five Ponds and Cranberry eskers are outstanding for their pines.) Among the upland mixed communities are beechn-maple mesic, hemlock-northern hardwood, and spruce-northern hardwood forests. Fire and storms have disturbed the area as have outbreaks of spruce budworm and beech scale.

The state bought the Webb Tract to settle a claim for damages brought by a land owner who charged that construction of a dam on the Beaver River had prevented his shipping and therefore selling the timber on his land. Later the Adirondack Park Agency combined the tract with 12,000 acres in St. Lawrence County to form Five Ponds Wilderness Area (Leopold et al. 1988, Roman 1980, Jamieson 1993).

Vermont

Green Mountain National Forest

-The Cape, also known as Lookoff Mountain, eastern Vermont (Rutland County). A 285-acre proposed Research Natural Area with old-growth, rich northern hardwoods forest. The location is a ridge top and a steep slope that faces west. On the ridge top the dominant species are American Beech, Sugar Maple, and Yellow Birch. Red Spruce and Yellow Birch dominate the upper slopes; Sugar Maple, the middle and lower slopes. The last are covered with deep soils and wildflowers.

-White Rocks, eastern Vermont (Rutland County)

Approximately 270 acres of Red Spruce on steep slopes. Trees are up to 25 inches in diameter, though most are 6 to 11 inches in diameter. Ages range from 145 to 155 years. Significant Eastern White Pines of the Appalachian Trail Corridor describes the site as old-growth (Nongame 1991), but the Vermont Natural Heritage Program says additional research is needed to determine the site's status (Marshall 1993).
Sears Island Woodchip Port Will Degrade Forest & Marine Ecosystems

by Ron Huber

International wood traders have big plans for Maine; they hope to move into large scale hardwood woodchip exporting by local communities and environmental activists can organize to stop them.

Transportation and international trade interests, combined with the wood product industry, have been having an extraordinary impact on hardwood ecosystems in the southeastern United States. Now they are promoting the export of hardwood chips from a wide swath of Maine. With large amounts of untreated softwood logs already going overseas or simply crossing the border into Quebec, exports of chipped beech, birch, maple, oak, and other hardwoods will dramatically increase stresses upon the economy and ecosystems of the Northern Forest.

The new plan calls for the creation of chippermills to liquidate hardwoods in two zones in Maine: a 40 mile swath along the Bangor & Aroostook Railroad, from Fort Kent south to Millinocket, and, south of Millinocket, the area within the roughly 75 mile radius of Sears Island, with Jay and Cherryfield representing western and eastern limits respectively.

Woodchips from the Fort Kent to Millinocket corridor would be transported via rail; those in the Jay to Cherryfield zone would travel by truck. Their common destination would be the proposed cargoport on Sears Island, at the head of Penobscot Bay, where they would be offloaded into cargo ships for transport to Europe and Asia.

In the southeastern United States the international traders have found that obtaining access to American hardwoods is easy. The exporters simply offer bids to private woodlot owners, the siren song of quick money for "junk" hardwoods has fallen upon willing ears across the southeastern states of Alabama and Georgia.

But as foresters and local economies are painfully discovering in the south, this sort of operation quickly denudes the surrounding region of both mature and younger hardwood forests leaving local sawmills, furniture and pallet makers, and other "value-added" businesses largely out of a resource base.

In an editorial entitled "Scoring past chipmill propaganda", The Chattanooga Times/Tennessean, a major Tennessee daily warned: "Chipmill operations recently proposed for Tennessee would destroy the forests that protect the region's river watershed from silting and pollution, that cleanse the air of pollution, that provide scenic beauty, recreation and hunting, that draw tourists, that provide hundreds of jobs, that give this region its essential character."

"All this would vanish for just a handful of mill jobs on the river for a product that would be largely sent overseas, not to value-added manufacturing jobs in the United States. The woodchips would supply high tech plants abroad; the Tennessee Valley's resources used to produce higher quality goods to sell back to the U.S. market."

It is likely the same enticements of quick money for "junk hardwood" will be offered here for the wholesale removal of what the Maine Forest Products Council calls "underutilized" hardwood species.

Almost all of the hardwood forests of Maine are held by timber giants such as Bowater, which told the Maineport Council ("wise use" group for the project), "We increased our production in Maine and as a company we have an aggressive goal for export. These circumstances offer considerable opportunity for Searsport.

These companies have historically used hardwoods as a problem more than a resource, using herbicides and burning as management tools.

The proposed international market for woodchips means that by the end of the decade, 600,000 TONS of chipped Northern Forest hardwoods could pour onto Sears Island annually by truck and train, three times the volume of cargo ships to the markets of Europe and Asia.

This could require the filling of up to 62,000 acres per year, according to TAGIER, a southeast organization that opposes the siting of chip mills in Tennessee, Alabama and Georgia.

Supporters of the woodchip export proposal include Maine Governor John McKernan, the Maine Department of Transportation, the Bangor-Aroostook Railroad, the Bangor Investment Corp. (an arm of the Amecsetag Corp., makers of Cannon towels) and the Maine Forest Products Council.

The Maine Dept. of Transportation (MDOT), eager for a new port and increased railroad and highway construction, is the state's lead agency for the project.

A Maine government source says the state's natural resource agencies, the Department of Environmental Protection and the Department of Marine Resources, have been muzzled by the governor. No employee of these agencies may make any public statements concerning the project without the governor's explicit permission.

Interestingly, rather than coming from forest conservation advocates, opposition to the proposed woodchipping of Maine has come from groups and agencies concerned about the negative effects the cargoport would have on marine and estuarine fish and shellfish in Penobscot Bay.

Regional officials of the EPA Army Corps of Engineers, National Marine Fisheries Service and US Fish and Wildlife Service are on record as staunchly opposed to the creation of the Sears Island port.

EPA: "The aquatic impacts associated with MDOT's two preferred "minimum impact" alternatives are severe, and either alternative would cause or contribute to significant degradation of waters of the United States in violation of Section 230.10 (c) of the guidelines."

Army Corps of Engineers: "The resources on Sears Island are of exceptional value and the potential impacts of the project are considerable. It is questionable whether functional replacement (of wetlands) in this case, is practical or even possible."

National Marine Fisheries Service: "Both of the designs proposed by the Maine Dept. of Transportation would require extensive dredging and filling of valuable wetlands, including eelgrass meadows, shellfish beds and shallow subtidal flats."

"The values of these habitats as foraging, nursery or rearing areas for marine species have been documented in great detail over the past two years."

"In our judgment, the marine impacts of the project alone justify a finding that the project would cause "significant degradation" and is thus ineligible for a Section 404 permit."

US Fish & Wildlife Service: "The potential adverse impacts to wildlife resources and their habitats associated with the Sears Island project are extremely serious...after 12 years of studying the environmental impacts associated with this project, we believe the time has come to be forthright with the MDOT and advise them that these impacts are unacceptable and violate the Clean Water Act Section 404 (b) (1) guidelines."

The agencies' concerns appear to be well founded. A Department of Marine Resources study in the early 1980s revealed that Penobscot Bay contains important spawning and nursery areas for the zooplankton, fish and shellfish of the Gulf of Maine. The fertile area at the head of Penobscot Bay in the vicinity of Sears Island contains a wide variety of marine habitats. Clam flats and submerged eelgrass beds may be found alongside deep (to 400') waters.

More than three dozen marine species, including copepods, shrimp, cod, haddock, minnows, mackerel, squid, smelt and herring, use the waters of this area to spawn and/or nurture their fry and juveniles.

Sears Island is itself free of human habitation or structures except for a partly paved road that runs through part of its northernwestern quarter, a short stone jetty on the western side of the island and a transmission tower on its southern end. Sproat and fir forest covers most of the island's 946 acres, with the rest a mosaic of hardwoods and wetlands. Vernal pools, streams, and freshwater wetlands are found throughout the island's forest, within which a host of migratory songbirds take up residence at varying times of the year.

For more than ten years, the Sierra Club has been throwing legal roadblocks in front of the project, to protect the island and Penobscot Bay. The Sierra Club applauds Army Corps of Engineers permits granted to the Maine Dept. of Transportation and successfully pressed for an EIS; and it uncovered major flaws in the commissioned EIS that nearly led to the disbarment of Normandeau Associates, the state's consultant that prepared it.

