Mainers Vote to Change Current Forest Practices

Pyrrhic Victory for Compact – $6 Million Campaign Fails to Win Majority
Ban Clearcutting’s Strong Surge in Last Ten Days Leaves Clearcutters in Disarray
Major Forestry Reforms Now Inevitable (see pages 6-9)

► Are Vermont Enviros & Industry Cutting a Maine-Style Compact to Save Clearcutting? (see pages 10-14)
► Herbicide Project Appeals to NH Supreme Court (see pages 22-24)
► Virgin Forests Clearcut in New Brunswick (see pages 26-28)
► Environmental & Social Costs of Nova Siberia Natural Gas Plan (see pages 26-28)

"The Homeless and clearcuts are both creations of our own culture, and we’re in denial not only about places that we’ve destroyed, but about lives that we’ve destroyed…"

As another King, Pyrrhus, said after a Third Century B.C. battle: "Another such victory, and we are lost."

Compact: The Last Hurrah

The traditional method of managing forest policy in Maine, controlled by industry and designed to disinform and disenfranchise the public, allowed the destruction of Maine's forests while Mainstream environmental groups acquiesced. The "Compact" is the last hurrah of this failed, discredited, anti-democratic, anti-ecological collaboration. Forest policy by organizations such as Maine Audubon Society that accept money from corporations that degrade forest integrity is a thing of the past.

Industry and its environmental Quaslings and Chamberlainers (Neville, not Joshua) can and will, no doubt, continue reactionary efforts to retain "power" over the process through fraudulent "Compacts". Like the Southern firebrands who threatened to—and ultimately did—secede from the Union over their right to secure liberty via slave ownership, forestry hardliners will fight to the bitter end against the needs of forested ecosystems and the will of the people. And, in the end, like the slaveholding South, these reactionary forces will rain themselves fighting what is politically and ecologically inevitable.

Meanwhile, those elements of the timber industry and the Mainstream environmental community with a conscience and a sense of survival will join the efforts to restore ecosystem integrity, understanding that they can neither co-opt nor control this movement.

Future forest policy will secure ecosystem integrity using a process that exemplifies democratic integrity.

A New Concept of Liberty

The Maine Clearcutting campaign and similar struggles worldwide mark the dawning of an era of ecological sanity. Like Moses, today's actions may not make it all the way to the promised land, but, like Martin Luther King, we have glimpsed it.

In ecological terms, the struggle is about one species re-learning how to live within regional and planetary limits. In political terms, the struggle is over a new relationship between liberty and power.

In 1775 Samuel Johnson trenchantly identified the Achilles heel of the American Revolutionaries' concept of liberty: "Who's it?" he asked, "that we hear the lowest yelps for liberty among the drivers of Negroes?" On the eve of the Civil War, fought to eradicate that blight on American liberty, the Richmond Enquirer wrote with no apparent sense of irony: "Freedom is not possible without slavery."

Are we not hearing the same things today, from defenders of clearcutting and property rights? We are told property rights—including the alleged right to destroy ecosystem integrity, wildlife habitat, and air, water, and soil quality—are sacred above all other rights and liberties. Pseudo-scientists assure us that clearcutting is a "valid silvicultural tool" and that without this "right" the liberty to practice forestry itself is not possible. (Defenders of clearcutting often cite the need to clearcut a once high-graaded stand to "restore" it. Similar logic led the Pentagon to destroy Vietnam villages to "save" them.)

Logically the right to pollute is sacred; the community—via governmental regulations—has no right to limit the polluters' "rights". They are silent on their responsibilities.

Overlooked in this historic debate over negative vs. positive liberties is a third "liberty"—the liberty of evolution and ecological integrity. Human liberties, whether of the positive or the negative variety, are limited by the laws of nature and physics. We don't have to like this state of affairs, but we are compelled to live within the constraints we have been given. And, as the American Revolutionaries understood that they could neither co-opt nor control this movement, so we must learn to live with our ecological constraints and make the best of them.

J. McMahon writes: "As Lincoln conceived it, power was the protector of liberty, not its enemy—except to the liberty of those who wished to do as they pleased with the product of other men's labor."

A few lines later, he adds: "Negative liberty is vulnerable to power; positive liberty is a form of power." (page 137)

More than a century later, the United States is still waging with these issues. While most people believe in a balance between negative liberty (government does not have the right to intrude on our rights) and positive liberty (government has the right and obligation to assure fair opportunities for all), there is a shrill minority that rejects any notion of positive liberty. These people, exalting tendencies to view all regulations as evil, by their logic, the "right" to pollute is sacred; the community—via governmental regulations—has no right to limit the polluters' "rights". They are silent on their responsibilities.

Paradoxically, when we accept the challenge to live within ecological limits and to respect the needs and rights of our non-human relatives, we are truly liberated, just as the slave holder's soul was liberated by the Emancipation of the slaves. As Gary Lawless observes in an interview in this issue (see pages 18-21), by speaking truth to power, by respecting and defending the land and the beings that inhabit the land, we are being true to ourselves. What greater liberty could we desire?

The Clearcutting campaign did not begin with the signature gathering a year ago. It did not end with the vote on November 5. The movement toward ecological sanity— which the Ban Clearcutting epitomizes—increasingly will dominate all future debates about liberty and power. The power of Nature dwarfs all forms of human power. Enduring liberty for humans is possible only when we embrace and abide by that reality.

That's when the fun begins.

—Jamie Sayers
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Over seven million people visited the White Mountain National Forest (WMNF) last year. Many of these people walked, hiked, skied, and snowmobiled through this spectacular public reserve. Congress may have to pay for the privilege.

During the past session, the U.S. Congress authorized a three-year pilot plan to charge user fees for hikers, snowmobilers, cross-country skiers, and other recreational users at as many as 200 federal forests, parks, and other reserves across the country. The WMNF volunteered to be a pilot site. According to WMNF recreation manager David Pratt, the 1996 budget for the forest is $9.3 million and is expected to drop to $7.6 million in 1997. If the fee program is implemented, the WMNF will be allowed to keep 80 percent of the revenues with the remaining 20 percent distributed among other pilot sites in the region.

While recreationists will be forced to pay to use our public lands, the Forest Service will continue to subsidize logging—including clearcutting—in the White Mountain National Forest. A General Accounting Office (GAO) report, titled Forest Service: Distribution of Timber Sales Receipts: Fiscal Years 1992-94, the WMNF lost an average of $1,023,899.00 a year between 1992 and 1994 on its timber program. Nationally, the Forest Service timber program lost an average of $330 million per year during the same time period. The Forest Service uses our tax money to pay for this subsidy to the logging industry.

Despite the erosion of the WMNF recreation budget, the Forest Service continues to propose and implement money-losing timber sales. A prime example is the proposed Kearsarge North Timber Sale. Located in the towns of Bartlett, Chatham, and Jackson, New Hampshire, the Kearsarge North Timber Sale would log 6.8 million board feet of timber from approximately 1,700 acres, including 200 acres of clearcuts. Using the loss per board foot calculated by the GAO, the WMNF will lose over $350,000 on this timber sale, money that is desperately needed to improve recreation facilities within the National Forest.

Before the Forest Service starts charging hikers, snowmobilers, and other recreational users to enjoy our public lands, they should end the expensive below-cost timber program. It seems ironic that the Forest Service is intent on subsidizing the destruction of our public lands while charging visitors to see them.

What You Can Do
Write to Donna Hepp and urge her to halt the below-cost timber program before she institutes any recreation fee program:
Donna Hepp, Forest Supervisor
White Mountain National Forest
719 Main Street
Laconia, NH 03246

David Carle is the Associate Executive Director of RESTORE: The North Woods.
A Homecoming for Wolves in the Northern Forest

by Kathleen H. Fitzgerald

Five hundred people convened in Albany, NY from 14-16 November 1996 for the Wolves of America conference sponsored by Defenders of Wildlife. During the conference participants heard detailed presentations from biologists involved in reintroducing wolves in Yellowstone and Idaho, passionate pleas from activists lobbying for wolf reintroduction in Colorado, debates on de-listing the wolf from the Endangered Species list, descriptions of wolf behavior, and success stories of natural re- colonization in Michigan and Wisconsin. The underlying theme of the entire gathering was the proposed reintroduction of wolves into the Adirondack State Park, and there was an overwhelming amount of support for the idea.

The Eastern Timber Wolf, a Gray Wolf subspecies, Canis lupus lycaon, once roamed the Great Northern Forest to the banks of the Great Lakes, through southeastern Canada to the Hudson Bay. The first New World bounty was set by the Massachusetts Bay Company in 1630 and included a devastating slaughter of wolves. For the next two and a half centuries wolves were shot, trapped, poisoned, blown up and burned. The last known wolf in New York was killed in 1897, and they disappeared from Maine by 1909. Today, Canis lupus lycaon survives in only three percent of its historic range in the United States in northern Minnesota, northern Wisconsin, and Michigan's Upper Peninsula.

Wolf Restoration in Adirondacks

Christine Schadler of the University of New Hampshire described the natural re- colonization of wolves in Michigan. Presenters at the conference generally agreed that wolves probably could not return to the Adirondacks on their own. One wolf may make its way across the St. Lawrence River, but the probability of a pack of wolves doing so is slim. Moreover, wolf populations in Canada are being depleted through habitat destruction and hunting, thus making natural re- colonization of the Adirondacks even less probable.

The 1992 Recovery Plan for the Eastern Timber Wolf identified a few of the prerequisites to bringing wolves back to the Northeast region and maintaining a viable population:

- Large tracts of wild land with low human population density, minimal accessibility and low road density;
- Abundant wild prey;
- Public support.

Presenters at the conference were confident that the Adirondacks provided enough wild land and prey for wolves. They stressed the need for education and outreach in order to increase awareness and acceptance of wolves.

Dennis A. Hosack of Defenders of Wildlife conducted a preliminary biological assessment of the Adirondacks and found that the road density within the park is approximately 45 km/km² and the area supports approximately 5.5 humans/km². It has been suggested that to maintain a viable population of wolves, an area needs to have less than 58 km² of maintained roads and fewer than 8 humans/km². Hosack argued that with a density of 3.25 white tail deer/km² and a Beaver population that has increased sharply in recent decades, there is a sufficient prey base for wolves. Using a known relationship between wolf density and prey biomass availability, Hosack predicted that the Adirondack State Park could support approximately 155 wolves.

Alan Hicks of the NYDEC disagreed with Hosack's conclusion that there is enough prey available in the Park. Hicks recalled numerous deer camps through the Park where hunters have been unsuccessful in killing any deer for years and said the DEC is not taking a position on the reintroduction proposal. An Environmental Impact Statement would resolve these questions.

Reintroduction in Yellowstone & Idaho

Biologists from the West clearly described the reintroduction procedures employed in Yellowstone and Idaho. For those conference participants who thought wolves were merely caught and released, they were amazed that reintroduction is "hands-on." After being darted, injected with sedatives, relocated, implanted with computer chips, and held captive for significant periods of time, the wolves we introduce today are a far cry from the wolves we recklessly obliterated years ago. Dr. John Theberge, a biologist studying Ontario's Algonquin wolves, challenged attendees to recognize the difference between a wild pack of wolves and a pack merely surviving. Theberge wrote: "Wolves currently are re-inhabiting various human settled places in the US and Europe. They may persist numerically, but if heavily persecuted may be forced to adopt both behaviorally and genetically. Maintaining them represents a different level of conservation success than the reintroduction and persistence of a truly wild population, whose natural selection continues to shape gene pools and behavior. Do people want a made-by-humans wolf to persist, to just hang on in the Adirondacks, or one made by natural selection?"

Challenges

Yellowstone and Idaho were referred to as successful restoration projects. This begs the question of how do we judge success, in quantity or quality of wolves? Because Yellowstone was a "success," we have reason to believe that reintroduction in the Adirondacks could be a success. Defenders of Wildlife's Hank Fisher said Yellowstone should not be used as a model because it cost too much, took too much time, and today there are still people with great antipathy for the wolf. We should learn from their mistakes.

Carnivore conservation is perhaps the greatest challenge facing wildlife advocates today. It is one we can meet successfully only with the cooperation of diverse organizations, biologists and the general public. It is one we must meet with humility, respect and sacrifice. It is time to bring the wolf back.

Mike DiMunno of the Adirondack Council said, "Wolf reintroduction is right for the wolf, it's right for the Park and it's right for the people." Philip J. Higdon of the Residents' Committee to Protect the Adirondacks said the Committee supports a feasibility study. With a supportive and energetic group attending the conference, it was easy to get caught up with the thrilling idea of hearing wolves in the Adirondacks. Before seeking a good reintroduction field crew, however, we must explore some difficult issues and questions.

The 1992 USFWS Recovery Plan for the Eastern Timber Wolf identified the Adirondacks, eastern Maine, northwestern Maine and adjacent New Hampshire as sites for potential wolf recovery. Defenders of Wildlife announced at the conference their intent to contribute money in support of a feasibility study for the Adirondacks. RESTORE: The North Woods is petitioning for a USFWS Northern Forest wolf restoration EIS.

Wildlands proponents would remind us that we should not study the Adirondacks alone, not just part of New Hampshire and Maine. Studies should extend through Vermont and southeastern Canada. Wolves will not stop at the Vermont border nor will they hurl themselves across the state into the study area of New Hampshire; thus an EIS should be conducted for the entire Northern Forest region.

Mike Phillips, of the Yellowstone Center for Resources, cited a Russian proverb, "A wolf is kept fed by its feet." We must provide enough space for wolves to be kept fed by their feet. Wolves may be able to survive within the current landscape, but as Michael Kellett of RESTORE: The North Woods pointed out, humans can survive in slums. Just because a species can survive does not mean it is in the best available conditions. Whether or not
The $1.75 billion bond issue comes at good news for Adirondack Park half-frogs.

The current landscape provides suitable habitat, habitat integrity is not guaranteed. Wildlands in the East are being rapidly lost due to development, logging, road-building, and mining. In order to secure viable populations of wolves and other wide-ranging species and maintain evolutionary processes, large wild areas must be reconnected and permanently protected. By not addressing these long-term priorities, people are given the impression that wolves can co-exist with our habits of growth and consumption; over the long-term they can not.

Yellowstone and the Adirondacks share some vulnerabilities—they are both geologically inclined habitat. In fact, the Adirondack Park could be seen as an archipelago holding within its boundaries 16 Wilderness Areas and 16 Wild Forests. Wolves will inevitably leave the political boundaries of the Adirondacks as they have in Yellowstone. The short-term solution provided thus far in Yellowstone National Park is darting and drugging wolves and then bringing them back into the park, or killing them if they have infringed on people's property. As prominent wolf biologist David Mech said, "We control bears, we control lots of species—we need to control wolves." Western biologists warned conference attendees that wolves would have to be killed, and we need to "toughen up" and accept this reality.

Wolves Need Wildlands

Perhaps this will be the short-term reality, if we reintroduce wolves under the "experimental non-essential" designation to yet another non-essential region of our country—Lake Champlain. Wolves are not the only large predators that can be found in this area; bears, coyotes, and bobcats are all present. It is crucial to reintroduce wolves into the ecosystem to help control populations of these large predators.

The bond act's major benefits to the Adirondacks are:

- The Champlain: $15 million of the $790 million set aside for Clean Water projects will go to removing phosphorus from Lake Champlain. Phosphorus promotes weed growth, blocks sunlight, and depletes oxygen. Some bays of the lake are as polluted today as Lake Erie was in the 1970s when it was considered dead. The two

main contributors of phosphorus to the lake are municipal sewage treatment systems and erosion-related runoff from farm fields and developed areas (parking lots, roads, new construction, etc.).

- Other Local Clean Water Projects: Hudson River and H.R. Estuary ($25 million) to be spent according to the state's plan.

- Open Space: The $150 million set aside for land acquisition statewide is the only pot of money available this year for the purchase of conservation easements on timberland in the Adirondack Park (unlike the Environmental Protection Fund, which cannot be used for easements in 1996 and early 1997 because the Legislature did not approve any easement purchases from the fund in July). It can also be used for the purchase of Forest Service land as part of the Clean Water category also, and must be tied to watershed protection. Every square inch of the Adirondack Park would qualify.

Another $100 million would go to the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation for statewide Parks projects.

Essex County Landfill: As part of a $175 million solid waste program, Essex County will receive financial assistance in getting out from under its multi-million dollar debt at the county landfill without importing trash into the Park. Money spent solving Essex County's problem must help solve regional solid waste disposal difficulties, inside the borders of the Park.

Rural and Adirondack Landfills: Roughly $50 million would be set aside to reinvigorate the 75 percent grant/25 percent zero-interest loan program set up under the Cuomo Administration to help communities close their old, unlined landfills. The money is ultimately aimed at protecting underground drinking water supplies and preventing the contamination of cropland and streams.

Safe Drinking Water: As part of the $355 million Safe Drinking Water program, communities that are now required to treat and filter surface waters used for drinking supplies (to do drill wells) can qualify for grants to meet the new standards set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The $1.75 billion bond issue comes at good news for Adirondack Park half-frogs. It is time to bring the wolf back. It is time to bring the wolf back.
Clearecutting Referendum

Public Wants End to Destruction of Maine Woods

by Jim St. Pierre

After a year-long race the results of the semi-finals are in: Question 2A, the citizens' initiative Ban Clearecutting scored 29.3%, Question 2B, the so-called Compact for Maine's Forest, pulled 47.4%. Question 2C the do-nothing choice got 23.3%. Since none received a majority, the Forest Compact will have to go to another statewide vote in 1997.

For weeks, advocates took to the air and to the airwaves to bolster their vote totals. The Compact, with the backing of the state, advertised heavily - but others stepped in to show that the Compact had no support. The 30-second radio and television spots were all directed at convincing voters that the Forest Compact is likely to continue to erode.

Maine voters soundly rejected logging operations such as this clearcut south of First West Branch Pond. However, massive timber industry spending and an effective scare campaign confused voters enough to delay ultimate resolution of the clearecutting crisis in Maine. Photo by Barbara Shamblin.

Timber Industry Leader's Myths Clarified

On November 3, 1996 Maine Public TV aired a debate on the Clearecutting Referendum. Proponents of the so-called Compact (C) tied Governor Angus King and Roger Milliken, president of Baskahegan Company which owns 108,000 acres in Maine. Milliken formerly served on the Board of the Natural Resources Council of Maine, and now sits on the Board of The Nature Conservancy of Maine.

During the November 3 debate, Milliken made several statements that are either untrue, or fall apart under closer scrutiny. The Forum offers this reality check.

Milliken Myth #1

Roger Milliken (during November 3 TV debate): The statistics that are being used here are misleading. Basically, the harvest levels in Maine have remained fairly constant over time. What changes is the growth rate of the forest, so you have periods where it grows really well, it puts on a lot of growth as was happening in the '50s and '60. Then we had the sprue budworm come, and it had a dramatic impact on growth rates in the north of the state where the spruce-fir resource is. The harvest remained the same, and right now the harvest is exceeding the growth. Indications are that we have hit the bottom; the forest is beginning to grow out of that and again in the early years of the next century growth will be exceeding harvest again. So partly it's a question of the time frame that you look at.

Mitch Lansky: During the heavy cutting and sprue budworm outbreak earlier this century, there was a decline in inventory. The inventory did bounce back, but how much of today's managers do we depend on the same method of forest renewal that was used then. After 1919, the annual cut declined. Lumbermen moved west and south to exploit other states. Transportation networks made those resources more available. Wood for fuel, construction, and leather tanning was replaced by fossil fuels, steel and concrete, and other processes. And then came the Great Depression, which collapsed demand for consumer goods for more than a decade.

The cut now is greater than it has ever been. In 1959, when the inventory was booming back, cut was 50% lower than now, but growth was 40% higher. The cut of spruce from 1982-1993 was triple the growth. Although if appears to be bouncing back in smaller diameters (34% of all trees 1-3 inches in diameter are balsam fir, spruce is not (only 6% of all trees 1-3 inches are red spruce).

Is industry going to save the forest with another depression? Is the sprue budworm going to ignore all the young fir coming up from past heavy cuts? Does Milliken believe that we can sustain the current unprecedented overcutting?

Milliken Myth #2

Roger Milliken (on impact of 2A on Baskahegan lands): "Many of those sites don't reach the numerical threshold in their bill so basically we wouldn't be able to harvest them at all . . . It would easily cut our harvest by 60% . . ."

Mitch Lansky: Before the heavy cutting and sprue budworm outbreak earlier this century, there was a decline in inventory. The inventory did bounce back, but how much of today's managers do we depend on the same method of forest renewal that was used then. After 1919, the annual cut declined. Lumbermen moved west and south to exploit other states. Transportation networks made those resources more available. Wood for fuel, construction, and leather-tanning was replaced by fossil fuels, steel and concrete, and other processes. And then came the Great Depression, which collapsed demand for consumer goods for more than a decade.

The cut now is greater than it has ever been. In 1959, when the inventory was booming back, cut was 50% lower than now, but growth was 40% higher. The cut of spruce from 1982-1993 was triple the growth. Although if appears to be bouncing back in smaller diameters (34% of all trees 1-3 inches in diameter are balsam fir, spruce is not (only 6% of all trees 1-3 inches are red spruce).

Is industry going to save the forest with another depression? Is the sprue budworm going to ignore all the young fir coming up from past heavy cuts? Does Milliken believe that we can sustain the current unprecedented overcutting?

Milliken Myth #3

Roger Milliken (on impact of 2A on Baskahegan lands): "Many of those sites don't reach the numerical threshold in their bill so basically we wouldn't be able to harvest them at all . . . It would easily cut our harvest by 60% . . ."

Mitch Lansky: Before the heavy cutting and sprue budworm outbreak earlier this century, there was a decline in inventory. The inventory did bounce back, but how much of today's managers do we depend on the same method of forest renewal that was used then. After 1919, the annual cut declined. Lumbermen moved west and south to exploit other states. Transportation networks made those resources more available. Wood for fuel, construction, and leather-tanning was replaced by fossil fuels, steel and concrete, and other processes. And then came the Great Depression, which collapsed demand for consumer goods for more than a decade.

The cut now is greater than it has ever been. In 1959, when the inventory was booming back, cut was 50% lower than now, but growth was 40% higher. The cut of spruce from 1982-1993 was triple the growth. Although if appears to be bouncing back in smaller diameters (34% of all trees 1-3 inches in diameter are balsam fir, spruce is not (only 6% of all trees 1-3 inches are red spruce).

Is industry going to save the forest with another depression? Is the sprue budworm going to ignore all the young fir coming up from past heavy cuts? Does Milliken believe that we can sustain the current unprecedented overcutting?

Milliken Myth #4

Roger Milliken (during November 3 TV debate): "Look, Roger Milliken: 'I haven't spent $6 million on advertising.'

Forum Response: According to the Campaign Finance Reports filed at the Secretary of State's Office and the Ethics Committee by the Citizens for a Healthy Economy and Forest (CHEF), Roger Milliken contributed $100 cash to CHEF on May 1, 1996. His company, Baskahegan, contributed $4,496.94 in "in-kind contributions" (staff time, office expenses, and related travel) to CHEF between January 1, 1996 and October 24, 1996. While Milliken's personal and corporate donations pale in comparison to the $874,638 contributed by Bowater, they are in excess of a "peny."
Letter from Maine

Hey, Angus, Is This How a Petard Is Supposed to Work?

By William Butler

The following indecisive November 5th referendum against clearcutting, the questions are:

1) Who won, and?
2) What next?

A rare chance to hear how the Governor and the paper industry assessed the American Pulpwood Association's forestry forum, two days after the election. What may have been planned as a victory rally emerged as a post mortem analysis with four speakers and pointed questions from the floor on what went wrong—spending six million dollars, how could we miss? Miss they did, failing to get more than 50% of the vote and sending their measure meant to thwart the Ban-Clearcutting initiative back to the voters at a time uncertain.

Rather than claiming to have accomplished their purpose, the discussion most certainly was of a defeat, with assignments of blame, recriminations, and repeated, unanswered, demands to try again in a different way.

That the first speaker, Matt Hancock, of a family-owned sawmill business, is one who opposed the industry's views but appreciated their natural resources Council of Maine-Maine Audubon—and the like's Compact is the first sign of the weakness that led to a vote divided 30% for and 70% against the initiative to Ban Clearcutting, 47% for the industry's competing measure—the so-called "Compact," and 23% for the "none-of-the-above" option required by Maine's constitution. Hancock acknowledged that the Forest Products Council supported the Compact (Question 2B on the ballot) 22-6. As we heard later in the evening, one of those 6 opposed were bigger players than most.

Describing the Compact as the work of a single segment of the industry which cut a deal with the Governor, Hancock concluded, "...as much or as little respect as you may have for the Governor." Proclaiming that the initiative failed because of the Governor's "...absolute sovereignty—the Question 2C people. He warned, "Never should our industry sit down with government without the full support of all." Hancock, who runs the front-group Professional Logging Contractors of Maine admitted right off that his group does not include most Maine woods contractors, and not even a majority of those present. Recognizing that most people want to see professional performance "at the stump," he plans to implement the American Forest & Paper Association's "Sustainable Forest Initiative," and predicts a voluntary sustainability audit is under way, Question 2B or not. Strangely, he sounded that the national SFI convention drew four or five of his tame contractors, but there was no industry attendance.

Chuck Godzik, Forest Commissioner, weighed in with his (and the King administration's) verdict, after an eight month, three-way race, he does not accept that the public forestry concerns were voiced in the initiative. "...to announce practices not limited to the minimum standards," asked if the Governor had a full appreciation of the position of the industry group, he responded, "No doubt, but he also has a feeling for those outside of industry," the governor, he said, understood the division as elements of the forest community broke away from the compact (2B), but when King sees 30% voting for the "extreme" proposals, he is now looking to a "broad audience, one that 2B did not recognize."

John Cashwell, manager of the Pignee Hein's million acres and previous forest commissioner, was out of sorts in protesting that I was taking note of the proceedings, but recovered so as to be the most forthright of the four. The vote Johns that the status quo is not acceptable, rate is economic disaster; the voters were informed, much informed, and misguided, especially, that, "People are just as confused as when we started, so we have done nothing but enrich radio, TV, and newspaper stations.

Where next—"The lights on attracted hundreds of thousands, if not millions—the forest community is divided on minutiae—I expect more..." John came up with a striking image of the forest ownership from away—his vision for the opposition from away—we have the next few months to get to every home....

John came up with a striking image in comparing the industry's squabbling to the pecking frenzy in a flock of turkeys when one, or two. His words were, "We could stand bully-to-bully in a circle, not back-to-back." Considering John's stately profile, this picture would require a big canvas. In the question interval, he continued to be responsive, asked how to get the 2B and 2C voters together, he invoked getting legal opinions from the Attorney General, or the Court, but acknowledged how hard it is to get a representative group to agree on reconciling 2B and 2C. Admitting that some legislators think they could rewrite the present forest practice law, he ventured that, "Question 2B is not likely to be alone on the November (1997) ballot."

While all the speakers were pressed to explain the failures in the Maine Forest Products Council's engineering of the election, Cashwell picked the Governor's calling the special legislative session to meet his initiative that precipitated not only the 2B alternative, but the unexpected 2C campaign. Laying the blame for this strategic misfire, he said only one person can call a special session, and the Governor believed this was the right way. Cashwell warned that it "...personally was opposed to the special session—I'd rather stand in front of a freight train than go to the legislature. "Now we have a new set of cards and a new thing on the table." Malcolm French, a forester for Mary Adams and the 2C faction, put it this way, "We have the Governor to thank for it." Dan Levesque, son of "a big sawmiller, cautioned, "The governor, yes, but we must be careful—we will need him." As Henry Mannen wrote of American political oratory, this is the best stuff. I wrote of the earlier American Pulpwood forum where they stewed over the public's effrontery in proposing to set forest policy; this was even better. I note there was no allusion to what The New York Times called the "middle-of-the-road" environment, nor did one mention Maine Audubon. What you find in the middle of the road is run-over animals and a yellow stripe.