The EPA sought a grand jury investi-
tigation in 1992 into the possibility that the MDOT and its consultants had deliberately covered up the presence of wetlands on Sears Island to get the necessary permits. The investigation was "throttled,"10 by then-U.S. Attorney Richard Cohen after Senator William Cohen's and Rep. Olympia Snow's offices complained about delays in the project. The statute of limitations to prosecute ran out in December 1992.

The Natural Resources Council of Maine, on the other hand, has been conspicuously silent. The group "has no position" on Sears Island port proposal, according to NRCM's communications director, who said her personal impression was that local citizens were in favor of the project.11

The Maine DOT is presently finalizing a Supplemental EIS to determine the impact the proposed port would have on more than two hundred acres of wetlands on the island.

Governor McKernan wrote the Corps in September saying that damage to the island and its surrounding waters would be an acceptable price to pay for the facility, provided that port development be followed by "mitigation."12 But officials of the aforementioned resource agencies point out that there has never been a successfully created artificial wetland, sea grass bed, or clam flat in New England. Not one.

The Corps of Engineers, the lead agency, is itself showing little enthusiasm for the project. Moreover the EPA has VETO authority over the Corps' decision in this case and Doug Thompson, New England regional director of the EPA, has been giving this project a big THUMBS DOWN.

Sensing the possibility of defeat, proponents of the port have begun to lash out against what they call "an EPA Boston Region One office run amok." Stet Hills, Chairman of the Maineport Council, said of the regional EPA staff: "Reasonableness and fairness no longer exist and these staff should be removed."13

Frustrated woodchipping proponents have also been trying to go over the heads of regional EPA officials. In June, Governor McKernan wrote to EPA Administrator Carol Browner asking for "a fair and impartial evaluation of the new Sears Island Alternatives."14

In late September, Senators George Mitchell and William Cohen of Maine hosted a meeting in Washington DC in which proponents of the woodchip port met with headquarters staff of the EPA and the Corps of Engineers.15 The woodchip proponents appear to hope that political pressures can force an override of the regional agencies' recommendations.

In November 1993 the Coastal Waters Project petitioned the New England Fishery Management Council to comment on the SEIS and make recommendations to the Army Corps of Engineers as to the project's potential impact on cod, flounder and other species under Fishery Management Council jurisdiction.

According to the Maineport Council the current project schedule is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/30/93</td>
<td>Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) circulated to federal agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/93</td>
<td>Section 404 permit application filed with Army Corps of Engineers by MDOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/93</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration ruling on DSEIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/94</td>
<td>Public hearing on DSEIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/94</td>
<td>DSEIS comment period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/94</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration ruling on Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/94</td>
<td>FES comment period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/94</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration Record of Decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/20/94</td>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers Record of Decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT YOU CAN DO:**

*Write the Federal Highway Administration (Address below) to get on the notification list for the availability of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and to be notified when public hearings on the SEIS will be held. Testify!*

The Corps of Engineers will also issue a Public Notice soliciting comments on the project since a Corps permit is required. To receive a copy of the Corps' notice, contact William Lawless at the Corps address below.

*Write Letters to: editors, the EPA, the Corps of Engineers, the National Marine Fisheries Service, USFWS, Senators George Mitchell & Bill Cohen, Reps. Olympia Snowe & Tom Andrews.*

**Urge the Natural Resources Council of Maine to be more active in the fight to protect Sears Island. Up to now the Maine chapter of the Sierra Club has been the only consistent voice of public opposition to the project. The NRCM has the resources and contacts to mobilize public opinion against the project should it decide to do so. Contact NRCM at 271 State St., Augusta, ME 04330 (1-800-287-2345).**

*For more information on how to stop the Sears Island Cargoport, contact:*

**Coastal Waters Project**

POB 1811

Rockland, ME 04841

207 596-7993.

Ken Cline

Sierra Club of Maine

207 288-3381

**Addresses**

Federal Highway Administration

Edmund Muskie Federal Building

Rm 614

40 Western Ave.

Augusta ME 04330

William Lawless

Chief Regulatory Division

US Army Corps of Engineers

424 Trapelo Road

Waltham MA 02254

Senator George Mitchell/William Cohen

US Senate

Washington DC 20510

Rep. Tom Andrews/Olympia Snowe

US House of Representatives

Washington DC 20515

The following regional offices of these agencies oppose the cargoport. Drop them a line. Express support for protection of Sears Island and its terrestrial and marine inhabitants:

Paul Kongh, Acting Regional Administrator

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

J.E. Kennedy Federal Building

Boston, MA 02203

Richard Roe, regional director

National Marine Fisheries Service

One Blackburn Drive

Gloucester, MA 01930

Ronald Lambertson

US Fish and Wildlife Service

300 Westgate Center Drive

Hadhley, MA 01033-9589
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is There Hope for Business?

Democracy, Ecology & Growth-At-Any-Cost Economics

by Andrew Whittaker

The people of the Northern Forest face the choice of dedicating resources to either fueling further economic growth along conventional lines of production or developing economies that respect natural inherent limits to growth. It is apparent that our continental and global policies are wedded to a path that in this region might mean, for instance, for the forest that exports hard-wood chips. It is also evident that proponents and practitioners of local economics continue to struggle with the hurdles and challenges of an approach still in its problematic infancy. In his Inquiry Into the Human Prospect, first published in the early 1970s, the economist Robert Heilbroner posed the question: Is there hope for man? For Heilbroner, the most of doubt and loss of faith inspiring the question pointed to the central issue of whether humanity was in fact capable of dealing with the environmental limits to economic growth: both the explosive growth of human numbers and steady depletion of natural resources. Behind the con­ pounding threats of "obliviterative weapons," the "civi­ lizational malaise" of material culture—capitalistic as well as socialistic, and the triumph over spirit of the scientific-technologic, Heilbroner saw our challenge to survival as, in essence, an environmental problem.

Champions of local economies may be disturbed by Heilbroner's dismissal of small-scale approaches to the new realities. He reluctantly concludes that bur­ geneoning problems will, after a grace period ending soon after the turn of the century, invalidate the notion of sustainable ecological growth and require the drastic action of large, centralized, and not necessarily democ­ ratic, government. Other agents will not be equal to this task.

Heilbroner's view of what survival for us and the planet necessitates is twofold. Economic rationalism, by which disregard for present and future "others" is justified in favor of current consumption, must go. Growth economics, which command ever more resources to provision an exponentially expanding population, must be replaced by either benign growth or stationary, redistributive systems. For a variety of reasons, Heilbroner does not think that the vested inter­ ests of commerce will awaken to the needs of the planet or humanity.

It is little has happened since the 1970s to encour­ age a more optimistic view. Leadership in the devel­ oped world is not focused on the environment; it is the market forces that favor least cost production in the place of present industry. Will government's view of what survival for us and the planet necessitates is twofold. Economic rationalism, by which disregard for present and future "others" is justified in favor of current consumption, must go. Growth economics, which command ever more resources to provision an exponentially expanding population, must be replaced by either benign growth or stationary, redistributive systems. For a variety of reasons, Heilbroner does not think that the vested inter­ ests of commerce will awaken to the needs of the planet or humanity.

Is There Hope for Business?

Is There Hope for Business? In his newest book, The Ecology of Commerce, Andrew Paul Hawken frames the question of whether we can save the planet as, Can we save business? With a full catalogue of institutionalized, indus­ trial malfeasance that threatens to swamp the planet in toxins and eliminate life forms, Hawken is every bit as lauded as Heilbroner but feels nevertheless that basic goodness, it is up to green fees, progressively phased in over a twenty year period, to impel business toward green behavior. With each year, a paper producer might be faced with rising procurement costs for spruce-fir or other virgin pulp, a steepening energy bill, and discharge taxes on various effluents (for the sake of argument, we'll concede that outright bans on more toxic substances have been accepted as part of corpo­ rate chartering). Change to cleaner methods will have thus been made a necessary prerequisite of achieving a competitively priced product, or, put another way, remaining in business.

It is hard to predict what low-cost production methods might be. Companies intent on avoiding change will argue that the paper industry will leave northern New York and New England under the added struc­ tures of green fees, but let us suppose that the new methods of taxation and regulation are universal. For instance, the price of paper products from Siberia would, in order to reach our markets, have to reflect the costs to the environment there—and today that price would be prohibitive, were the paper producer to de­ cide to reflect the reality of millions of acres being cleared and the existence of such species as the Siberian tiger threatened. Prices of pulp from the Southern states would have that factor of increased production costs of plantation silviculture. The necessary change from today's situation would be that industry, although it might fold, could not flee to an area willing to sell out nature's model in which the wastes of one organism feed another. Re­ cycling will be an essential ingredient in the taxa­ logic system where everything is important. Most of Lansky's proposals center on "shortening the lines of production costs, doing so will, in his view, address the challenges identified by Heilbroner: creat­ ing a regard for future generations and replacing the growth mentality with a true development ethic.

Lansky points out that externalities are indeed a factor in encouraging destructive forest practices, such as herbicide spraying, and irresponsible papermaking, reliant on organochlorines. His analysis suggests sever­ al ways in which cost internalization may not work: how do we quantify the value of components in a bio­ logic system where everything is important? Most of Lansky's proposals center on "shortening the lines of awareness and responsibility." In order for green fees to work, the process of determining and monetarizing impacts and setting fees at a level high enough to encourage innovative response in a sustainable direc­ tion would have to receive continuing feedback. Is the process working? What changes would make it work?

The idea of a green fee is to encourage industry toward a certain goal, sustainability. While some believe that mandating this goal directly is the best strategy—as Barry Commoner favors the outright ban of dangerous chemicals—Hawken argues that market mechanisms are our best hope for encouraging least­ environmental-cost production. As Hawken argues, the ability to evolve is a necessary ingredient in the taxa­ tion of externalities, and it is not in any way possible to evolve, a vision of sustainability must be agreed upon at the outset.

In Beyond the Beauty Strip, a critique of forest management in the Maine woods, Mitch Lansky out­ lines many of the costs presently avoided by the timber industry. He also outlines many avenues for greater cit­ izen input and has, in conversation, suggested the implementation of local forest councils that would syn­ thesize these many points of view and provide the anvil for hammering out agreement on what best repre­ sents the public interest. Such councils, if not subset­ ted by various profit interests, would be one means of identifying and bringing true costs into product price.

Lansky points out that externalities are indeed a factor in encouraging destructive forest practices, such as herbicide spraying, and irresponsible papermaking, reliant on organochlorines. His analysis suggests sever­ al ways in which cost internalization may not work: how do we quantify the value of components in a bio­ logic system where everything is important? Most of Lansky's proposals center on "shortening the lines of awareness and responsibility." In order for green fees to work, the process of determining and monetarizing impacts and setting fees at a level high enough to encourage innovative response in a sustainable direc­ tion would have to receive continuing feedback. Is the process working? What changes would make it work?

The idea of a green fee is to encourage industry toward a certain goal, sustainability. While some believe that mandating this goal directly is the best strategy—as Barry Commoner favors the outright ban of dangerous chemicals—Hawken argues that market mechanisms are our best hope for encouraging least­ environmental-cost production. As Hawken argues, the ability to evolve is a necessary ingredient in the taxa­ tion of externalities, and it is not in any way possible to evolve, a vision of sustainability must be agreed upon at the outset.

In Beyond the Beauty Strip, a critique of forest management in the Maine woods, Mitch Lansky out­ lines many of the costs presently avoided by the timber industry. He also outlines many avenues for greater cit­izen input and has, in conversation, suggested the implementation of local forest councils that would syn­ thesize these many points of view and provide the anvil for hammering out agreement on what best repre­ sents the public interest. Such councils, if not subset­ ted by various profit interests, would be one means of identifying and bringing true costs into product price.

Lansky points out that externalities are indeed a factor in encouraging destructive forest practices, such as herbicide spraying, and irresponsible papermaking, reliant on organochlorines. His analysis suggests sever­ al ways in which cost internalization may not work: how do we quantify the value of components in a bio­ logic system where everything is important? Most of Lansky's proposals center on "shortening the lines of awareness and responsibility." In order for green fees to work, the process of determining and monetarizing impacts and setting fees at a level high enough to encourage innovative response in a sustainable direc­ tion would have to receive continuing feedback. Is the process working? What changes would make it work?

The idea of a green fee is to encourage industry toward a certain goal, sustainability. While some believe that mandating this goal directly is the best strategy—as Barry Commoner favors the outright ban of dangerous chemicals—Hawken argues that market mechanisms are our best hope for encouraging least­ environmental-cost production. As Hawken argues, the ability to evolve is a necessary ingredient in the taxa­ tion of externalities, and it is not in any way possible to evolve, a vision of sustainability must be agreed upon at the outset.
A new tool for measuring consumption is being developed at the University of British Columbia by Mathis Wackernagel with the Forest Project on Planning Healthy & Sustainable Communities. In a draft handbook, the authors outline a method by which we can arrive at an estimation of land required by a given population to support current consumption. They term this "Appropriated Carrying Capacity" (ACC) or, more poetically, the Ecological Footprint.

The key concept in ACC accounting is that consumption requires land. Individual acts of consumption and aggregate consumption by populations appropriate land from the finite amount of ecologically productive land available.

Developing concrete ACC figures for specific populations, at the very least, promises to raise awareness that we are consuming past the Earth’s capacity to sustain current lifestyle. To cite two examples the authors offer; the Lower Fraser Valley of British Columbia—based on the average Canadian’s requirement for 4.8 hectares of land, and a population of 1.7 million—appropriates an area twenty times larger than itself; Holland similarly requires an area 15 times its size to fuel current consumption.

The finite availability of productive land means that as some consume more, others—those in poorer nations—must consume less. The alternative, “growth philosophy” behind most recent trade initiatives holds out for the myth that an expanding world population will, with capital and technology, be able to live like British Columbia and Holland do.

Determination of ACC, on both broad population levels and for comparing specific economic development proposals, promises to give the planning community a useful tool in propelling society toward sustainability. Where is the fat in our ACC budget? (Energy consumption clearly stands out as the major component in developed economies’ greediness.)

The ethical implication is that we must live within our means not only because in the long term we have too, but also because consumption here means deprivation there. Conversely, degrading our own carrying capacity to participate in the worldwide exchange of carrying capacity is rational only so long as we continue to believe in the finite availability of resources or magic of technology.

Another consideration raised by ACC analysis is a shift away from global trade in carrying capacity and toward at least some level of local sufficiency. If we are to do this we must first begin to base individual and social action on ecological integrity.

Measuring Our Ecological Footprints

The ethical implication is that we must live within our means not only because in the long term we have too, but also because consumption here means deprivation there. Conversely, degrading our own carrying capacity to participate in the worldwide exchange of carrying capacity is rational only so long as we continue to believe in the finite availability of resources or magic of technology.

Another consideration raised by ACC analysis is a shift away from global trade in carrying capacity and toward at least some level of local sufficiency. If we are to do this we must first begin to base individual and social action on ecological integrity.

A copy of the discussion draft of ACC is available from: The Task Force on Planning Healthy & Sustainable Communities, Department of Family Practice, The University of British Columbia, 5804 Fairview Avenue, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1V3. Send $5.35 to this address and ask for “How Big is our Ecological Footprint: A Handbook for Estimating a Community’s Appropriated Carrying Capacity” by Mathis Wackernagel with Janet McIntosh, William Rees and Robert Woollard.
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The Northern Forest Forum
Hamlet Stewardship in the Adirondack Park

by Claire L. Barnett

[Ed Note: The following article is reprinted from Wildernes...]

I had to explain that I had recently had a conversation with another professional about communities in the Park. I was one of only a half-dozen women among perhaps two hundred men. I was being graciously introduced by one of the good old boys to another good old boy some twenty years his junior, as the new young member from the Adirondacks. The junior boy said, "Oh, how beautiful the Adirondacks is. How much the wife and I have enjoyed our visits to the Park and the following paper on hamlet stewardship in the Park. Unlike the previous topics, there is no deep, rich belly of literature or research to draw upon. In the least, I hope I can begin to develop in all of us an awareness of a few issues and make some suggestions of topics which should be explored in far greater detail by thoughtful people.

First I will try to tell you what a community is, then I will try to describe stewardship of a community and then outline what the results, or the vision, of such stewardship might be at some time in the future. But to do this, I must share with you two brief stories, which in my own mind accurately set the stage for this presentation of traditional thinking about the Adirondacks.

One View of the Adirondacks: Industry

Seven years ago this fall, I attended the annual meeting of a statewide organization in Corning, the New York State Economic Development Council, where I was introduced to a half dozen women among perhaps two hundred men. I was being graciously introduced by one of the good old boys to another good old boy some twenty years his junior, as the new young member from the Adirondacks. The junior boy said, "Oh, how beautiful the Adirondacks is. How much the wife and I have enjoyed our visits to the Park and the following paper on hamlet stewardship in the Park. Unlike the previous topics, there is no deep, rich belly of literature or research to draw upon. In the least, I hope I can begin to develop in all of us an awareness of a few issues and make some suggestions of topics which should be explored in far greater detail by thoughtful people.