Major Land Ownership in the State of Maine

November 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Owner</th>
<th>Headquarters</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowater Inc. (Great Northern Paper)</td>
<td>Greenville, SC</td>
<td>2,032,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Paper Company</td>
<td>Purchase, NY</td>
<td>944,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Islands Land Company (Pignee Hein)</td>
<td>Bangor, ME</td>
<td>941,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappi Ltd. (S.D. Warren Company)</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>908,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentiss &amp; Carlisle Management Company</td>
<td>Bangor, ME</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Maine</td>
<td>Augusta, ME</td>
<td>865,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion International Corporation</td>
<td>Stanford, CT</td>
<td>769,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D. Irving Ltd.</td>
<td>St. John, NB</td>
<td>575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meat Corporation</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>510,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-Pacific Corporation</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber Resources Corporation</td>
<td>Edison, NJ</td>
<td>438,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Timber Resource Group</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>255,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noranda Forest (Friser Paper)</td>
<td>Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>216,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>213,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James River Corp. (Diamond Occidental)</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>148,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peribonca Nation</td>
<td>Old Town, ME</td>
<td>123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot-Malequey Tribe</td>
<td>Indian Twp., ME</td>
<td>138,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doum Timberlands</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>109,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baskabege Company (Milliken Family)</td>
<td>Falmouth, ME</td>
<td>108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stetson Timberlands</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>106,662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideal Gift for New England Wildlands Lover

Dean B. Bennett, a professor at the University of Maine at Farmington has just published The Forgotten Nature of New England: The Search for Traces of the Original Wilderness, (Down East Books, $17.95 pap). In this handsome book—the ideal gift for a New England wild lands lover.

Although this could be a depressing book because so little of the original wilderness remains, Bennett sees the remaining vestiges of wilderness as helping to conserve hope for a future. He concludes with these thoughts; "Hope is the human emotion behind the theme of this book. It was written with the hope that the nature of the New England wilderness will not be forgotten, that its remnants will be preserved, and that all those who visit these remaining traces of wilderness, or simply know about them, will be more caring of this planet and the future of all species."
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The Forestry Referendum and Where We Go from Here

by Mitch Lamky

A version of this article will appear in Maine Policy Review of the Margaret Chase Smith Center for Policy Studies of the University of Maine.

What Happened?

An issue: A 1986 poll conducted by the Forests for the Future Program asked Maine people what they considered the two most important problems they faced. Only 4/10 of 1% of the respondents "either explicitly used the word 'forests' or its synonyms or mentioned forest-associated industry in their replies." The authors commented (in surprise), "Apparently, forest-related concerns are not foremost in people's minds..." The report also discovered that in this forest-dominated state, the public was "often poorly informed about the forest." The referendum has changed at least half of these problems. Forestry is now an issue in people's minds in Maine.

Forestry was not a major public issue before because conflicts were usually settled by key insiders. Industry could influence policy through: sending PAC money to legislators, getting former industry representatives appointed to key government posts, flooding hearings with industry employees, or making sure committees had industry representation. With these tactics, conflicts could often lead to benefits, such as tax breaks.

The Ban Clearcut referendum bypassed industry's traditional strategies. Industry representatives could no longer simply negotiate with key individuals; they now had to convince the majority of the public. Company officials decided to spend as much money as needed to accomplish the new task. And they did. But this massive expenditure in public relations meant that forestry has finally become a high-profile public issue.

A mandate: Despite the Ban Clearcut referendum's shortcomings of lack of money, expertise, or organizational support, early polls showed surprising support. Industry's first response was denial of any problems. This was followed by anger at the impudence of the Greens. After reading the polls, however, industry engaged in negotiation—not with the organizers of the Ban Clearcutting referendum, but with more traditional conservation groups. Ironically, these reactions mirror the first three stages that people go through as they deal with death. The last two, according to Elizabeth Kubler-Ross, are depression and then acceptance.

The forestry referendum can be interpreted as a public mandate for change. It was clearly not a Green Party vote. Although the Green Party only got 4% of the vote for their senate candidate, the 2A option got nearly 30%. This, despite more than $6 million spent to whip up a frenzy of fear and loathing in the public over the "Drastic Green Forestry Ban." That so many people would vote for 2A, according to Thomas Urquhart, among others, has correctly stated that the NFSA doesn't really do anything. Perhaps that's why Maine Audubon Society supported it. Maine Audubon has long had a policy of accepting money from the timber industry, and there are usually industry representatives on its board.

Confusion: Despite all the advertisements and debates, the public is still not well informed on forestry issues—but people are better informed than they were a year ago. At least they know that there has been a lot of clearcutting in the past. I would estimate that a tiny fraction of 1% of all voters have actually read, let alone understood, the Forest Practices Act, the Ban Clearcut Referendum, or the Compact. Much of the debate was in TV sound bites that were hardly more enlightening than a catalogue of "infor- mal fallacies" ("attacking the person", "attacking the authority", "bad evidence", irrelevant analogies, etc.).

Distrust: One of the results of the campaign is residual anger and distrust. Because of the Compact, there are serious divisions not only among environmentalists, but also in the forest products industry. Indeed, one lumber company announced that different divisions within the company were going to support different referendum options.

Chaos: Industry expenditures on the Compact set record. There was an impressive line-up of organizations in support, including paper companies, major conservation groups, the Maine Forest Service, and every daily newspaper in the state. Yet the Compact still did not win a majority of the votes. Because of this, many issues are left hanging in the air.

Some legislators have already announced that they will introduce forestry legislation. Many who are new to the Compact, such as the resource educator, the ecological reins, or the study on liquidation cutting, could easily be enacted as separate legislation. But one wonders why they had to be in a Compact in the first place.

Large landowners have agreed to abide by the new clearcutting rules regardless of whether the Compact passes or not. The audit program is voluntary and will, supposedly be enacted regardless of legislative backing. Since the Compact refers to actions to be taken by certain dates, and since these dates will have passed by next November, and since it is possible that the wording of the Compact can be amended, there may be legal obstacles to its passage.

Where Do We Go From Here?

We?: When Casper asked his Indian guide the same question, the response was "What do you mean 'we' White Man?" Not everyone wants changes in forest policy. It is clear that a certain element of the public will argue for the sacred right of property owners to do anything they want to their land, regardless of the impact these actions might have on the rights of other prop-
ery owners or the rights of the community. Some of those making such an argument happen to be large contractors who rely on liquidation cutting for part of their income. The degree to which they defend the Forest Practices Act indicates the degree to which they think the FPA is the equivalent of no regulation at all.

Because of the level of distrust, it may be difficult to forge new alliances (or keep old ones). Although some of the signatories to the Compact may be tempted to opt out and connect to other options, this would be done at the risk of breeding greater distrust. If these organizations want to retain their membership, they cannot hide their time until the next election. They must show some credible progress towards the Compact, or they will be attacked from many sides.

Steps: Assuming a genuine desire to come up with a better forestry policy, what steps should be taken?

1) Assess the situation. There are a number of recent documents concerning forest statistics, forest practices, and biodiversity that can give us a shared body of facts. Having a shared body of facts, however, does not guarantee a shared interpretation. Facts exist in contexts, which can be manipulated. This is called "spin control." Doublespeak, we will have some lively debates on what the figures mean.

2) Define the issues. If the issue is "sustainable forest management," for example, we need to determine just what we are sustaining, where, for how long, and for whose benefit. If the issue sounds narrowly defined, then comprehensive solutions that take into account silvicultural, ecological, and social issues will not result. Problems not dealt with will continue to fester.

3) Define the problems. My own reading of the available data shows that there are problems, either statewide or on a regional basis, in the following areas:

Silvicultural. This includes:

- overcutting (cut more than growth),
- clearcutting (where other options could be viable),
- understocking (overstocked with insufficient stocking to make adequate use of the growing space),
- high grading (shift from high-grade to low-grade species and trees), and
- stand damage (damage to soil and residual trees).

Ecological. This includes:

- simplification (loss of key species or of diversity in a stand),
- fragmentation (chopping up habitat so that it may not be adequate for viable populations, migration, or dispersal),
- conversion (drastic change in habitat type),
- invasions (of exotic species),
- pollution (of air, soil, and water),
- instability (lowered resistance to disturbances—such as spruce budworm—or resilience from disturbances)

Social/Political. This includes:

- job loss (in the woods and in the mills),
- revenue loss (profits, jobs, and value-added going out of state),
- tax loss (lowered percentage of General Fund from corporate income tax or lower revenues from corporate property tax),
- ownership changes (lowered commitment to communities, more non-strategic lands spun off and liquidated),
- economic domination (artificially low purchase prices for wood and payments for wood labor due to oligopoly and vertical integration), and
- political domination (leverage over the state and local political processes due to economic domination).

4) Define the goals. Good definition of the problems is key to good definition of goals. For example, based on the silvicultural problems listed, the solutions would be to:

- cut less than growth,
- have a presumption against clearcutting,
- maintain adequate stocking (unless there is good reason not to),
- increase forest quality, and
- do less stand damage.

Supporters of the Compact may think that such goals are implicit in the Audit program. If so, these goals were buried in 27 pages and were not well communicated to the public. And the public was not reassured by the proposed process to reach these goals either.

5) Set up a process to reach the goals. In the past decade we have had a number of processes that have failed to adequately address the issues, let alone solve them. The Forests for the Future Program, the Northern Forest Lands Council, and the Maine Council on Sustainable Forest Management have all been appointed, "balanced" committees (i.e., with a strong industry presence) with limited agendas. They also had limited impact.

The Forest Practices Act promised to "promote a healthy and sustainable forest." Much of this bill was created by an Environmental/Industrial Forum—a group (similar to the Compact) with representatives from industry, environmental organizations, government, and academia. The bill did not get much enthusiastic support from those outside the inside groups. It created extremely complicated rules about the distribution of clearcuts, but it didn't even come close to addressing the most pressing problems—which is why we are still struggling over them.

For a process to work, therefore, the public must feel represented—without industry domination—and pressing issues must really be dealt with head on. The success of any process will depend on the extent to which the public is interested and involved. If the public loses interest, the process will revert to an insider operation once again. I believe that the public would prefer to vote on legislation that offers clear goals and a believable process to reach those goals than another "overly complicated" set of pre-determined rules.

Conclusion

We now have more of what Charles Atlas used to call "dynamic tension" in the political process. More people from more perspectives are paying attention to forest policy. It is possible to harness this tension as a source of power to improve our forests by striving to be broader in scope. Or, this tension can be used to further Balkanize forestry policies. Given the current levels of distrust in the state, the latter possibility would not be difficult to achieve.

Improving forest management could be a win/win situation for the public and industry. How could it hurt industry to improve the productivity and quality of its forests? Some debates concluded that the referendum was not really about improved forest management; it was about power. Those who have power will not willingly relinquish it. There should be some interesting struggles in the coming months. Stay tuned.

Chuck Gadzik is director of the Maine Forest Service. Previously, he served as Roger Milliken's forester at巴斯克栾公司。Although Gadzik has been around a long time, and there have been predictions of a serious shortfall of spruce and fir for the past decade from state studies, academia, and informed citizens, when the results of the 1995 US Forest Service Inventory of Maine showed that clearcutting had reduced the state's spruce-fir acreage from 7.7 million acres in 1982 to 6 million acres in 1995, he was professed surprise. In a Portland Press Herald article on October 29, toe read: "Gadzik said the loss of spruce and fir took him by surprise. 'It's potentially a number that could change long-term projections (about timber supplies),' he said. However, Gadzik suggested the spruce-fir forest could be brought back through herbicide spraying..."
Vermont Enviros & Industry Seek Maine-Style Compact?

As we head to press, it appears that several Vermont environmental groups have been approached by four industry foresters to work out agreement on regulation of liquidation cutting. It is unclear whether this will be an attempt to forge a Maine-style compact or to reach accord on the broad outlines of an agreement for later legislative tinkering. The environmental groups involved include the Vermont Natural Resources Council, Sierra Club, and Vermont Audubon.

Landwest forester Richard Carbonetti, wood procurement forester Peter Condaxis and Bill Samal, and Bell-Gates' lumber/Jonathan Wood authored the proposed "heavy cutting legislation." It proposes to define forestry as activities in harmony with Current Use guidelines and US Forest Service Silvicultural guides. Under the agreement, "forestry" would be shielded from further examination and regulation. At present, the proposal suggests 50 acre limits on clearcuts with buffers of roughly 100 feet between cuts.

"The key," says the latest draft of this plan, "is to minimize any new encumbrances on forestry while dramatically increasing the scrutiny placed on non-forestry actions implemented in Vermont's woodlands." One provision of the plan would enact a "Right to Practice Forestry" that would foreclose local zoning and "local or state regulations that would add...encumbrances on the management, harvesting and trucking activities associated with...[definition] forestry."

While the Forum acknowledges the appetite for consensus among those who would dearly love to retire forest issues from the headlines, we must consider proposals to regulate on their merits, and whether they address long term fundamentals. We will be looking at this Vermont proposal and asking our own questions. Would this proposal use legislation to codify the power of foresters to define forestry and avoid scrutiny of their own activities and shield them from scientific input? What is the regulation on the liquidation/development side intended to accomplish? If the intention is establish minimal standards for forest conservation, are these standards adequate to the task?

Frankly, much of this proposal as now drafted does not pass either the laugh or sniff test. However, the basic structure of defining forestry and regulating activity outside the definition needs to be looked at on its merits.

To our readers who are interested in these issues, we urge your involvement by lobbying your favored environmental group, and as a citizen, by staying abreast of Vermont's FRAC and the state legislature. The Vermont Citizens' Forest Roundtable will be gathering public commentary on the proposal. VCFR may be contacted through coordinators Andrew Whittaker at 802-748-8043 or Barbara Alexander at 802-586-2288.

Andrew Whittaker

VT Citizens' Forest RoundTable Forum

Biological Integrity Should Be Context of Forest Practices

The evening of October 22 found the Pavilion Auditorium in Montpelier with a full house in attendance at a Vermont Citizens' Forest RoundTable forum on herbicides. Presentations included slides from a recently sprayed area of Champion International's Pittsburg holdings. Barbara and Richard Alexander of Craftsbury, Vermont spent several days touring the sprayed woods documenting problems with industry assertions about the precision and silvicultural rationale of aerial spraying.

Areas of drift and sprayed wetland and water are evident in the slides. So too are examples of how the broad brush strokes of herbicides is being applied to clearcuts with spotty regeneration. The photographic images also indicate a simplification of forest vegetation post-cutting and spraying.

These latter images in fact echoed the earlier twenty minute keynote presentation by Dr. Stephen Trombulak of Middlebury College, in which the professor of biology asserted that biological integrity of the forest should be the goal and touchstone of forest policy. The question that should be used in evaluating a given forest practice is, does this practice diminish long term fundamentals. We will be looking at impacts on structures (such as age classes, missing species) and functions (food webs). The cascading effects of loss of key species lead inevitably away from biological integrity.

"We are at a point in time," said professor Trombulak, "when it is legitimate to ask whether extinction levels, such as 35% of Vermont's vascular plants, is an acceptable level." The good news of Vermont's resilient forest, which has re-established in the wake of 19th century agriculture, must be balanced with the bad news that existing acreage of old growth amounts to less than 3/100 of 1% of the overall forested landscape. "Any forest practice we engage in has to be evaluated against what we've already done."