First I will try to tell you what a community is, then I will try to describe stewardship of a community and then outline what the results, or the vision, of such stewardship might be at some time in the future. But to do this, I must share with you two brief stories, which in my own mind accurately set the stage for this presentation of traditional thinking about the Adirondacks.

One View of the Adirondacks: Industry

Seven years ago this fall, I attended the annual meeting of a statewide organization in Corning, the New York State Economic Development Council, where I was introduced to a half dozen women among perhaps two hundred men. I was being graciously introduced by one of the good old boys to another good old boy some twenty years his junior, as the new young member from the Adirondacks. The junior boy said, "Oh, how beautiful the Adirondacks is. How much the wife and I have enjoyed our visits to the Park and the following paper on hamlet stewardship in the Park. Unlike the previous topics, there is no deep, rich belly of literature or research to draw upon. In the least, I hope I can begin to develop in all of us an awareness of a few issues and make some suggestions of topics which should be explored in far greater detail by thoughtful people.

First I will try to tell you what a community is, then I will try to describe stewardship of a community and then outline what the results, or the vision, of such stewardship might be at some time in the future. But to do this, I must share with you two brief stories, which in my own mind accurately set the stage for this presentation of traditional thinking about the Adirondacks.

One View of the Adirondacks: Industry

Seven years ago this fall, I attended the annual meeting of a statewide organization in Corning, the New York State Economic Development Council, where I was introduced to a half dozen women among perhaps two hundred men. I was being graciously introduced by one of the good old boys to another good old boy some twenty years his junior, as the new young member from the Adirondacks. The junior boy said, "Oh, how beautiful the Adirondacks is. How much the wife and I have enjoyed our visits to the Park and the following paper on hamlet stewardship in the Park. Unlike the previous topics, there is no deep, rich belly of literature or research to draw upon. In the least, I hope I can begin to develop in all of us an awareness of a few issues and make some suggestions of topics which should be explored in far greater detail by thoughtful people.

First I will try to tell you what a community is, then I will try to describe stewardship of a community and then outline what the results, or the vision, of such stewardship might be at some time in the future. But to do this, I must share with you two brief stories, which in my own mind accurately set the stage for this presentation of traditional thinking about the Adirondacks.
ing their towns, respondents named sewer, water, affordable housing, the lack of zoning and planning, overdevelop­oment, too rapid growth, landfills, and the lack of viable downtown businesses. They were losing their communities. Lots of taxpayers, but no stewards. The National Trust for Historic Preservation coordinates a revitalization program designed to help in this situation and overwhelmingly the survey respondents, some 80 to 90 percent, felt that such an approach would help their communities.

Take an Adirondack Tour

What would such stewardship efforts result in with efforts undertaken by Adirondack local governments, the private sector and major state agencies? Take an Adirondack tour. Drive from one hamlet to another. Think about what you see from your car and what you can purchase in these small hamlets when you stop. And recall the grandparents. Here are a few items to get you started:

Historic Markers: Can you see them? Can you read them? Are there pull-overs? Are you driving the historic Northwest Bay Road cut between Lake Champlain and Saranac Lake?

Architecture: Does it respect the history of the hamlet and the region?

Think of the new business in Keene: a bank, a garden center and a Stewarts. Is there a school? Or are children being bussed 90 minutes each way to learn history, environmental science, and history sitting in an urban classroom? Where would you rather learn natural sciences—indoors in Glens Falls or outdoors in Newcomb?

Recreational access: Are the beaches? The trails? The historic walks? Are the improved paved access areas operated by local governments and/or the local private sector or is the community still trying to get the attention of the New York State Office of Parks and Recreation or the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation in Albany? Are there public restrooms near trailheads?

Stores: Do they carry local products? Take the challenge: Try the Department Store in Speculator, the Marina in Westport, Howard Johnson’s in Lake Placid and count the locally produced, value-added products and souvenirs. Are the nectars, soap, herbs, wooden toys and potpourris from the Adirondacks or from Wyoming, Maine and California? Is the maple syrup from Vermont or when most farms in the Champlain Valley have sold out of dairy why is the butter from Wisconsin: what are the real barriers to creating a sustainable natural resource-based economy?

Roadways: Are there scenic pullovers? The only scenic pull-off I know of along Lake Champlain is, in fact, the driveway of an 80-year-old grandmother down the street from me in Westport. Another grandmother I know opened up her own garden to walkers when a condo development cut off the lake view from the sidewalk. Are there bike lanes? With the same amount of asphalt and just slightly narrower driving lanes, couldn’t we have biking lanes throughout the Park? Wouldn’t this relieve ORDA (Olympic Regional Development Authority) from seeking funds to pave part of the Forest Preserve?

Is there a functioning rail line along the shores of Lake Champlain, Edward, Whitehall, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Port Henry, Westport and East of Old Forge, Maine and California? Is there a functioning rail line along the shores of Lake Champlain, Edward, Whitehall, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Port Henry, Westport and East of Old Forge, Maine and California? Is there a working ferry service between New York City and Montreal: Fort Edward, Whitehall, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Washington and so on up the line of historic communities, historic depots, fabulous views and Park access. Imagine the results of a linked series of parks, developed with programmatic/historic preservation projects along the line. Then link this to the Hudson River Greenway.

Are the people you see in the stores and on the streets healthy? Do they have access to reliable primary care? Is there a continuum of care, especially for the sick and older, for the teenaged mothers? Why not? What are the barriers? Is the emergency squad technically proficient?

Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC): Has there been a steady reduction in toxics in household and commercial use? Is there recycling that small communities can actually afford? Is there a scale? Will they never achieve economy of scale? Imagine in 25 years’ time both New York State DEC and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) will have used their unique and innovative approaches to environmental health and primary care, now being invited to national symposia to talk about the possible of their path to a healthy rural population. Imagine that local fish and game can now be eaten weekly, even by pregnant women.

Are there scenic pull-overs? The only scenic pull-off I know of along Lake Champlain is, in fact, the driveway of an 80-year-old grandmother down the street from me in Westport. Another grandmother I know opened up her own garden to walkers when a condo development cut off the lake view from the sidewalk. Are there bike lanes? With the same amount of asphalt and just slightly narrower driving lanes, couldn’t we have biking lanes throughout the Park? Wouldn’t this relieve ORDA (Olympic Regional Development Authority) from seeking funds to pave part of the Forest Preserve?

Is there a functioning rail line along the shores of Lake Champlain, Edward, Whitehall, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Port Henry, Westport and East of Old Forge, Maine and California? Is there a functioning rail line along the shores of Lake Champlain, Edward, Whitehall, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Port Henry, Westport and East of Old Forge, Maine and California? Is there a working ferry service between New York City and Montreal: Fort Edward, Whitehall, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Washington and so on up the line of historic communities, historic depots, fabulous views and Park access. Imagine the results of a linked series of parks, developed with programmatic/historic preservation projects along the line. Then link this to the Hudson River Greenway.

Are the people you see in the stores and on the streets healthy? Do they have access to reliable primary care? Is there a continuum of care, especially for the sick and older, for the teenaged mothers? Why not? What are the barriers? Is the emergency squad technically proficient?

Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC): Has there been a steady reduction in toxics in household and commercial use? Is there recycling that small communities can actually afford? Is there a scale? Will they never achieve economy of scale? Imagine in 25 years’ time both New York State DEC and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) will have used their unique and innovative approaches to environmental health and primary care, now being invited to national symposia to talk about the possible of their path to a healthy rural population. Imagine that local fish and game can now be eaten weekly, even by pregnant women.

Are there scenic pull-overs? The only scenic pull-off I know of along Lake Champlain is, in fact, the driveway of an 80-year-old grandmother down the street from me in Westport. Another grandmother I know opened up her own garden to walkers when a condo development cut off the lake view from the sidewalk. Are there bike lanes? With the same amount of asphalt and just slightly narrower driving lanes, couldn’t we have biking lanes throughout the Park? Wouldn’t this relieve ORDA (Olympic Regional Development Authority) from seeking funds to pave part of the Forest Preserve?

Is there a functioning rail line along the shores of Lake Champlain, Edward, Whitehall, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Port Henry, Westport and East of Old Forge, Maine and California? Is there a functioning rail line along the shores of Lake Champlain, Edward, Whitehall, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Port Henry, Westport and East of Old Forge, Maine and California? Is there a working ferry service between New York City and Montreal: Fort Edward, Whitehall, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Washington and so on up the line of historic communities, historic depots, fabulous views and Park access. Imagine the results of a linked series of parks, developed with programmatic/historic preservation projects along the line. Then link this to the Hudson River Greenway.