Dr. Trombulak summarized his presentation with an exhortation to the public that "every citizen be involved in the discussion of desired future conditions. Then, and only then, can science enter the discussion. Science being neutral, it can only guide us where we want to go. Failure by the conservation community to articulate its goals, he warned, will result in a general perception of perennial nameless dissatisfaction of environmentalists.

The evening proceeded with a slate of speakers that included several appearing earlier on the interactive TV hearing (see) of Aug 10. John Porthast of Caflas, Vermont picked up Steve Trombulak's rallying for involvement and noted several difficulties with public process. "Nature is intelligent. How can society be intelligent? What's best for Vermont? The legislature is lacking the sensibility that can inform society. We need to find public identity, nurture, and societal ways of caring."

Andrew Whittaker

In Memoriam

Ian MacLeod Alexander

Vermont lost a very special person this October, a happy young boy who spent his three years within view of Lake Champlain, the Adirondacks and Green Mountains. Ian's world was comprised of mountains, sky and his own sense of wonder. Ian loved tractors, farming, bows, fields and gardens. His parents write, "At the time of Ian's death, the Autumn leaves were a vibrant array of colors. Ian's imagination, as it so often did, helped us see this beauty in his own way: 'The papa dragon turns the leaves red, mommy. The mama dragon turns the leaves yellow.' Although Ian has gone, his memory and spirit live on with a circle of loving friends and family whose lives he will continue to enrich.
Alice in Wonderland Forest Politics in Vermont

by Andrew Whittaker

- A number of unchallenged statements about silviculture are being made in Vermont as elsewhere these days. "Sometimes you have to clearcut (or spray herbicides) and start over." This has become a basic recipe for restoring forest productivity. However, we have yet to prove the superiority of this approach as one that would work within existing stands, utilizing ongoing processes maintained by standing forest, such as nutrient flow and moisture conservation. In the interest of maintaining the gray train, resourceists are demanding that America go for what is behind the curtain! (Skeptics inquire, what is at the bottom of a downward spiral that diminishes forest quality with each historic wave of cutting?)

- Recently a Vermont forestry consultant stated to the Forest Resource Advisory Council's assessment committee that Vermont has a lot of "garbage overstory" that must be cut and managed, and what, in fact, emerges from the surface of rural America.

- The observation that Vermont has a "garbage overstory" which must be "exported" is, in fact, an interesting development from the rationale that soothed fears in the 1980s that biomass plants and chipping would motivate premature harvest of sawlogs.

- We who believe that ultimately all is grounded in reality must remember, however, that humans have constructed their own reality—that is, statehouses—& to operate within such corridors requires an Alice in Wonderland logic. I recently quizzed a FRAC member on why he has repeatedly characterized the Maine Ban Clearcutting referendum as "extreme" when one could build the case that from an ecological perspective, with reference to the Northern Forest's pre-historic disturbance regime, the Compact rationalizes a more "extreme" approach to forest management: "mean politically extreme," he replied.

- So what are the silvicultural rationales for clearcuts that exceed the size of gaps caused by natural disturbance—with which our forests have been evolving for some millennia? What are the justifications for going beyond the range of natural disturbance?

- Restoring High-graded Stands to Quality timber: Here the idea appears to be that by removing low grade wood, you can regenerate high quality stems. Note that the focus is on trees entirely, rather than the biotic and abiotic processes that contribute to tree growth—processes underlined by clearcuts.

- Regenerating Shade Intolerant Species: Apparently popular and paper-born are species so much in demand that market savvy foresters are busily converting our landscape to those species, which cannot regenerate in shade. Here the absurdity is that, of course, these species were components of the pre-settlement forest that managed to thrive.

- Creating Early Successional Stands for Wildlife: Strictly speaking, this is a political rationale for clearcuts, as acknowledged by biologists who speak of the hunting/early successional lobby. Silviculturally as well as biologically, a body of evidence emphasizes the critical need to restore old growth functions and structures for the long term viability of our forests.

In sum, we need only look at proposals to spray herbicides on clearcuts to see that the clearcut lobby gets snarled in its own logic. To regenerate spruce and fir, we would be patch cutting at most and selection cutting on wind farm sites. Since we have cleared and promoted hardwoods, we now "need" to spray. This is what foresters term "working with ecology." It's what I term having to cover your ass.

- My brother recently made the observation of our own family woodland that the site coming closest to the standards of the US Forest Service's stock guides for "fully stocked" is a red pine plantation. Any subjective, and I dare say, objective, assessment of the stand's biological richness relative to other sites with a tree composition closer to that pre-dating settlement would conclude that the plantation is more or less of a desert. Natural structures and functions that might contribute to its long term productivity are missing.

- Our approach will be to cut and manage in such a way that native components can regain presence. We could take some of the understocked, "natural" areas and "start over" with clearcuts, herbicides, and roundabout but col­

VERMONT FOREST HARVEST: Low grade & sawlog Components of Harvest 1945-1995: As Vermont begins to assess the impact of clearcutting on its forest economy, policy wonks and other analysts will also be looking at data as shown in the graph above. Cutting overall has been on the rise since the 1970s; low grade wood in the words of some loggers is "flooding the market." The key question, which results from the ongoing US Forest Service decennial survey may help answer, is, does the booming low grade wood market for chips and pulpwood fulfill its supposed silvicultural purpose of adding value to standing timber? As a long term trend, could these markets be "demanding" our forests into a degraded condition that invites further cutting for fiber?
A Conversation About Forestry Issues With Vermont Representative David Clarkson

Vermonters are fortunate to have had Representative David Clarkson of Newfane, in Vermont's southeast corner, serve as a legislative member of the Forest Resource Advisory Council. At the first meeting of FRAC, Clarkson introduced the Crow to Noss and Cooperider's work, Saving Nature's Legacy, and warned that the public would not be allowing the issue of biodiversity to go away. The representative has put extra effort into the already tenuous task of lowering development compensation rates for loggers. On the personal level, Clarkson has been active in forest conservation, working with neighboring landowners to protect a combined holding of 10,000 acres.

Clarkson's legislative service of three and a half terms encompasses a lifetime of working, math and history, he is leaving to make room for someone else to carry on the Vermont tradition of an amateur, citizen assembly. The Northern Forest Forum sought an interview with him to gain a legislative perspective on forest policy. Our conversation began with the topic of current use and how the program, which establishes use value appraisal for enrolled farm and forest lands, became a political football. At the conclusion of last year's legislative session, the burden of funding the program was shifted to towns, a controversial move which has added to the uncertainty of Current Use's future, as the program is due to sunset in June 1997.

Andrew Whittaker

David Clarkson (hereafter DC): I was interested in all issues from the very start that related to forest policy and management...[I] became an advocate for the current use program quite naturally over that seven years.

AW: What was your argument for current use?

DC: Well, first of all, tax equity. It was unfair to tax farm and forestland at its fair market value, at development prices, without considering the other uses policies in the state to have reasonable growth but not to lose the main resources that draw people to Vermont; which is forest and farm land. If this place was New Jersey, they wouldn't come here in large numbers; they live in New Jersey because its close to where they work. But they vacation in other places.

The other main advantage of current use that doesn't get mentioned enough is that it requires active management on the part of the forest landowners. It's assumed that farmers are going to actively manage in the most efficient manner and make a living, but they couldn't count on it and a lot of people that just sat on it, and there are others who over-managed it, cut it too heavily and damaged the long-term prospects for sustainable forestry, and they also occasions there were some damage to the ecosystems they were responsible for.

But all of a sudden you had a program that ended up involving a million acres of Vermont forestland—that's about a fourth—managed largely by small landholders. There were a lot of acres, many of them owned by absentee landowners, people who had either inherited or bought a vacation home but wanted forest land or farmers...

Representative David Clarkson of Newfane in Windham County steps down from the Vermont legislature this session after 31 1/2 terms. Serving on the Forest Resource Advisory Council, Clarkson views the loss of large parcels of forestland as a key challenge facing all of Vermont.

DC: [This was] the climate in which the Environmental Board was divested of some of its most experienced members in a series of hearings one summer that were draconian in their nature. I came up here at my own expense just to witness it. It was horrifying to see the lack of sensitivity in the way those hearings were conducted. It's certainly the case in recent sessions of the legislature there's been far too much successful effort to avoid hearings and public involvement by attaching major policy shifts to the budget bill at the last moment without adequate vetting.

There are two basic ways to produce bad legislation: one is to do it on the floor, without using the committee process at all, and the other is to slip it into major bills as an amendment, particularly at conference committee time. In the case of current use, that's what happened. They couldn't get what they wanted from the House, which wanted full funding of current use, so they went through the House-Senate Conference committee at the last minute.

AW: I'd say the Vermont environmental community has been extremely supportive of current use and the broader concept of use value appraisal. We have some landowners however asserting that use value appraisal in principle is their due and that it should come with no strings attached. Selectmen from one town in my area, Newark, have written to the Governor in opposition to the cost shift and the placing of cutover lands into the program: they don't see the level of management expected. Are there some challenges to the consensus you've referred to?

DC: Oh yes, very much so, there always was a firm alliance between the agriculture and forest communities to establish the program in the first place; they realized that they needed the support of the other. It's been a slightly rocky road because the other community didn't like the lien and the various devices that were used to encourage long-term stability of the program, and I think the way the policy issues were formulated over the '90's caused a substantial increase in the costs of the program. There were times when the ag community was so frustrated with the underfunding that a minority were proposing to split off the forest part of current use, and I think that will continue. But I think the majority opinion is that the program is strengthened by the presence of both components. It's like the Housing & Conservation Trust Fund; there you have two quite disparate goals combined in the same area and you have Vermont Land Trusts working together with downtown poor types, and it's great, it's a blending of our society that rarely gets in the same room together talking policy. It's very much what Vermont is about.

AW: As our understanding of biodiversity gains depth, there's definitely a rationale for assessing unmanaged lands at use value, should they be?

DC: I don't know. I think we need to keep looking at that issue, for pristine land that is allowed to grow back into old growth, although I think it should be on a limbo list. That's the kind of forest we have in Vermont, it's been heavily cut over at least twice and likely to be again, given the economics of the situation.
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Montpelier and the press would find out about it afterwards. The most recent session of '95-'96, it got so bad that many of the Democratic minority got frustrated and were essentially shut out of the political process. The Republican majority on the committees would meet and decide which laws would pass and wouldn't inform the rest of the committees; there'd be a vote without discussion. That's not the way the legislature has functioned in the past and I hope it's not the way it will be in the future.
If everything were taxed at its use value we wouldn't have any problem. But we also wouldn't have a program that promotes active forest management and preserves the resource. In the past, I'd like to see land that is forested and timbered feed an industry that employs 10,000 people and has a major economic function in the state. I certainly don't go along with some loophole in the program that allows people to highgrade their land.

AW: Can we economically include all land owners in the program?

DC: Absolutely. I'd like to see the program expand and cover all woodland owners to a point.

AW: If we drive for such an expansion, does there need to be more commitment to sustainable forest management practices as a state policy?

DC: I think so, I think it has to be tied to ecosystem management, to preservation of the resource and long term commitment to keeping land in its current use—I'm no supporter of the program as a tax shelter. For example, some of these big parcels of land in Windham County that have been sold recently—when IP [International Paper] sold 2,000 acres to van Buskirk it had been in current use and withdrawn in '89 so its appraisal value was at an '89 level so the lien in '94 was negligible, a minor carrying cost in a million dollar deal. The lien has not been a deterrent.

AW: If Vermont has the arsenal of current use do we need the hammer of tighter forest practices regulations?

DC: Yes, probably. I say that advisedly because I don't like regulations better than anybody else. But I see it in the field the serious abuse and reengaging on that stewardship responsibility.

AW: Last session you did introduce a bill to establish licensing of foresters—

DC: Licensing of foresters and eventually certification of loggers is going to be needed in the state of Vermont, and I will urge my colleagues who take an interest in such matters to continue the effort. It takes a long time when you have opposition.

AW: What should licensing achieve?

DC: A stronger statement of ethical conduct for the foresters; and exclude loggers from practicing forestry.

AW: Can we work more biological understanding into forestry?

DC: Part of the licensing process should have a strong component on the state of the art of what we know about the forest so that the old-fashioned forester who's just marking trees for the timber market has to have a broader background. I think that's happening naturally as the profession shifts to younger people.

Break for lunch, conversation resumes:

DC: We're really putting our finger in the dike down in Windham County because of the tremendous amount of acreage that's coming on the market in large parcels—6,000 acres in various parcels from IP, most of it heavily cut over and therefore not purchasable by the industry and so it's being offered at development prices, over $400/acre. Then we have private owners bringing land on the market, over 13,000 acres either on the market or already sold, putting a heavy strain on the foundations and Forest and Vermont Land Trust and Housing and Conservation Trust trying to save some. I guess that's happening all over the state. It's scary.

AW: Well I was going to lead into the next body of questions by asking about that. In northern Vermont, we had the Northern Forest Lands Council and fragmentation and heavy cutting focusing attention on the forest. What do northern Vermont and southern Vermont face in common?

DC: We're losing large parcels—we're at risk of losing large parcels to other uses for two basic reasons. The economic reason; you can get more for land that's developed. But industry itself, IP in particular, is overcutting their holdings, liquidating them, so in the process there's tremendous pressure in changing use of the land. The case study someone just did as a master's thesis [shows] the small private owners are selling for retirement money to a younger generation also interested in retirement and the land is being heavily converted to development.

AW: What is it the public expects from FRAC?

DC: Policy advice to the governor and legislature based on science, based on knowledge.

AW: What would you say have been the high points and low points of your involvement with FRAC?

DC: Highpoints: the dedication of the experts, the public servants who come to testify and the unspoken testimony of the citizens—we got good testimony from all over the state from different perspectives.

The low point for me is how slow the process is, how difficult it is to reach the point where you start making policies. I would hope that FRAC is able to bite the bullet and propose some things before they fold their tents and silently steal away.

AW: At the time I was invited to join one of FRAC's work groups [Rural Economic Development] you commented that you would be interested in how my criticism of FRAC might change. After six months I would admit I'm a bit puzzled because we have some significant voices saying that even for the good of the industry we need a regulatory framework—but a lack of progress.

DC: Did you form the opinion early on that this was really going to happen, that industry and AIV (Associated Industries of Vermont) and so on was really going to make what you would call the serious give and take you need to solve problems when you're trying to develop policy?