Are the people you see in the stores and on the streets healthy? Do they have access to reliable primary care? Is there a continuum of care, especially for the sick and older, for the teenaged mothers? Why not? What are the barriers? Is the emergency squad technically proficient?
The genius of the market is its pro-
teas ability to commoditize anything. 

Not, of course, to be confused with their 
neighbor's wilderness situated several 
bundred feet away across the property 
line.

This concept breaks from the tradi-
tional attitude towards undeveloped 
areas. In the past, landscapes were 
viewed with an eye as to what value 
could be extracted from them, either on 
or beneath their surface. Now, it is the 
landscape or the view itself that is seen 
as a source of commercial value. Like 
so many objects in our culture, it is 
being promoted as a source of intangi-
table benefits. Wilderness is being treated 
as a source of freedom, beauty, isola-
tion, status, spiritual regeneration. There 
is no doubt that wild, open spaces do 
encourage, if not actually provide, some 
of these blessings. What is objection-
able is the notion that they can be had 
by some for a fee, and simultaneously 
denied to others who can't afford the 
asking price. Part of the cache of owning 
a unique landscape is its exclusivity. 

After all, what's the point of paying big 
bucks for your own piece of paradise if 
you Tom, Dick, or Harriet can hike 
across it and enjoy the same benefits for 
free.

As was pointed out by Mark 
Lapping in his article "Second Chance 
Wilderness" (Forum vol. 1 #4), the 
desire to own a second home in the 
country is symptomatic of the failure of 
our first homes to satisfy fundamental 
spiritual, aesthetic, and psychological 
needs. What is ironic is that the growing 
desire to address this sense of emptiness 
could foster the type of development that 
destroys the very connections with 
life we seek.

The market, poised like a spider to 
respond to the slightest vibration in its 
web of demand, is only too eager to 
supply our needs, both real and con-
structed. If a desire, analytically significant 
portion of the populace believes it can 
find solace in back-country second 
homes, then the commercial ventures necessary to satisfy that need will 
spring to life, regardless of the legitima-
cy of such beliefs or the harm they 
could perpetuate to the very wilderness 
sought as refuge. And a market that 
combines both high margins and volatil-
ity (two features that certainly charac-
terize the real estate industry) will 
inevitably attract unscrupulous opera-
tors.

The question that faces 
Adirondackers and to one degree or 
another the rest of the Northern Forest 
community is: Do you want the com-
mercial real estate market to be the dri-
ving and determining force in shaping 
the future of the region?

It might be worthwhile considering 
a brief history of capitalism's relationship 
to natural resources before answering 
One of the salient features of that 
relationship is struggle for control of 
those resources.

The cardinal rule that has 
emerged from this struggle, whether it applies to oil fields in the Middle East, or 
the forests of Maine, is that indigenous 
control will not be tolerated.

Capitalism's advance was largely 
tied to its ability to exploit natural 
resources regardless of their location or 
the political and cultural entities that 
possessed them. Control over locally 
produced resources was wrested away from the hands of those who lived on or near those resources. From the 
gold of Central and South America, to 
the spices of the Far East, to the fur 
trade in the North Country, a struggle 
was waged (in most cases a violent one) 
to gain control over these resources. The 
end result was that the winners 
enjoyed immense profit at the expense of 
local inhabitants.

(Residents of the NFL need look no 
farther than the pervasive practice of 
exporting raw timber to Canada or the 
Far East to gain an understanding of the experience of indigenous peoples in 
seeing their resources expropriated and 
sent overseas for the benefit of foreign 
enterprise.)
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Wildlife & Wilderness: A History of Adirondack Mammals


This is a wonderful book—wise, full of important information, and brimming with delicious quotations from early explorers, hunters, trappers, and biologists. If true wilderness is to return to this region, wolves, cougars, lynx, wolves, and mountain lions must return. Terrie, a professor of English and American Culture at Bowling Green University, understands this and presents an irresistible case for real wilderness, not manipulation of forests in the name of deer management.

Moose, not white tail deer, Terrie writes, are the true symbol of Adirondack wilderness. It was only after American civilization had cut down the native forests, over-hunted and trapped native species, and persecuted native predators into oblivion that deer populations swelled. In the ancient Adirondack forests, deer were not common due to deep snow, lack of edge and early successional habitat, and the presence of moose, wolves, and cougars.

Terrie provides us with a succinct history of the demise of wilderness in the Adirondacks. Without romanticizing Native American culture, he notes that native peoples understood the role of wildlife in supporting their lives, that they co-existed respectfully with native species, and that they neither hunted species to extinction, nor altered the environment so severely that it could no longer support viable populations of native species.

He points out that this region of North America was not opened by European religious or colonizing efforts, but by the dream of accumulating quick fortunes trafficking in the pelts of wild animals.

His accounts of early white hunters, both contract and "sport" are especially insightful: "As the first sportsmen prepared to make the journey north to the Adirondack wilderness, the wildlife community was changing, but sportmen, preoccupied with deer, seldom noticed. Beaver were few and hard to find. The large predators, the wolf and mountain lion, were declining in numbers and range, and the moose would be gone by the time of the Civil War. But the major change—at least as far as the sportsmen were concerned—was the slowly increasing quantity of deer. And as long as the deer appeared to be plentiful, animals seemed equally so." (page 59)

These white hunters bong none of the woodcraft or respect of the native hunters. "Throughout the literature of sport in the Adirondacks in the nineteenth century, it was not the killing or even the waste that startled. It is the lack of dignity, denied to both the hunters and the hunted."

Terrie traces the history of wildlife—"deer"—management in the Adirondacks from the 1860s through the 1950s in the context of the maturing "Forever Wild" State Forests in the Park. He quotes a 1919 Report of the Conservation Commission that candidly acknowledged that the commission practiced "economic biology." (Note: The NY Department of Environmental Conservation still does engage in such ecologically destructive, economically-motivated activities as pond poisoning, euphemistically called "pond reclamation".)

Ironically, Terrie notes, the Forever Wild Clause of the New York State Constitution halted the anthropogenic activities on state lands that promoted the expanding deer herd and began a natural ecological restoration process that started to recover habitat suitable for wolves, cougars and moose. Today, deer hunting on managed private lands is superior to hunting on maturing Forever Wild State Forests.

His treatment of the extirpation of native predators is as instructive as it is distressing. Nearly every town in the region had a bounty on cougars and wolves, but even without bounties, "trigger-happy" hunters eagerly shot one whenever their paths crossed.

"The state established bounties on wolves and mountain lions in 1871." Terrie writes on page 76, "intending to eliminate both species. The wolf and mountain lion were not long for the Adirondacks, but that the bounties alone were responsible for their extirpation is unlikely. Rather, survival simply became more and more difficult as their natural habitat was destroyed. Disease may also have been a factor as distemper and rabies, introduced by domestic animals, spread to wild canids and cats."

Ironically, at a time the state legislature was persecuting native predators, it attempted to restore beaver, moose, elk (although probably not native to the Adirondacks). The catch is that these species were all valued for trophies and trapping. "The primary predator, man," Terrie dryly notes, "remained uncomportable with the idea of predation."

Regarding current efforts to "restore" moose who are already reintroducing the Adirondacks in growing numbers of their own accord, Terrie urges caution: "Much as I want to see a thriving moose population in the Adirondacks, I have reservations about reintroduction. We should remember what happened with the elk and moose the last time we tried something like this. We may not have all the information we need. Snatching an animal from its home and plopping it down in an unfamiliar place is an act of anthropocentric cruelty. Do the proposed benefits, which are by no means certain, justify taking chances with the lives of healthy moose? All signs are that the moose are here to stay. Perhaps we should leave them alone and hope for the best." (page 155)

The concluding chapter speaks eloquently and affirmatively about what true Wilderness is, and how society should manage humans, rather than continue to manipulate nature. (See "Excerpts from Wildlife & Wilderness" on this page.)

Phil Terrie loves the natural, wild Adirondacks. He sees it with the eye of the poet, and he reports with the skill of a great historian. This small book is a gem, and is indispensable reading for anyone interested in wildlife, wilderness, the Adirondacks, or sharing this gorgeous region with all native species.
Forestry Conflicts Are About Basic Values

by David Orton

Forestry conflicts are about clashes in basic values.