AW: I see the consensus coming from other quarters—that are minorities within the industry organizations...

DC: Yes—I went so far as to state publicly that I didn't think the people representing their industry were representing all of the industry that well—one such representative handled that by confronting me directly; we had a good knock-down-drag-out in the halls of the capitol where we agreed to disagree. I said the industry has really got to be pro-active to meet the public concern about what's happening in the forest. It's not enough to stand there and oppose and oppose...

AW: You co-sponsored a clearcutting bill with Carl Reidel last session.

DC: I felt it was a start. When you propose a bill like that, it goes through the mill. It's rather refined and gains support or gets blocked in the pass or gets chewed. Reidel's bill never got developed because other issues took priority, but I think if I were to submit a bill it would not be focused on clearcuts, but liquification, and would continue the issues of extensive clearcutting which can be extremely damaging to the ecosystems and long term health of forests and highgrading.

FRAC has taken a cursory look at a severance tax that would encourage a residual stand that hit certain acceptable stocking levels—is that something we should look at?

DC: Absolutely, absolutely. That and the issue of permit by rule and intent to cut where an owner is not ipso facto prevented from doing something, merely required to justify it, and go through a review so if what they are proposing makes sense they can expect according to precedents that have been set and rules in effect some may be denied and some accepted.

I take a very dim view of a person who buys a piece of property and then claims an absolute right to do whatever they want on it. That was never true from the earliest reaches of our society. Property was something you staked and held by force and then someone stronger came along, they knocked you out and got your property. A whole body of law grew up to protect property rights, and we reached a state where what you buy with property is a bundle of rights and a bundle of responsibilities. To say otherwise is garbage, it's not true.

AW: Should we take a look at using Act 250 to develop review criteria for logging?

DC: I would think it's too general, we need the expertise of the forest community.

Concluded on page 14

TOTAL VERMONT FOREST HARVEST BY REGION 1980 - 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vermont Department of Forests, Parks & Recreation

Observers of southern Vermont woodlands note the cutting over and liquidating of large forestry parcels, even at a relatively constant rate of cutting since 1980. The much more visually dramatic clearcutting occurring in northern Vermont is reflective of accelerating levels of harvest. What can we conclude about the condition of northern Vermont forestland in the productivity and quality of even southern Vermont timber stands is in question?
Using Lichens to Assess Ecological Continuity in Northeastern Forests

by Steven B. Selva

Editor's Note: The following is excerpted from Chapter 3 of the important new book Eastern Old Growth, pages 35-48. Granted with permission from the editors, this excerpt gives hints about the topic covered in the book. For more information, check out the references.

Copyright © Island Press, 1996.

The intimate physiological relationship between lichen thalli and the environment, the perennial nature of lichens and their sensitivity to disturbance ... means that lichens act as constant monitors of the environment. An appreciation of their qualities as biological monitors, and the study of the parameters limiting the occurrence of particular species, has led to their use as indicators of a variety of environmental factors.

-Hawksworth and Hill (1984)

The term "ancient" forest is used here to describe those old-growth forests that have been around long enough to acquire the types of microhabitats that enable Growth Fossiliferous and other indicator species to become established. Once established—and because dispersal is limited—these ancient forest indicators require ecological continuity of mature trees and a constant supply of substrate in various sizes, marking them as distinct from contemporary forests where lichen colonization patterns will help put these observations into perspective.

Lichens in the Order Caliciales have been shown to be ideal bio-monitors of forest microhabitats. They and their macrolichen counterparts can serve as valuable evidence of great age or lack of it—particularly for forests where other documentary evidence of antiquity is not available—and demand the attention of all who wish to understand forest ecosystems.

Lichens can be described as a stable, self-supporting association of a fungus and an alga, or cyanobacterium, in which the resulting life form and behavior differ markedly compared to other partners growing alone (Hawksworth and Hill 1984). The lichen association is recognized as a "lifestyle" equivalent to saprophytism or parasitism, by which a fungus can satisfy its need for carbohydrates required for respiration and growth. By relying on a photosynthetic symbiont, the lichenized fungus can even colonize bare rock or hitch a ride on the back of a tortoise. For, unlike its saprophytic or parasitic counterparts, the lichenized fungus takes nothing from the substrate upon which it grows; once established, it survives on nutrients that wash over it or are deposited daily upon it from the atmosphere.

The effectiveness of lichenization as a nutritional option is evidenced by the fact that approximately 13,500, or one in five, species of ascomycetous fungi are lichenized (Hawksworth and Hill 1984). Under the rules of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, the names given to lichens refer to the fungal partner while the identity of the algal partner is irrelevant for nomenclatural purposes. In the British Soldier lichen, for example, the scientific name Cladonia cristatella refers to a particular fungus known only in the lichenized form. The algal partner in this species (Trebouxia ericae) may also exist in the free-living state or even be found in other lichens—thereby expanding even further its distribution into habitats not generally colonized by aquatic organisms.

Most of what one sees and calls a lichen is fungal. The algal partner is found just under the upper surface of the lichen thallus, surrounded by the fitful lyrhal sympodial strands of the fungus. While the fungus often reproduces sexually, the lichen per se does not. Nowhere more than in old and ancient forests is the generation of new lichens, the development of new thalli, and dispersal of the fungal "seeds" a strategy for colonization by lichens and has thereby become available for sporadic and random inoculation by lichen propagules originating from old-growth forests elsewhere. This suggests that the diversity of lichens on any given tree can be expected to increase over time (with certain limitations; see Goward 1994), with a disproportionate number of rare species being restricted to very old (i.e., ancient or "antique") stands.

While each lichen species is distributed according to its own microhabitat requirements, there is a tendency for gymnosperms (softwoods) and angiosperms (hardwoods) to host quite distinct epiphyte communities. This has led me to propose two indices of ecological continuity (IEC): one for sites dominated by gymnosperms (i.e., spruce-fir forest types) and the other for sites dominated by angiosperms (i.e., northern hardwoods forest types).

Selection of indicator species is based on the multiple, exclusive (and, in some cases, near exclusive) occurrence of the species in forests with a documented long continuity. These include the northern hardwoods stands at Big Reed Preserve, Musquasqueton, and Yankee卓doodles in Maine and The Bowl in New Hampshire, and the spruce-fir stands at Big Reed Preserve and Dry Town in Maine and Nancy Brook and Gibbs Brook in New Hampshire. The lichen species selected appear to be faithful to the ancient forest conditions present at these sites and, though widely distributed in the Northeast, are not generally...
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collected outside of undisturbed habitats (e.g., Gowan and Brodo 1988, Hole 1979, Armstrong 1977, Silva unpubl.).

Many epiphytic Calicophyta species prefer microhabitats of high humidity and rather low light intensity (Tibell 1990), often sharing such niches with few other species. Though they may be found on all sides of older trees, they are more likely to be encountered near the base of the trunk on angiosperms—typically on the side opposite the more conspicuous lichen vegetation—and at breast height, rarely lower, on most gymnosperms. Interestingly, a close inspection of the trunks of many trees that appear to be without lichens at old-growth sites reveals that they are, in fact, colonized by one to several Calicophyta species. That many of these species are able to tolerate the increasing acidity of bark during stand succession may be a decisive factor in competition with macrolichens for space (Hyvarinen, Halonen, and Kauppi 1992). Finally, except for the presence of Sphagnum species, neither the upper trunk nor the branches of angiosperms or gymnosperms support a well-developed Calicophyta flora.

In both the present study and that by Tibell (1992), lichens in the Order Calicophyta have been shown to be ideal biomarkers of forest microhabitats. They and their macrolichen counterparts can serve as valuable evidence of great age or lack of it—particularly for forests where other documentary evidence of antiquity is not available—and demand the attention of all who wish to understand forest ecosystems.

References


The Paper Colony

A New Video on Clearcut Maine Woods

In his new 27-minute video The Paper Colony, Doug Hawes-Davis draws attention to the intimate connections between land ownership, industry and political power in Maine. "From lands owned by Champion International Paper, Boise Cascade goes directly to fuel those concerned with forest ecosystems and the ecological consequences. This widely-shared concern stimulated the citizen initiative to ban clearcutting—an initiative that won 30% of the vote in Maine.”

Not surprisingly, many of Maine's representatives fight hard to maintain lax environmental regulations that permit decimation of the northern forest. Through combined ownership of land and industry, corporate timber interests play a powerful role in the Maine legislature—to the point that "we have to clearcut in order to protect the forests," according to Oulette of Millinocket. "It's terrible to see the clearcutting because the forest." Hawes-Davis explains, "it's terrible to see the clearcutting because the beautiful state of Maine is being butchered by clearcutting, but you gotta have it. You gotta have it.

The ecological justification for such statements is dubious, at best. But it's clear that ecological concerns that drive clearcutting in Maine are not ecological concerns that drive clearcutting in the rest of the world. A look at the ecological consequences of clearcutting may help us to see why we have to clearcut to make the money. You gotta have it.

In their quest for money, large corporations have wrested control of Maine's forests from the people. However, Mainers have a growing concern over clearcutting and its ecological consequences. This widely-shared concern stimulated the citizen initiative to ban clearcutting—an initiative that won 30% of the vote in the November election.

In a style characteristic of his earlier documentaries, Southbound, Green Rolling Hills and The Element of Doom, Hawes-Davis uses the voices of local people to tell the story of the clearcutting controversy in Maine. He skillfully weaves together the impressions of loggers, environmentalists, state land managers, industry representatives and others, illuminating a conflict which is shaping the future of Maine's northwoods.

Without drowning the viewer in a sea of despairing imagery, Hawes-Davis offers an honest and jarring look at the Maine landscape and the devastation that has occurred there. Excellent aerial footage along with creative cinematography may carry the viewer full circle from clearcuts to paper production to human consumption. The Paper Colony illuminates both sides of the clearcutting debate and uncovers the driving motivations behind each perspective. Hawes-Davis successfufully puts the issue in both local and national context, and the video should interest not only Mainers, but all those concerned with forest ecosystems and the need to liberate them from corporate domination.

The Paper Colony, Doug Hawes-Davis

Video on Clearcut Maine

Order at http://www.ecologycenter.org

Available in bookstores or call 1-800-626-1302

Eastern Old-Growth Forests Prospects for Rediscovery and Recovery

Edited by Mary Byrd Davis

"Anyone serious about acting to ensure the persistence of communities of eastern North America's leafy elders needs a copy of this book."

—Stephanie Mills, author of In Service of the Wild: Restoring and Reinhabiting Damaged Land

Authoritative essays from leading experts examine the ecology and characteristics of eastern old growth, explore its history and value, both ecological and cultural, and make recommendations for its preservation. Also included is a discussion of the importance of ongoing research of these valuable ecosystems.

420 pages • tables, figures, photos, illustrations, maps, index • 1996

Hardcover: $50.00 ISBN:1-55963-408-1
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Peace & Happiness
by Michael Phillips

Dad always answered our holiday query of what he might want the same way. "Peace and happiness." That seemed evasive to two boys with a seemingly endless list of material desires. There were fleets of battleship models to buy, the Daniel Boone frontier set, shiny new bikes ... why a fellow could spend whole evenings going through the Sears catalog just trying to narrow down the possibilities.

That answer said a whole lot about my father that I couldn't understand at the time. Didn't we have peace whenever my brother and I weren't fighting and happiness when we got all the stuff we wanted? A child's sense of economy and values can be fairly basic. The reality of paying bills, earning an income, and making economic choices is beyond a child's ken. Choices like finding happiness through giving all you possibly can to your children, be they material or spiritual gifts.

There are gifts we can pass onto future generations and by so doing perhaps find that elusive peace and happiness. These gifts cannot be delivered by the global economy. Their value is not measured in mere dollars. You won't even find them in the Sears catalog. Yet their worth is immeasurable in a human economy based upon meeting everyone's needs and living in a sustainable world.

The first is the gift of family and friends. Having time enough to share each day's simple pleasures with one another is too often lost in the pursuit of the material more. Perhaps in embracing the material less we will find the spiritual more.

The second is the gift of good health. Both ours and the planet's. There should be no debate about clearcutting entire forests for corporate gain at the loss of local sustainability and cottage industry. There should be no debate about the risks of pumping dioxins into our environment so we can have white toilet paper. There should be no debate about spraying our foods with chemicals so that food can be cheap in every sense of the word. The gift of health definitely assumes a certain level of species intelligence.

The third and final gift is that of inner peace. Each one of us, whatever our economic and political beliefs, needs to sit back and reflect on all the good and joy inherent in this creation. We need to focus on the good we can do one another. We need to invest our very brief time on earth in acts of celebration and love.

All our talk here of local economy and good stewardship of the environment begins with such understanding.

Inspiring Local Economy

• Next vacation consider consulting with an anti-travel agent in planning a trip. The idea here is to travel locally and spend money on nearby recreation. How about a weekend getaway at an area inn complete with a hot tub out under the stars? The point of vacations is getting away, not necessarily far away.

• Last month we installed a gravity-fed waterline to our farmhouse. The cost was significantly greater than the option of replacing the pipe to the shallow well from which an electric pump had drawn water for decades. Yet now we'll save that portion of an electric bill and can have water through a prolonged power outage. It's one of those economic choices that in the long run is worth far more than any short term savings. Buying a quality item often achieves similar savings by lending itself to repair and a longer lifetime of use. Local producers more often than not deliver such quality. Though you spend more in the beginning—smaller-scale production simply has greater costs—you're tapping into a gravity-fed economics that recirculates local dollars for the benefit of all.

• Whether you voted or not this last election, did you realize you cast an even more important vote locally each time you spend your hard-earned money? Our economic choices tie into our environmental vision. Don't eschew the pulping of our forests while at the same time participating in a throwaway society. Eat locally-grown foods in season—not strawberries in January—if you truly want to support small family farms in your environs. Walk more rather than burn unnecessary petroleum. All the little acts add up to a huge vote of how we want our world to be.

Note to our Readers: What are your ideas for inspiring local economy? Your suggestions, thoughts and outlandish opinions are what make this feature of the Forum work. Write us today! Every Person's Need, RFD 1 Box 275, Groveton, NH 03582.
Supporting Local Business

Does it really matter? Why should I go out of my way to eat at the Mom and Pop diner? Isn’t the corporate canoe a better buy? Damn straight that’s what it is, that’s what the market tells you. What do my personal values and hopes have to do with how I spend my money?

We’ve been asked such questions before about the merit of supporting local economy. Now is the time to speak the truth of the matter. Your livelihood may appear to be independent of your neighbor’s success but that is only an illusion of these corporate times. A deeper affluence exists for a society with the will to support its own and live within its means.