The 1993 book, *The Pesticide Hazard*, which looks at international trends in pesticide use, and is put out by the British organization The Pesticide Trust, states that globally, pesticides are responsible for 20,000 deaths and 3 million cases of acute poisoning annually. This book notes that the burden falls particularly on agricultural workers and rural communities. This community of Scotsburn is a farming and forestry community. The last time I looked it up, there were about 150 pesticides licensed for use on “crops and orchards.” The pulp culture in our province wants “agro-forestry,” and consciously uses modern industrial farming as a model.

Every political party in Canada, whether Liberal, Conservative, or New Democratic, when in political power, allows the forest industry to clear cut and forest spray. Government publications state that clearcutting makes up 90% of the cutting in Canada. All of us know that here in Nova Scotia, spraying is closely associated with this type of cut.

What are the basic similar values or assumptions which our political parties share with the forest industry? If we want to stop forest spraying or clear cutting, it is these values which must change. If we want a truly sustainable society, where do we not destroy our ecology or our communities—and a society which has social justice at its core, then shared values which promote this end are crucial. A sustainable forestry needs a sustainable society.

There are two basic values (which I consider evil), that are destroying our environment and society itself, and they permeate and shape forestry. These are:

1. The assumption that the economy has to grow; and
2. A human-centered ethics, where nature is seen as a “resource” solely for human use.

The economy has to grow: This is the view that we need more “development” and more consumer goods. The “good life” is to be a consumer. Our destiny is seen as “fitting” into a global capitalist economy. This is what I call the mentality of paying over the universe.

Pictou Forest Owners, has a slogan which they proudly exhibit: “Good Forestry is Good Business.” The 1986 Provincial Forest Policy, spoke of “A doubling of forest production by 2025.” Today in Nova Scotia, about 80% of production is in pulpwood, the least valuable use of wood. We have a “pulp culture” in our province. It is interesting, that the article in today’s paper about Stora possibly closing their mill (a blackmail attempt to get environmental concessions and more government funds), states that if Stora stays, they need to build a second newsprint machine to increase capacity—that is, they have to grow. The same Stora article states that the fate of the mill will be decided at a meeting held in Germany, not in Nova Scotia. Pulp and paper multinational in N.S., like Stora, Scott, or Bowater, look at the world with global, not national interests in mind. N.S. is a feedlot for these three pulp and paper mills. These companies think globally not nationally. We must resist to think locally, Localism, not globalism!

The growth philosophy runs into the fact that we live in a finite world. There are limits to everything. At existing levels of growth, we already have enormous environmental problems. Thus, for example, carbon dioxide in our atmosphere has increased 25% since the industrial revolution. A good example of limits is the situation with minerals in Canada: “At current production levels, estimated reserves of conventional petroleum will be depleted within 14 years. The estimated reserve life of natural gas is 27 years. Canada’s coal reserves could last 70 years. The reserve lives for other minerals range from 20 to 30 years.” [Human Activity and the Environment 1991, p.174, Statistics Canada]

Reorienting to limits rather than growth, means accepting the need to reassess our lifestyle and live much more directly with nature.

We are trying to control nature for growth, instead of adjusting to nature’s natural laws. This “control” in forestry means that “demands for forest protection will increase.” (see “Forest Spraying: A Gathering Storm”, by D. Orton, Canadian Dimension, October 1990). Thus: chemical pesticides plus biological controls like viruses, fungi, and nematodes, plus the release of genetically altered organisms, for “forest management” purposes. When problems come up, we look for fixes. For example, the use of nematodes (a broad spectrum biological control) against the spruce budworm weevil, which is now taking place in Pictou County. We have discovered that one of the nematode sites is a recent Scott clearcut on the McIeth Road near Scobsburn. The forest industry does not want to look at the actual clearcutting itself—the weevils are attracted to the large areas of wood residues on clearcut sites—as the reason for the problem.

There is lots of environmental double speak. We have “Vax”, Monsanto’s forestry herbicide, which poisons plants and kills them. Or we have the term “sustainable development” which, from the 1987 Brundtland Report, says we can have more growth and still protect the environment. This term has replaced sustained yield in forestry.

Human-centered ethics: This second value or assumption says that human interest is above every other interest. Humans see themselves as apart from nature, not as part of nature. This human-centered view of the world shapes our society and industrial forestry. The language used in forestry shows this. For example, hardwood trees, from a pulpwood perspective, are “weed” trees. Or trees are described as “over mature”, meaning they should have been cut, no matter what the ecological functions played by such trees.

We routinely give ourselves the right, as in clearcutting or spraying pesticides, to make life and death decisions about other plant and animal species. Yet if we see ourselves as part of nature, then we are part of the forest. We then are destroying ourselves when we destroy the forests. Those who profit economically from forest spraying or logging, do not have a sustainable situation. Forestry conflicts are about clashes in basic values.

Forestry is Good Business. The 1986 Forestry and Forest Products Report, says that globally, pesticides are responsible for 20,000 deaths and 3 million cases of acute poisoning annually. This book notes that the burden falls particularly on agricultural workers and rural communities. This community of Scotsburn is a farming and forestry community. The last time I looked it up, there were about 150 pesticides licensed for use on “crops and orchards.” The pulp culture in our province wants “agro-forestry,” and consciously uses modern industrial farming as a model.

Every political party in Canada, whether Liberal, Conservative, or New Democratic, when in political power, allows the forest industry to clear cut and forest spray. Government publications state that clearcutting makes up 90% of the cutting in Canada. All of us know that here in Nova Scotia, spraying is closely associated with this type of cut.

What are the basic similar values or assumptions which our political parties share with the forest industry? If we want to stop forest spraying or clear cutting, it is these values which must change. If we want a truly sustainable society, where do we not destroy our ecology or our communities—and a society which has social justice at its core, then shared values which promote this end are crucial. A sustainable forestry needs a sustainable society.

There are two basic values (which I consider evil), that are destroying our environment and society itself, and they permeate and shape forestry. These are:

1. The assumption that the economy has to grow; and
2. A human-centered ethics, where nature is seen as a “resource” solely for human use.

The economy has to grow: This is the view that we need more “development” and more consumer goods. The “good life” is to be a consumer. Our destiny is seen as “fitting” into a global capitalist economy. This is what I call the mentality of paying over the universe.

Pictou Forest Owners, has a slogan which they proudly exhibit: “Good Forestry is Good Business.” The 1986 Provincial Forest Policy, spoke of “A doubling of forest production by 2025.” Today in Nova Scotia, about 80% of production is in pulpwood, the least valuable use of wood. We have a “pulp culture” in our province. It is interesting, that the article in today’s paper about Stora possibly closing their mill (a blackmail attempt to get environmental concessions and more government funds), states that if Stora stays, they need to build a second newsprint machine to increase capacity—that is, they have to grow. The same Stora article states that the fate of the mill will be decided at a meeting held in Germany, not in Nova Scotia. Pulp and paper multinational in N.S., like Stora, Scott, or Bowater, look at the world with global, not national interests in mind. N.S. is a feedlot for these three pulp and paper mills. These companies think globally not nationally. We must resist to think locally, Localism, not globalism!

The growth philosophy runs into the fact that we live in a finite world. There are limits to everything. At existing levels of growth, we already have enormous environmental problems. Thus, for example, carbon dioxide in our atmosphere has increased 25% since the industrial revolution. A good example of limits is the situation with minerals in Canada: “At current production levels, estimated reserves of conventional petroleum will be depleted within 14 years. The estimated reserve life of natural gas is 27 years. Canada’s coal reserves could last 70 years. The reserve lives for other minerals range from 20 to 30 years.” [Human Activity and the Environment 1991, p.174, Statistics Canada]

Reorienting to limits rather than growth, means accepting the need to reassess our lifestyle and live much more directly with nature.

We are trying to control nature for growth, instead of adjusting to nature’s natural laws. This “control” in forestry means that “demands for forest protection will increase.” (see “Forest Spraying: A Gathering Storm”, by D. Orton, Canadian Dimension, October 1990). Thus: chemical pesticides plus biological controls like viruses, fungi, and nematodes, plus the release of genetically altered organisms, for “forest management” purposes. When problems come up, we look for fixes. For example, the use of nematodes (a broad spectrum biological control) against the spruce budworm weevil, which is now taking place in Pictou County. We have discovered that one of the nematode sites is a recent Scott clearcut on the McIeth Road near Scobsburn. The forest industry does not want to look at the actual clearcutting itself—the weevils are attracted to the large areas of wood residues on clearcut sites—as the reason for the problem.