Here’s the skinny on becoming a local economy advocate—

- Downtown character is preserved, enhanced and filled with life. The other option is either shopping strips outside of town or the mega mall, all of which look the same, smell the same and are depressingly unconnected to community vibrancy.

- Local business people are the folks you go to school, church, and see on Saturdays on the tennis courts. It’s a sure bet your friends are going to give you better service and guarantee your satisfaction.

- Recirculation of local dollars is a must if a community is going to stay afloat. You scratch my back and I’ll scratch yours, if you like, just don’t do any scratching at McDonald’s.

- A local business person is more likely than not to return some of the profit to the community that supports them. This might mean sponsoring the school play, donating refreshments to the hospital fund-raiser, or doing advocacy for good stewardship of our forests. Corporate support of shared values never quite works the same.

- Wise use of area resources is more assured when the circle of use is local. Wood harvested, milled, and built into furniture (and the like) by a community would be more than one owned by investors from away whose primary interest is increasing their personal coffers. A community wouldn’t spray herbicide on itself but Boone Cascade wouldn’t.

- We are far from having local food security. New England imports close to 90% of its food. Wouldn’t it be nice to know local farmers could make a living and thus all of us could eat should weather or failed transport take that distant food supply away someday?

- Seventh generation thinking comes in a community that maintains a sense of its own destiny. Wall Street isn’t going to provide for our children’s future, but we can.

- Caring for one another is a central tenet of local economy. Enrichment of the human soul is more than just a financial transaction.

It doesn’t take a whole lot of pondering to realize which businesses in your area contribute to such possibilities. The membership list of Businesses for the Northern Forest is another place to begin. These are locally-operated ventures that have pledged to support stewardship guidelines for our region’s forests. This may mean utilizing native hardwoods harvested in a renewable manner. These businesses may sponsor education seminars aimed at raising public understanding of forest issues. They’re all local folks deserving of local support in order to build a more sustainable tomorrow. Let us know if you have any more additions for the list.

Businesses for the Northern Forest

Maine
Acadia Mountain Guides, Inc, Orono
AIP Sport Center, Lewiston
Alycon Woodworks, Portland
All Seasons Sport, Waterville
Alpenglow Adventure Sports, Orono
Augusta Canoe & Kayak, Augusta
Bath Cycle & Ski, Woolwich
Belfast & Moosehead Lake Railroad Company, Unity
Bookland Brunswick, Brunswick
Borealis Viets, Dover-Foxcroft
Cadillac Mountain Sports, Bar Harbor
Cahill’s Sporting Goods, Dover-Foxcroft
Cove-Side Wheel & Ski, Newport
Dunway Dolls & Garrett Bookseakers, Inc., Farmington
Down East Native Tours, Bar Harbor
Earthly Delights, Hollis
Eastern Mountain Sports, South Portland
Ecology House, Portland
Good Foods Store, Bethel
Good Kind Pen Company, Scarborough
Great American B & Sia, Bethel
Gulf of Maine Books, Brunswick
Harvest Time, Augusta
Holden Cycles, Skowhegan
Hopkins Flowers & Gifts, Manchester
Huff Forest Products, Fitzfield
Jeff’s Fly Shop, East Paris
John McKee Location Photography, Bridgton
Johnson Sporting Goods, Brunswick
Kennebec Books, Augusta
Lippincott Books, Rangeley
Mahoosuc Guide Service, Neary
Mahoosuc Mountain Sports, Bethel
Main Bound, Orono
Maine Street Market Natural Foods Coop, Unity
Merrill’s Bookshop, Hollis
Morning Glory Natural Foods, Brunswick
Natural Wonders, South Portland
Nelson’s Sport & Hockey Shop, Dover-Foxcroft
Northern Lights Health & Sport, Farmington
Paper Kicks, Hollis
Plants Alive, Inc., Waterville
Rangely Lakes Antiques, Rangely
Rangely Mountain Bike Touring Company, Rangely
Red Oak Sports, Farmington
Rose Bicycle, Orono
Seasons Cafe, Lewiston
The Boat Doctor, Damariscotta
The Body Shop, South Portland
The Coffee Store, South Portland
The Cooperative Hand, Dover-Foxcroft
The Map Store, Old Town
True North Adventures, Bethel
Unity Pond Pottery, Unity
Wooden Boat, Brooklin

New Hampshire
Applebrook Bed & Breakfast, Jefferson
Eastern Mountain Sports, Peterborough, North Conway
Exeter, Newington, Nashua, Salem, Manchester
Healthy Rhino Natural Foods, Lancaster
Independent Mountain, North Conway
International Mountain Equipment, North Conway
Jefferson Inn, Jefferson
Lost Nation Cider Mill, Lancaster
Lost Nation Natural Foods, Lancaster
Midtown WashBach, Lancaster
Moriah Sports, Gorham
North Country Outfitters, New London
Notchland Inn, Han’s Location
Omar & Bob’s, Hanover
Ragged Mountain Equipment, Intervale
Riveredge Inn, Ashland
Sunnyfield Farms, Landamondery
Summers Backcountry Outfitters, Keene
Travel & Nature, Exeter
Tuckerman’s Outfitter, North Conway
Unabogu Outfitters, Enfield
Wilderness Map Company, Twin Mountain

New York
Adirondack Alpine Adventures, Keene
Adirondack Outfitters of Long Lake, Long Lake
ADK Mountain & Stream Guide Service, Olmsteadville
All Season’s Outfitters, Saranac Lake
Barkester Bikes, Saranac Lake
Bashful Bear Bookstore & Natural Foods Store, Keene Valley
Beaver Brook Outfitters, Warrensburg
Blue Mountain Boat Livery, Blue Mountain Lake
Blue Mountain Outfitters, Blue Mountain Lake
Carl Heilman Nature Photography, Brant Lake
Eastern Mountain Sports, Lake Placid, Saranac, Loysburg, Au Sable, Schroon, Lake Placid, Warrensburg, Castleton. High Peaks, Lake Placid
Horneback Bikes, Olmsteadville
Hunt Enterprises, Blue Mountain Lake
McDonald’s Adirondack Challenges Guide Service, Lake Clear
Mountaineer Outdoor Supply Company, Inlet
Nor’s Whole Foods, Saranac Lake
North Country Co-op, Plattsburg
St. Regis Canoe Outfitters, Lake Clear
Syd & Durt’s Outfitters, Lake George
Tickers’ Boats, Old Forge
WildWaters Outdoor Center, Warrensburg

Vermont
Action Outfitters, Stowe
Barre Army & Navy, Barre
Battenkill Canoe, Arlington
Bear Pond Books, Stowe
Belgian Woodworks, Starksboro
Canoe Imports, Shilburne
Caplan’s Shoe, Apparel & Camping, Morristown
Catamount Family Center, Williston
Catamount Trail Association, Burlington
Clearwater Sports, Waitsfield
Climb High, Shilburne
Couaching Lion Bookshop, Waterbury
Downhill Edge, Warren
Duke’s Sport Shops, Enosburg Falls
East Burke Sports, East Burke
Eastern Mountain Sports, South Burlington
Flyfish Vermont, Stowe
Flyrod Shop, Stowe
Foot of the Notch Bicycles, Jeffersonville
Good Wood Computer Products, South Strafford
Green Mountain Herbs, Putney
Green River Canoe, Jeffersonville
Mad River Bike Shop, Waitsfield
Meredith Footwear, South Burlington
Morristown Village Inn, Morristown
Northern Lights Bookshop, St. Johnsbury
Onion River Sports, Montpelier
Outdoor Adventures of Vermont, Montpelier
Outdoor Gear Exchange, Burlington
Pine Ridge Adventure Center, Williston
Shilburne Farms, Shilburne
Simply Better, Burlington
Skirack, Burlington
Ski City Bike & Sport, Randolph
The Alpine Shop, South Burlington
The Craftsbury Outdoor Center, Craftsbury
Common
The Mountain Bike Shop, Stowe
Top of the World Books, Williston
Tubbs Snowshoe Company, Stowe
Umisk Outfitters, Stowe
Vermont Vagabonds, Milton
Water ‘N Woods, Morristown
West Burke General Store, West Burke
Jamie Sayen (hereafter JS): When we met more than ten years ago you gave a workshop on an idea that struck me as rather remarkable and new, an idea you called “giving voice to place”. Could you explain what you mean by that and how you came to view things from that perspective and why you find that a helpful way to look at the world?

Gary Lawless (hereafter GL): I think that idea was spurred by my connection with the bioregional movement. When I first started going to bioregional movement gatherings, everyone was reminded that when they spoke from the place they were representing—the place from which they came, from their bioregion, their biological home—when you spoke politically or culturally about that place, you weren’t just speaking for, in my case a white, male, European, you were actually representing everything that lived and moved and occurred within the borders that you use to define your place.

When you try to speak for a place you have to include not only everything that lives there, but the sum of all the interactions that take place there, all of which have some connection with you whether or not you want to admit it. So most of our political and most business people in their actions don’t really speak or act in a way that’s based in a particular place because they’re only keeping in mind a very small fraction of who and what happens there in that place.

When I say speaking as the place where I live, I almost mean it literally. I have an idea that if you listen closely enough in ways that aren’t necessarily connected to human discourse, that you can pick up on the conversations of the place that go on and try to hear the voices of lichen or the wind or fish. There are lots of different ways to be sensitive to that conversation and to almost get to take part in it.

For three days we’ve been driving by a dead fox lying on a bridge, and it kept telling me it didn’t want to be there. So, this morning I took a shovel, and I went to the desert, I wrote a couple of bear poems, and Jasper said it was weird looks—what’s he doing? There’s no respect for those guys. There’s just no respect.

For three days we’ve been driving by a dead fox lying on a bridge, and it kept telling me it didn’t want to be there. So, this morning I took a shovel, and I went to the desert, I wrote a couple of bear poems, and Jasper said it was weird looks—what’s he doing? There’s no respect for those guys. There’s just no respect.

When you go to the desert, you learn a lot more about the importance of water, for example. And also when you go to the desert you learn about how Yaqui people live in North America and how different is that? How Navajo or Hopi people live, how other cultures deal with their relationship with the natural world, and how they find other ways of living with the place. It’s really instructive, and unfortunately we’ve tried our best to cut off that line of information so that we can remain separate and lord and lady over the planet.

When the animals come to us, asking for our help, will we know what they are saying? When the plants speak to us in their delicate, beautiful language, will we be able to answer them? When the planet herself sings to us in our dreams, will we be able to wake ourselves, and act?—Gary Lawless

When we met more than ten years ago you gave a workshop on an idea that struck me as rather remarkable and new, an idea you called “giving voice to place”. Could you explain what you mean by that and how you came to view things from that perspective and why you find that a helpful way to look at the world?

GL: Well, that sets you up yourself as God. But I think that if you make the commitment to live in a particular place and educate yourself as much as you can about that place, that’s a commitment of humility; you’re choosing to be a part of, not having power over. I think that humility comes with respect for the place.

When I went to work with homeless people, I didn’t know how to behave, natured, listened, learned. When I went to work with disabled people, I had to allow myself to just be there and let them teach me how to behave, rather than assert myself and say “this is how it’s going to be,” because I was in a community that I was unfamiliar with, and I had to learn all the community’s language. I’m not talking necessarily about spoken language, but that kind of language of interaction.

If you want to speak for trees you have to learn the language of interaction because one of the ways the tree is going to speak to you is in the way that it interacts with everything else within the community. If you deny some of those interactions, then it’s a lot easier to get rid of the trees because you’re denying its interaction with soil microbe, you’re denying its interactions with beetles, with the other plants living in that community—wetlands, or water. So you’re not really understanding the language of the tree because you’re not learning about the whole conversation. You’re hearing a little part of the conversation.

Part of the consequence is that tree, that plant, makes good pulp, but there’s a whole other community conversation going on.

In the work I’ve been doing with homeless people, I really feel there’s a connection between how we behave toward the homeless as opposed to toward clearcutters. Both are seen as ugly and things we don’t really want to see or we don’t want to spend time with or in. And they’re actually both creations of our own culture, and so we’re in denial not only about places that we’ve destroyed, but about lives that we’ve destroyed.

I see a clearcut as disabled, not hopeless; it’s still the same place it was. A lot of the homeless folks are homeless because of actions that have created the condition of homelessness and the condition of a clearcut—like we don’t have much respect for a polluted river or a clearcut or an open pit mine, tailings pond… We’ve just lost respect for those places as places. And we’ve lost respect for a number of people as people, or did we ever have respect for them? I don’t think you can heal one without the other in a broad sense. I think some-one has to be working in both places and that some of us choose to spend our time in some places, and some of us choose to spend our time in other places.

I just, myself, am curious about a lot of different aspects of my community, and I’ll never figure out all of it. I’ve developed this idea—this extends to other species—that a community is really a conversation, and if you aren’t allowing all the voices to be present then the community is out of balance. It can’t heal itself until all the voices are present, and no one voice is in control.

So I think the bioregional model of representing all the voices of a place is a really powerful model for a way to think about a community’s future. You don’t just think about where all the humans can live and where they can get their water from and where they can put their waste. You have to include all the impacts on other species in that place and everything downstream and downwind. The planet gets smaller and smaller and smaller without changing size, so there’s less and less room for everybody and everything.

I think that there is a role for creative artists—there’s a cultural role as well as a scientific role. I don’t know what the difference is, I just hear a different kind of language from environmental activists and cultural...
sions of a number of people—I know it. I've seen some people whose subconscious it's sitting in. There are different ways of making people see another side of a situation, and maybe not the confrontational "my facts are better than your facts." For some people, that might not be the way to get them.

JS: I agree with you, and I don't see a conflict between someone who is a more politically or scientifically-oriented animal, or someone who's coming from dance or poetry. If we look at the environmental community as an ecosystem, it's going to be stronger if there's diversity and interactions rather than one voice dominating, whether it's the political or the scientific or even the poetic voice dominating.

GL: Well, I certainly wouldn't want the poetic voice to dominate (laughs). We'd be in trouble.

JS: Having heard some of the other voices, I might go for the poet.

GL: The poets learn from those other voices. I mean if we're listening to those other voices we're learning from them too.

JS: You said something earlier that is similar to what the ecologist F. Engler once said: "Ecosystems are not only more complex than we think, but more complex than we can think."