There is lots of environmental double speak. We have “Vax”, Monsanto’s forestry herbicide, which poisons plants and kills them. Or we have the term “sustainable development” which, from the 1987 Brundtland Report, says we can have more growth and still protect the environment. This term has replaced sustained yield in forestry.

Human-centered ethics: This second value or assumption says that human interest is above every other interest. Humans see themselves as apart from nature, not as part of nature. This human-centered view of the world shapes our society and industrial forestry. The language used in forestry shows this. For example, hardwood trees, from a pulpwood perspective, are “weed” trees. Or trees are described as “over mature”, meaning they should have been cut, no matter what the ecological functions played by such trees.

We routinely give ourselves the right, as in clearcutting or spraying pesticides, to make life and death decisions about other plant and animal species. Yet if we see ourselves as part of nature, then we are part of the forest. We then are destroying ourselves when we destroy the forests. Those who profit economically from forest spraying or logging, do not have a sustainable situation. Forestry conflicts are about clashes in basic values.
Pesticides Used in Forestry in Nova Scotia, 1993

by Helga Hoffmann

One of the main reasons for gathering here tonight, is to give us all an opportunity to express our concerns about forest spraying. I want to provide a glimpse as to what this entails, why we have reasons for being concerned.

At present, there are no insecticides being sprayed in forest operations. We are pleased that no spraying against the spruce budworm, with B.t. (Bacillus thuringiensis variety kurstaki) is taking place.

There are five herbicides approved for use in forestry this year (or six if you go by trade name). These are: Glyphosate-Vision, Hexazinone-Velpar L & Promax, Simazine-Princex NT, Tricosan L, 2,4-D (ester)

All these herbicides are approved for ground application, and Vision, Velpar L and 2,4-D are also approved for aerial application.

The main herbicide being used, according to the spray permits we have seen, is Vision. You will see these names used interchangeably, for example Vision, Roundup, Velpar L. In an example of 25% hexazinone as active ingredient, and the rest are "inerts." What are these "inerts"? Are they unimportant fillers, as the name seems to imply? The pesticide manufacturers do not want to reveal what the "inert" ingredients are, claiming they are trade secrets. Monsanto, the manufacturer of Vision, did not willingly provide the information about the additives, and today still only talks about a surfactant and water making up the other 59% of the herbicide Vision. The knowledge about the chemical composition of the surfactant surfaced in a letter written in the medical journal The Lancet (Feb. 6, 1988) by Japanese physicians. They have investigated a series of 56 cases of Roundup poisoning in Japan, mostly suicides or attempted suicides, involving nine fatalities. They reported that the name of the intentionally-added secret ingredient, the surfactant, is POEA or polyoxyethylenamine. It makes up 15% of the total mixture. Tests done show that POEA is three times more acutely toxic than glyphosate itself.

In addition to intentional additives, there are usually contaminants present. In Vision, these contaminants are isoproylamine (3%), N-nitrosoglyphosate (0.1 ppm), and 1,4-dioxane (0.035%). N-nitrosoglyphosate is a by-product of the manufacture of glyphosate. About 65% of N-nitroso compounds are associated with stomach cancer.

There is one known fact about 1,4-dioxane was only discovered when knowledgeable people on the Pacific Northwest, upon reading the letter in The Lancet, realized that POEA could have 1,4-dioxane as a contaminant, and got the necessary lab tests done independently. The tests confirmed their suspicions. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1,4-dioxane is a probable human carcinogen. The Journal of Pesticide Reform has had several articles dealing with inerts in Vision ("Glyphosate"), by Caroline Cox, in the Summer 1991 issue, and "Roundup, Vision, POEA, and 1,4-Dioxan: Why Pesticide Formulations Are the Problem," by Mary O'Brient, in the Winter 1990 issue).

And then, there are the breakdown products. One of the breakdown products of glyphosate is aminoethylyphosphinic acid (AMPA), and this in turn breaks down to formaldehyde, a known cancer-causing substance.

Company literature also informs us that "a defomer can be added." Other than all of the already mentioned chemicals, one could imagine that other "inerts" of known or unknown toxicity could surface in the future.

A few things come to mind, looking at all of these chemicals. First, whether they are in small or large amounts, the fact they are present, but not accounted for, is reason for concern. Secondly, looking at data provided to residents living near spray sites (see "Technical Reference, herbicides: "Glyphosate", a joint report of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association and the Forestry Canada, Forest Pest Management Institute, 1993), it can be very confusing to figure out which product they are talking about when giving acute or chronic toxicity test results. Sometimes they mention Vision, other times glyphosate, and still at other times a third product (Ezject) is mentioned.

There is very little detailed information provided on chronic toxicity, even if one wanted to trust their reports. Look at examples of cancers that are now showing up in farmers. For 20 to 30 years they have been spraying 2,4-D, and they were assured it is safe. Now, we are seeing more and more evidence that it causes cancers of the blood and lymph systems, among others. Recently studies have shown that farmers also have an increased incidence of prostate cancers. One study I have come across, "Mortality among Forest and Soil Conservationists" in the Archives of Environmental Health March/April 1989, discusses how foresters and forestry workers also had a higher cancer rate, often related to the duration of employment.

There is no mention of immunity problems. Today there are more and more cases of environmental hypersensitivity, often related to exposure to chemicals. The best known example from Nova Scotia is without doubt, the case of the employees at the Camp Hill Hospital, where many are now permanently disabled. Many other people have stories to tell about exposure to pesticides and subsequent hypersensitivity.

Due to the importance of the issue of "inerts", we want to show you a video of a CBC Marketplace program dealing with this topic, which was first shown on December 29, 1992. Please remember that when people go to the store to buy a pesticide, they may not know what the inerts are, but they do have a choice whether or not to spray. We residents in the rural areas don't even have this choice. We insist that we want to have adequate information and the right to choose whether or not the spraying will take place. We want the right to INFORMED CONSENT.

Helga Hoffmann works with the Green Web in Salthsprings, Nova Scotia.

Maine's Mt. Blue Coalition Fights for Park

So you think the northern forests of Maine are an untrammelled wilderness? Here are some facts to ponder. Ninety-eight percent of Maine is "forested," making Maine the most wooded region in the United States, yet over 50% is owned by multinational paper companies. Less than five percent of Maine is owned by the public. The one percent of Maine's land that is in parks and reserve land status remains unprotected from the timber industry.

In 1984, the people of Maine overwhelmingly voted for a referendum outlawing commercial cutting in state parks, but the law excluded all existing deeds and contracts. In 1987, the state of Maine decided stumpage rates to 1160 acres of the 5000 acre Mt. Blue State Park to Timberlands, Inc. for a thirty year period. In a shady exchange, Timberlands gave the state 17 acres on Webb Lake. The State recently reported Timberlands violated the original deed and management plan, yet the fundamental issue remains that timber companies should get out and stay out of Maine's dwindling public lands.

After ignoring the deed since 1972, Timberlands began cutting again in 1992. One hundred people organized to stop the cut in Mt. Blue State Park. Numerous tactics ranging from meetings, lobbying and education to non-violent direct action (blockades, 35 arrests resulting in all charges dismissed) have brought the issue to the forefront of the forestry debate in Maine. The deed expires in 1997, when the state will inherit a scarred and unsightly park checkerboarded with clearcuts. Maine forests are already stripped of their original diversity, thanks to the multinational timber companies.

We call upon the people of Maine, the United States, and the world to help protect the public land remaining in Maine, the paper plantation state.

Natalie Springuel & John Clark
Mt. Blue Coalition
Aerial Photographs Reveal Beauty, Degradation & Sadness of America

Aerial photographer Alex MacLean is one of the true heroes of the Northern Forests. In 1989 his photos of massive industrial clearcuts in northern Maine redefined the terms of the debate over the future of the Northern Forests. Throughout that year, a handful of us had attempted to persuade the Northern Forest Lands Study (NFLS) to address the issue of clearcuts and forest practices. It refused, and industry stonewalled. It was easy for defenders of industrial clearcuts to characterize environmental extremists “and the like.” But when we began showing Alex’s color photos of massive industrial clearcuts in northern Maine, we achieved instant credibility with a shocked and outraged public. Although we failed to persuade the NFLS, or later, the Northern Forest Lands Council, to honestly study forest practices, Alex’s photos put them on the defensive. Today, only the most selfish industry still insist there’s no problem.