GL: It's unknowable. The dangerous part is that with creative arts you can romanticize too much, you can mythologize that too much and sort of become a fake Indian. You can really romanticize your relationship to the planet and get overly poetic and get lost in the majesty of your words and twist the situation in a way. I think that's a dangerous tendency too.

JS: I'd like to look at this relationship between politics, science, economics, social theory, poetry, art. How can we all work together so that instead of protecting my credibility or my institution's endorsement, we actually work in concert to protect long-term the ecological and evolutionary integrity of these forested systems?

GL: If a creative artist, a poet such as myself, is going to speak to the heart, then people have to speak truth to power and not be worried about gee, maybe I won't get asked to the ball, or I won't be on a particular committee, or Maine Audubon will never publish my poems, or I'll never get to be Attorney General...

It seems like if you're going to speak in the line of voice I'm describing, then you have to be prepared to speak the truth as you see it and not be afraid of what other people are going to think. You're compelled to speak. But you have to be prepared to take the consequences because there are a lot of people who are just going to dismiss you. If you're really speaking the truth in the situation as you see it, and people want you to compromise that truth in order for some temporary political or economic gain, you have to resist that temptation. You're only going to be on the planet for a short time, and if you waste some of that time compromising you, what good has it done? Maybe it'll get you a better job, or they'll give you a new car, or a job in the King Administration.

I'm getting more and more to the point where I think that it's imperative to say what you really feel or rethink your position and not say anything for a while. To be untrue to yourself—everything is so fragile these days that if you decide to compromise, the planet loses. Every time people who are trying really hard to speak for the planet decide to compromise for some temporary goal, it's irreparable. The loss isn't for two years. The loss is forever. Places are gone. Species are gone.

JS: Opportunities are gone.

GL: Opportunities are certainly gone. People don't realize the shortness of their lives and the relative importance of their lives. If you take a position that is scoffed at by a number of other people, but it's a position that you feel is really speaking for the truth of the place where you are, you should take it. You shouldn't have someone else say, "15,000 waitresses aren't going to be able to sell donuts to loggers anymore, according to the state." The state is a temporary thing; the government is a temporary thing; the paper companies have proven that they're only temporary. They're leaving pretty soon anyway.

JS: Several of them have left.

GL: Right. And things are overlooked. I was talking about Boise Cascade to a friend who had just taken a tour of Boise Cascade through Maine Audubon. I said Boise Cascade was clearcutting in Mexico, and this summer when peasants tried to protest the clearcut the Mexican army came out and shot them and killed 14 people and wounded another 30 or whatever it was. And that I believed it was possible in Maine for Boise Cascade to call out the National Guard, they would. They would, they'd be out there in the street. There's a very fragile line of protection from that kind of overt violence toward people, but not any protection toward overt violence against any other species. We're backing off from that line right and left.

JS: Something else that is forgotten by the political calculators who aren't comfortable taking and defend-
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ing a position from a matter of principle is that the power of the truth would be on their side if they were to side with it.

GL: They’re scared of the power of truth. Don’t you think some people are more comfortable with a small amount of personal power accrued than with the power of the truth in their lives? They’re confusing what power is all about. They’re confusing the power of a good act with the power of some political muscle. And political muscle is so temporary. Just fleeting.

JS: (laughs) Then he wouldn’t be screwing up.

GL: But I wouldn’t want any of those because I think they are doing much more important work on their own. We [poets] are perhaps some of the unacknowledged legislators.

JS: When you go into a school is it all grades?

GL: It’s mostly high school and some college. A lot of them really want to be given access to certain ways of speaking, and they aren’t really being given them in their traditional English classes. They aren’t getting much creative writing, so they’re listening to how people who’ve gone before them have told tales, but they’re not being encouraged to speak for themselves. God forbid that high schoolers should speak for themselves! A lot of them have really strong opinions about what’s happening on the planet, and they’re looking for ways to express that.

JS: I think my theory is that our society’s education system tries to sever the connection to the natural world that all kids of our species are born with.

GL: But that’s one particular kind of education, this society’s education. Because on this continent there are other societies whose education system is different from ours and who bring their children up in a different way, although we’ve tried to squash a lot of that. If you looked at people who got here before we Europeans brought our European system here, people were brought up with stories that taught them exactly where they lived and how it worked.

When you look at New England and you look at place names that native people had, before we got here and changed them, they’re very descriptive, very biological going on of those places. They’ll tell you where to fish and where not to fish, and where you should get out and walk around instead of trying to canoe through. Or what the primary species was in this particular place—to hunt or to fish or something. We’ve developed a language that’s devoid of that connection—and purposely so.

JS: Why do you say ‘purposely’ so?

GL: So you can destroy it. The farther away you are from that connection the easier it is to just wreck it, I think. So, as we find less and less reverence for a place, it’s just much easier to trash it and move on and change the name of the place next to trash and it then change the name back to “Quail Run” or “Deer Hollow Lane” or something. You name it after the species that you’ve chased out of your own habitation.

I think the whole planet is trying to educate us. I think all the time there’s this educational literature available if you would just stop and breathe and look around and say, you know, let’s get out of the way for a minute. Everything around you is trying to educate you about how to be in that place. So, if you stop to listen to the wind in the trees for a minute and look down to see what was happening under your feet, or just concentrate on a particular place, even on a sidewalk, there’s stuff going on that can educate you about that place. We just have a pretty narrow idea of what education is.

---

**Which World**

There is a path winding between the hills,

passing totems stolen from their island homes,

emptied of ashes and bones,

placed along the trail.

In the distance, a volcano.

Raven flies just above the surface of things, broad eagle watching through layers of air and water for the fish passing through, shining in the cold river light like from another world.

everything moving, everything moving to come together, come together and fall apart, again.

the water rushing, the heart beating.

I am waiting for you at the mouth of the river.

—Gary Lawless
mind of the planet moving, the long thought, the deep breath the scratch in the rock which tells all the stories—a traveling skin of feather, fur, wings and fins, the old map of the earth, deep in ocean, rock, tundra, air where everything moves where everything breathes we learn how to walk, how to fly, travel together, singing the song of life, the hymn of planet.

—Gary Lawless

to give them some fresh language, some fresh way of seeing things and what hasn't been allowed in the text books. And by the time you're in and out (laughs) it's seeing the situation that hasn't been allowed in the text like you.

support. It's a really lonely task. I think that the par­ forays I make how they can get beaten down or how community for that nurturing, instead of excluding it because you aren't on the faculty and don't have a cer­ tificate?

Education has to be partly throwing yourself into situations that you're not comfortable with or that aren't in your experience. Environmentalists need to find new ways to some kind of experiential education, as well as book learning.

The books aren't taking any chances at all. In the regular education process—for the most part—the texts aren't going to take any chances. They're written by flat from some lecture that owns the pub­ lishing company and they're not interested in the edu­ cation of children. They're only interested in making money off the textbooks. They're not interested in hav­ ing any controversy with any school board anywhere.

JS: How do we restore a culture to a respectful and healthy relationship with the land from which it springs?

GL: I think it's only in our heads that we're alienated; our bodies are still carrying on a conversation with the planet, but our heads are denying it. The conversation is when you sleep at night, sometimes it talks back to you. Or when your children tell you sometimes you hear that conversation, some­how they haven't man­ aged to give them the right words to deny.

I think one of the steps is to commit yourself to a place. When I was living at Gary Snyder's, when I was young and foolish, he told me that the most radical thing I could do was to stay at home.

And I think the second step is to accept your posi­ tion as one of humility and ignorance and start educat­ ing yourself. Speak out of a state of beginning educa­ tion, and this language will change right away. When you start acknowledging your connection to everything of a sudden your language changes, because you have to find a new way of talking about who you are, and where you are, and what you're doing.

Once you acknowledge that connection you realize that a lot of what you're doing isn't so good. And that's OK. You don't have to feel guilty about that, but you have to feel humility about that and start to make changes, and we can also help each other make changes. Mutual aid isn't such a bad idea, but it isn't just about humans.

I think sometimes political solutions have within them the right idea, but they're so species-oriented. Like the idea of "It Takes a Village"—Hillary's right, but her idea of village is just a little short of what the whole community is you live within, and the idea of mutual aid is a good idea, but it wasn't extended to all the other species and the natural elements of the place. Mutual aid also means that you're going to the river; the river's good to you; you're good to the air; the air is good to you.

So that your behavior within your place—nobody's alone and there's no separating that, I think at least for me, that's the beginning of the education process. The beginning of right livelihood process is that act of recognizing this.

Radio "Active" The Earth Day Every Day Radio Station Project that will establish an environmentally focused radio station in a metropolitan area in the United States is underway. The initial stage of the project will raise sufficient funds to make a sizable downpayment on an existing radio station and to staff the station with quali­ fied, enthusiastic, ecologically-minded people. Financial contributions are 501(c)(3) tax deductible. For more information contact Traci Hickson or Dennis Hendricks: Project Coordinators, Earth Day Every Day Radio Station Project, POB 130, Bar Harbor, ME 04609; (207) 288-5063.

The good news Roads disappear, and the caribou wander through. The beaver gets tired of it, reaches through the ice, grabs the trapper's feet, pulls him down. Wolves come back on their own, circle the state house, howl at the sportswriters, piss on the ATV.

Trees grow everywhere. The machines stop, and the air is full of birdsong.

—Gary Lawless

ate for the place where we are by referring back to the place we came from. So it's sort of a denial of the place where you are and the time that you live in. Evolution has to do with language as well as the progression of any species or combination of species. We inform each other through the language of our voices and through the languages of our actions. If the language of our actions isn't the same as the language of our voices, then that's sort of a dysfunctional image that we're providing to anyone we're trying to communicate with. So, when your heart says one thing and your language compromises itself, it betrays your heart, and it betrays the place where your heart living.

People who obviously really like a place, but then betray themselves by saying we're going to do something they said to be used by forces that are actu­ ally in opposition to that place, it just makes them look like they don't really know who they are, like they aren't at peace with themselves. And in some societies that would be called mental illness.

I think there are some people whose essential rela­ tionship to the place is good, but they put themselves into these political situations which aren't necessarily native to the place where they are. Political situations enforce a reality that's not specific to the place, and it causes people to act in ways that betray their connect­ ion.

JS: You've raised an important point—the idea of an imposed political structure, or system, basically a European political structure imposed on North American ecosystems.

GL: Right. The place names are mostly European. The ways of behaving are mostly European. And the continent is not. So it's misbehavior. It's oppression. It's occupation. The imposition of rule by aliens—"that's the definition of occupation." If people belong to the place where they are, and they're having to call it something else so that they feel more comfortable there, then it's under occupation. It's not a place gov­ erning itself. And Maine certainly isn't a place govern­ ing itself (laughs). When paper companies can spend $6 million to disrupt the democratic process...
Herbicide Project Appeals Pesticide Control Board Decision to NH Supreme Court

by Daisy Goodman

In August, 1996, after a nine hour hearing and a one hour deliberation, the NH Pesticide Control Board upheld a Division of Pesticide Control permit for aerial application of herbicides on 2,000 acres of forest land in Coos County.

The Board's decision to allow Boise Cascade to continue their aerial spray program was only the end of the first round in what promises to be a long drawn out fight to end aerial herbicide applications in northern New Hampshire. Neither the temporary moratorium on spraying set by Champion International after the embarrassing revelation of a ten-acre sized herbicide application "mistake" the previous year, nor the recent sale of Boise Cascade's northeastern assets to the Mead Corporation, are guarantees that this version of forest mine-management will disappear from Coos County.

New Hampshire Pesticide law allows an aggrieved party to request a re-hearing after an unfavorable decision on an appeal. In September the Herbicide Project filed such a request, based on the Board's suppression of the Project's expert witness on toxicology, the Board's refusal to accept written testimony, and the application of strict courtroom rules of evidence at the August hearing despite administrative hearings which specifically state that the rules of evidence accepted in litigation do not apply at administrative hearing.

Although the August hearing made it abundantly clear that attempts by local community groups to challenge Division of Pesticide Control decisions concerning pesticide applications would be met with a disregard bordering on contempt, a crucial reason to continue to challenge the permits themselves, and to challenge the lack of local input into the permitting process in general. Failure to challenge the decision on the August appeal would allow it to stand as a dangerous precedent, implying that local opposition to pesticide applications has no place in Division decisions.

In October the Pesticide Control Board denied our request for a re-hearing. Among the reasons given were the written testimony of highly qualified expert witnesses opposing aerial applications of herbicides, all of whom, would have failed to alter the Board's decision on the appeal in any case. Since the written decision on the initial appeal, in excess of ten pages, was issued the day after the hearing, this statement seems more to be an admission of the pre-determination of the August hearing rather than a legitimate reason for ruling out a re-hearing.

Refusal to grant a re-hearing by the Board leaves only one avenue open; appeal to the NH Supreme Court. On November 26, Herbicide Project attorney Richard deFORE filed a 56-page notice of appeal with the Supreme Court and the Division of Pesticide Control.

Among the crucial issues which must be addressed is the intention of the New Hampshire law which delin...

cates the role of the Division of Pesticide Control, i.e. to safeguard the public health and welfare and the public assets in the waters, soil, and forests of the state.... (PES 430-28). A logical interpretation of this legislation would seem to be that the Division is mandated to protect the public and the environment from misuse or inappropriate use of pesticides.

However, the Division position throughout has been that the EPA registration process ensures the safety of every registered product and that the Division of Pesticide Control's sole responsibility is to ensure that applications in-state fulfill registration and label requirements. The known carcinogens DDT, 2,4-D, and Agent Orange are well-known examples of chemicals that were registered and in use for years before their true human and environmental implications were understood.

The many shortcomings of the registration process are clearly explained in Caroline Cox's interview with the Forum ("The Best Management Strategy Avoids Causing Pest Problems", vol. 5 No. 1 pp 22-25). The use of the word ‘safe’ in reference to any pesticide, and that EPA registration does not imply EPA approval of a pesticide for use.

Since our initial contact with the Pesticide Control Board and Division of Pesticide Control Director McKay, the Herbicide Project has repeatedly attempted to provide the Division with an extensive bibliography of peer reviewed, published research concerning the extent of ecosystem impacts and specific toxicology studies on the three herbicides and surfactant permitted for aerial application in New Hampshire.

At our initial meeting with the Board, which took place in May, 1996, we were politely thanked for our efforts and assured that Board members would contact us during the permit review process. The only agency which did contact us was the Department of Health's Health Risk Assessment Division. Mr. McKay, although he is responsible for maintaining files on each pesticide approved for use in New Hampshire, showed no interest in furthering his knowledge of current research on glyphosate, sulfonyluron, methyl, imazapyr, and POEA, although these chemicals are currently in use under permit by his division. To date, the only information contained in the relevant files in Mr. McKay's office is the pesticide manufacturer's label and material safety data sheets (MSDS) provided by the manufacturer.