The essays, photos, and maps of Nature’s Endangered Species provide an overview of the state of the environment. They illustrate the consequences of overdevelopment and industrialization, and underscore the importance of the Endangered Species Act. The book demonstrates that listing permits us to go beyond existing permits, pollution control, and habitat enhancement programs. Cooperation between local, state, and federal agencies is sometimes slow, and often insufficient, but it is the only way to achieve effective environmental protection. With listing, it is possible truly to require mitigation or even termination of activities that negatively affect salmon. Thus if it can be demonstrated that an industrial polluter or a particular logging operation is destroying salmon habitat, mitigation measures may be LEGALLY required.

Recovery of wild Atlantic salmon is an opportunity to bring about the ecological restoration of New England’s rivers. Listing permits us to go beyond existing regulations and consider restoration of runs in rivers where salmon no longer exist. In many cases this will first require restoration of the river ecosystem itself. This is RESTORE’s agenda: to bring about the ecological restoration of the northern forest landscape. Just as the wolf is a barometer of wildlands quality in forested landscapes, the salmon is a measure of aquatic ecosystem quality. A river that will support salmon will also support many other living creatures such as aquatic invertebrates and plants. If we can successfully restore wild Atlantic salmon over most of its former range in New England, we will be that much closer to bringing about the ecological restoration of the North Woods, enhancing not only the quality of the landscape, but enriching the quality of our lives.

Is there a property “right” more basic than the right to drink unpoisoned water on your own land? Apparently the property rights zealots of the Granite State—the New Hampshire Landowners Alliance (NHLA)—believe that the “right” to spray poisons on your land that taint your neighbor’s drinking water is a greater right.

In August, I learned from neighbors in Stratford Hollow that Boise-Cascade planned an aerial spray of Roundup on its 75-acre plantation. Numerous abutters objected strenuously, pointing out that the spray would enter the hydrologic cycle, affect drinking water, and the health of children, cows and wildlife in the neighborhood.

Boise-Cascade, headquartered in far-away Boise, Idaho, turned a deaf ear to local concerns. They care about corporate profits, not community health. After all, it was their unceasing forest management that created the problem by clearcutting the tract three years ago. Subsequently, BC imported migrant labor, all of whom are medically susceptible species that are not genetically native to the tract. Since plantations are expensive, unnatural ecological nightmares, they require intensive management—read: “herbicide spraying”—so that the seedlings are not outcompeted by sunloving early successional species native to that tract that naturally regenerate right after a disturbance, whether natural, or un-natural.

This ugly story gets an uglier twist from recent legislation—promoted by the ultra-right-wing, “property rights” Farm Bureau—passed by the New Hampshire Legislature that denies towns the right to restrict pesticide use within their borders. The state’s regulations override all town ordinances not in existence prior to August 1993. The whole process for the Stratford Hollow spray operation is suspect. Regulations for notification of abutters and public hearings were ignored by Boise and not enforced by the State.

Not surprisingly, the state’s regulations are pesticide user-friendly. Isn’t it extraordinary that the “Live Free or Die” state which boasts of “local control” that locals have no control over the quality of the water in their own wells?

Early in September, BC thumbed its nose at protesting neighbors and sprayed the tract. Apparently the spray was not a complete success and will be repeated one or more times.

At about this time, I contacted Cheryl Johnson, President of New Hampshire Landowners Alliance (NHLA), because I believed that this was a genuine property rights issue which we could fight together. She said she would take my request to her board. Several weeks passed, and still I had not heard from Cheryl. I called her again, and she said the NHLA board was meeting that week. Several more weeks passed, and still there was silence.

In October at the Northern Forest Lands Council NH Citizens Advisory Committee, I asked Cheryl if NHLA could help my distressed neighbors. “Didn’t you get our letter?” she asked. No, I answered (and as of late December, I still have not received any letter from Cheryl or NHLA).

“No, we have a policy of not getting involved in disputes between landowners,” Cheryl informed me.

So, there you have it. NHLA has poisoned public debate over the protection of the Pemigewasset River. It has misrepresented the activities of the Northern Forest Lands Council. It has spewn forth false, misleading and inflammatory charges against environmental groups. And, in general, it can consistently be found opposing environmental protection efforts—all in the name of “property rights.”

The NHLA will wage war with the environment and the truth to promote the selfish, economic dreams of its members, but won’t lift a finger to protect its neighbors’ children from industrial toxins.

Clearly, the “property rights” zealots from New Hampshire, the NHLA, do not believe that untainted well water is a property right.

*CHANGE REALITY*

Controlling forests 2 and investing more in competing regions than in the Northern Forest region?

This may be the last chance for the timber industry to play a meaningful, constructive role in determining the future of this region, but first it must stop fighting lost battles. Ecologically appropriate forest practices regulations will be enacted with or without industry participation in the process. The public will acquire large tracts of land for newly-established large ecological reserves whether industry likes it or not.

A handful of responsible individuals in the timber industry recognize this; they are clearly making a good faith effort to address ecological reality. But, until a majority of the voices of the timber industry join these progressive leaders, industry risks dealing itself out of the debate over the region’s future.

The only guarantee in life is change. Dramatic changes are occurring. Gone are the days when we could ignore the physical and ecological limits of the natural world. Thus far, timber industry critics, "property rights' zealots, and other opponents have failed to raise a single ecologically valid or constructive objection to the establishment of large reserves.

We need constructive critics who can challenge us to develop strategies that adequately, effectively and equitably address all the thorny ecological, economic, political and social issues confronting us. Such critics help us to identify the roadblocks to achieving our goals; they do not heap obstacle after obstacle in our way in a desperate effort to deny the inevitable.

We believe our vision for the future of the Northern Forests—large publicly-owned ecological reserves, a diverse, locally controlled economy based upon ecologically sustainable activities, and a regional democracy that genuinely respects the needs of current and future generations of all species native to the region—is scientifically sound and ethically compelling. If it is politically unrealistic under the current political regime, then it is time to change such an ecologically unsustainable "political reality."

—Jamie Sayen

"East of Albany, in New York's Hudson River valley, a progression of vegetation advances toward the center of a naturally dying pond in clearly visible concentric circles known as succession belts. The vegetation will eventually consume the pond."

This photo, from Alton MacLean's book Look at the Land, is even more striking in color.
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SUBSCRIBE TO THE FORUM

A one-year subscription to the Forum costs $12 (US) or $20 (Canadian) for six issues.

We will send you a freesie if you can't afford to pay on the condition that you become actively involved in the search for sustainable natural and human communities.

We urge our more affluent subscribers to send us $24 or more to sponsor a freesie.

Please consider becoming a lifetime subscriber with a donation of $1000 or more.
"For forestry to have a future, the future must have a forest." -David Brower

Help Distribute CLEARCUT & Get a Free Copy for Yourself

The publishers of CLEARCUT want to get this extraordinary coffee-table book that documents "the failure of industrial forestry" into the hands of as many community leaders and policy makers as possible. If you are willing to commit to delivering at least five copies of CLEARCUT to local politicians, community leaders and other important opinion molders, Contact:

CLEARCUT  415 771-1102

CLEARCUT: The Tragedy of Industrial Forestry is a 300 page exhibit-format style book that comprehensively documents the destruction wrought by industrial forestry through over 100 stunning, full-page, color-images of some of the most horrific clearcuts in North America. Accompanying this pictorial indictment are over a dozen essays by leading ecologists and activists explaining the myths and failures of today's dominant forest-management practices while outlining ecosystem-based solutions.

Co-published by Sierra Club Books and Earth Island Press and edited by Bill Devall, the book's contributors include David Brower, Chris Maser, Colleen McCrory, Reed Noss, Mitch Lansky, Dave Foreman, & Herb Hammond.

The book's purpose is to serve as an organizing tool for forest activists to highlight local, national, and international problems. Local coalitions of citizens are invited to present CLEARCUT to the press, legislators, public agency officials, timber industry executives, and others who influence forest policy.

Rainforest Action Network, The Sierra Club, and Canada's Future Forest Alliance are joining together in a continent-wide campaign to distribute over 12,000 copies of the book in the first quarter of 1994. Copies of CLEARCUT will be provided at no charge to activists who agree to present the book face to face to community leaders and policymakers.

Activists across Canada and the U.S. are using CLEARCUT to educate the public on the extensive devastation of our forests. We are demanding policymakers adopt a profoundly different set of principles based on respect, integrity, and stability for forests and forest communities. Every person involved in forest preservation is encouraged to participate in this effort to alert the public with images that speak for themselves.