During the Appeal hearing in August, the Herbicide Project's attorney questioned Mr. McKay concerning his lack of interest in independent toxicology studies. In response, Mr. McKay stated that the EPA registration process was insufficient to ensure the safety of the products being used and that his responsibility to evaluate pesticide products ended there. The Pesticide Control Board clearly agreed with Mr. McKay's position because the Board initially challenged the Herbicide Project appeal on the grounds that it was only a "collateral attack on the EPA registration process", and as such, did not concern them. The suppression of Caroline Cox's testimony on the grounds that it was not relevant to the permits under question because it discussed the toxicology and environmental impacts of the chemicals proposed for use is another indication that the PCB and the Division of Pesticide Control have abdicated their responsibilities as outlined in PES 430-28.

As Mr. Cox points out in her interview, many pesticide studies are done only after the introduction of a chemical has caused traceable environmental damage. The controversy surrounding the sulfonylurea herbicides, introduced to northern New Hampshire forests under the DuPont product name OUST by Boise Cascade in the 1980s and still in use is a case in point. It is a clear example of why a Division of Pesticide Control which was actually concerned for the environmental implications of pesticides must take a second look at the EPA registration process.

The sulfonylureas are a chemical family which includes drugs used for treatment of human diabetes and a potent group of herbicides of which sulfonyluron methyl, the active ingredient in the DuPont product OUST, is one. The sulfonylurea herbicides are known for their extremely high potency, causing tree and brush mortality at a rate of less than an ounce per acre actually applied, and currently used to sensitize plants at unbelievably low concentrations of parts per billion.

These herbicides were registered in the early 1980s by the EPA and first came on the market in 1982. From the start these compounds have been extremely controversial. According to a 1990 memo from the Chief of the EPA's environmental effects branch, one of the EPA's research divisions recommended to the Registration division as early as 1981 that the sulfonylurea herbicides as a group not be registered "based on the determinations that SLUs are excessively persistent in the environment and that they cannot be detected at low levels in environmental samples".

Despite this warning, in 1982 the standard EPA requirement that the manufacturer submit data on non-target plant impacts and drift of the sulfonylureas was waived by EPA's registration division. Without this data, concern over concern left out of the registration process, the sulfonylurea products, under DuPont patents, were registered and subsequently marketed. In full light, these products are widely used to kill weeds in wheat production, in utility and road right-of-way brush control, and in forestry applications to promote softwood growth.

In 1986 the EPA began to accumulate reports of widespread plant injury as a result of sulfonylurea drift. Because these compounds are highly mobile in water, persistent, and used at very low doses and volatile, additional recommendations were made to the EPA's Registration division that aerial applications not be allowed. Successful litigation by farmers whose crops were damaged by drift from adjacent right of way applications followed.

Alarmed, the EPA's northwest region, Concerned about the herbicide's widespread use, called for an investigation into the effects of drift concentration sulfonylurea exposure. The results were deeply disturbing. Although the concentration of herbicide was below environmentally sophisticated detection methods, plant injury was still detectable. The most signifi...
resurrection and other abuses of the legal system. In fact, Organic Gardening Magazine (vol 43, no. 9) reports that among other sanctions, DuPont received an unprecedented $115 million fine from a Georgia court because company representatives lied under oath.

"Value by the Division since testimony is crucial since we are living in the most immediately affected areas and because this information has been suppressed on the State level and never made accessible to us.

We hope to be able to attack the potential 1997 aerial spray permit applications initially at the agency review level, and then in another appeal if it becomes necessary. For example: the Fish and Game Department is one agency which reviews aerial herbicide permit applications, and has consistently approved them since the 1980s. However, an informed and angry public has the opportunity to influence this decision if the numbers are right and we effectively communicate our opposition to Department representatives.

Another example: several larger New Hampshire environmental organizations are considering taking a position on DuPont's application to plant three new herbicide gardens in N.H. Aoadobn encourages its membership to contact the main office concerning the issue. The Northern Forest Alliance has taken a position in favor of increased regulation and increased public participation in the permitting process. Contact the Alliance to express your appreciation of this position and your support for an even stronger position in opposition to DuPont's application.

Letters of opposition written directly to the Division of Pesticide Control will fall on unwilling ears unless copies are sent to a number of other parties. We recommend cc: Stephen Taylor, Commissioner of Agriculture; Governor-Elect Jeanne Sheehan; and the Herbicide Project. In addition, a copy to Mead Corporation at Rumford Mills, Rumford, Me. would be useful. Mead has not indicated yet whether it plans to continue Boise Cascade's herbicide program, although indications are that few changes will be made.

Pressure on the corporation directly will be more effective if it carries an economic punch; for example that your school, business, etc would consider not purchasing Mead products unless Mead eliminates herbicide spraying from its forest management strategy. In addition, Organic Gardening is calling on the EPA to initiate a special review of the sulfonylureas herbicides, based on their "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment". Letters in support of this review should include the phrase quoted above and be directed to Carol Browner, Administrator, US EPA, 401 M St., SW/1101 Washington, D.C. 20460. Want more information? Would you like to help spread the word? Please contact us at PO Box 184, N. Stratford, N.H, 03590 (603)922-5544; or through the NARP office. Thanks again!
Court Rules EPA Must Disclose Secret Ingredients in Pesticides

On October 16 two pesticide reform organizations announced a historic ruling by the District of Columbia Federal District Court that significantly expands the public’s right-to-know about secret chemicals in pesticide products. With limited exceptions, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) must now provide information about the identity of so-called “inert” ingredients in pesticide products.

"Pesticides are poisons," says Norma Greer, Executive Director of the Northwest Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides (NCAP). "They are one of the few classes of toxic substances that are intentionally broadcast into the environment. This ruling puts a stop to pesticide industry secrets and gives all Americans the right to know the identity of pesticide product ingredients."

Using six pesticide formulations as the focus, NCAP and the National Coalition Against the Misuse of Pesticides (NCAMP), represented by the Western Environmental Law Center (WELC), in 1994 filed a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit arguing that EPA must publicly disclose the identities of these products' ingredients, as the recent ruling upholds their claims.

"Americans are exposed to pesticides in their food, water, homes, schools, workplaces, and parks," says Jay Feldman, NCAMP Executive Director. "This decision provides public access to critically important information about the 'inert' ingredients in these pesticides."

"Inert" ingredients are any of over 2,300 substances that are added to pesticides but are not named on product labels. Despite their name, they are neither biologically, chemically, or toxicologically inert. They often comprise most, even up to 99 percent, of a pesticide product. EPA has been routinely accepting manufacturers’ claims that "inerts" are trade secrets.

The court agreed with NCAP and NCAMP that EPA improperly relied on unsubstantiated claims by manufacturers that the identity of the ingredients was "trade secret" or "confidential business information." The court ruled that EPA and the manufacturers had failed to show that competitive harm would occur from release of the identity of the majority of chemicals in the pesticide products that were the subject of the lawsuit.

The opinion clarifies that these chemicals are not exempt from the Freedom of Information Act. "Federal agencies can no longer rubber-stamp chemical manufacturers' claims of confidentiality," said Deborah Mailander of WELC.

"The identity of the majority of ingredients in many pesticide products has been withheld in the past," says Michael Aline of WELC. "Now when people ask what is in the pesticides that they have been exposed to, EPA will have to tell them.

Based on a press release by NCAP, NCAP is a grassroots, regional organization that promotes sustainable resource management, prevention of past problems, use of alternatives to pesticides, and the right to be free from pesticide exposure. If you desire information on how to file a freedom of information request to discover the identity of the inert of your favorite pesticides, contact the Northwest Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides, POB 1393, Eugene, OR 97440, (541) 344-5044.

Maine Counties With Nuclear Plants or Paper Mills Show Highest Cancer Rates

Since the Maine Cancer Registry started reporting on cancer cases and cancer deaths in 1983, Lincoln County has been among those at the very top of the list. Aside from Lincoln and Knox counties, and sometimes Waldo (all downwind from Maine Yankee), the ones with occasional high incidence are those that are home to paper mills. Oxford County has occasionally had the highest incidence, but Lincoln and Knox (except for the year 1990) have always been listed among the top counties as to incidence of all cancers. The figures are based on statistical adjustments for age and population in each county. The latest figures are an average for the years 1988 through 1992.

Please understand that the work of our state cancer registry falls behind in the years about which it can report because of the need to receive and compile an enormous amount of information. We can be very proud of our Bureau of Health. It is exemplary among agencies nationwide in its diligence on behalf of the people of Maine, even though it has been seriously underfunded.

Here are some interesting figures from the most recent Maine Cancer Registry Report:

- Knox County shows the highest rate of all cancers. Oxford is next highest. This time around, Lincoln County is third highest. Penobscot, Kennebec, and Androscoggin are all below. All but Knox and Lincoln host pulp and paper mills. This is the trend we have seen since 1983. These counties have shown higher cancer incidence than the state average, sometimes significantly higher.

- From 1988 to 1992, Lincoln, Knox, and Oxford Counties have had high rates of thyroid cancer, with only Kennebec County being higher.

- Although the latest state report does not differentiate among those leukemias that can be related to radiation and those that are not, only Waldo, Franklin, Kennebec, Oxford, and Penobscot counties above the state average.

- For central nervous system and brain cancers from 1988-1992, Lincoln County reports the second highest statewide, only Franklin being higher.

- Lincoln County reports considerably higher incidence of breast cancer than the rest of the state with Oxford, Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Washington counties being only slightly higher than the state average for the five-year report. As for prostate cancer: Hancock, Oxford, and Piscataquis counties lead the state in incidence with Lincoln and Knox next highest. All are above the state average.

- Unusually high releases of radioactive gases during 1990 will cause careful scrutiny of future reports. Links to nuclear power and pulp/paper mills need greater attention by public health agencies.

This information was compiled by Maria Heil of the Midcoast Health Research Group (MHRG) and the Citizens' Monitoring Network from the latest Maine Cancer Registry Report. The Maine Midcoast Health Research Group was founded in 1979 in response to concerns about health effects from releases of radioactivity into the air and water around Maine Yankee Atomic Power Plant. The core group comprises physicians and public health nurses. In 1979, the group began lobbying for funding of the Maine State Cancer Registry. In 1983, the Registry was able to issue its first report of incidence and deaths from cancer. The purpose of the citizen research group is to monitor trends in cancer incidence and deaths by reviewing the literature on environmental pollutants in general and, more specifically, on man-made radioactivity. While no causal links have yet been definitely demonstrated, the trends in Maine over the past decade suggest the need for further research into health effects in populations around both paper mills and the nuclear plant.

MHRG can be contacted at: 115 High Street, Bath, ME 04530; (207) 443-3588.
The issues surrounding Christmas Mountain have not been resolved as of this date. The matter is now under the legal system ( Provincial Court ). The Defenders of Christmas Mountain have elected to temporarily stay the physical occupation of the Mountain as of September 20, 1996. Fundraising efforts for legal and logistical support are continuing. We are also encouraging letter/calls of support/assistance on logging/clearcutting issues and to particular any information on issues involving REEM.

After this announcement Tobique's Warrior Society has been only monitoring the area and found that the company has stepped up its operations to clearcut the entire area before any more opposition surfaces. Seven new logging roads have been built. A hundred trucks a day. Twenty-four hours a day REAP has initiated a lawsuit against the Warrior Society for hundreds of thousands of dollars of profit that was lost due to the slowing down of the operation. European countries have boycotted paper products from New Brunswick and the struggle goes on.

Although the situation is still not resolved the struggle continues it has been slowed down and provided more time to deal with the fate of one of the last virgin/primeval forests in the Northern forest area. Together we can make a difference. International pressure is a strong weapon against the corporate giants that are destroying what's left of our planet.

What You Can Do

If you are concerned with this issue you can voice your opinion to:

The Canadian Department of Natural Resources announced that clearcutting will not stop. The Warrior Society and the Friends of Christmas Mountains had coordinated their efforts to physically but non-violently slow the movement of heavy logging vehicles and equipment from entering the proposed cut area in the summer of 1996. They maintained a peaceful encampment and temporarily slowed the proposed logging operation.

When the Canadian action reached REAP New Brunswick, Inc., Woodland Division they immediately had their attorneys file an injunction order with the Court of the Queen's Bench of New Brunswick prohibiting this group from impeding the logging operations of the corporation citing their Crown License No. 4. While the authorized law enforcement to arrest and detain anyone interfering with the logging operation. This put everyone in the group at risk of being arrested or worse for participating in this non-violent protest.

The situation became very tense at that point and for a few weeks threats of violence from loggers and equipment operators working for REAP caused many people to abandon the camp. On October 7, 1996 the Warrior Society at Tobique ( Maliseet Reserve ) issued this press release:
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The Case Against the Sable Island Natural Gas Proposal

by David Orton

Editor's Note: A recent proposal to drill for natural gas off Sable Island, east of Nova Scotia has profound implications for the Maritime Provinces and New England states. Proponents of the drilling proposal, a 350 mile pipeline through Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Maine, New Hampshire that will terminate in the Boston area at a cost of $500 million, are being told that natural gas is environmentally clean and that this project will be a great benefit to the regional economy. Critics note that the federal and provincial energy policy, that natural gas contributes to the Greenhouse Effect, that the pipeline will have enormous ecological consequences, and that the pipeline is being imposed on citizens of the region by corporations with no concern for local communities. The following article is based on a statement by David Orton, on behalf of the North Shore Anti-Pipeline Group, to the final "Scoping Meeting" of the Joint Review Panel/Sable Gas Projects, held at the Citadel Inn, in Halifax N.S., on October 24, 1996.

For many conscious people, a sense of self includes family, community and one's own place. One's own place is part of what a person is. A gas pipeline which is imposed without consent into one's home space, violates this sense of self.

It was the above initial concern which helped motivate people to come together to form the North Shore Anti-Pipeline Group in July of 1996. By July 29, a press release was issued noting the creation of a Panel opposing the gas pipeline. The Panel stated the following reasons for this opposition:

1) The destruction of precious little remaining wildlife, wetlands and forest habitat.
2) Concerns for human health and safety, including the loss of self and community, of being near a gas pipeline will cause us.
3) The fact that this pipeline is being imposed upon us without our consent.

The Joint Public Review Panel for the Sable Island Gas Project has recently had open discussion and "scoping meetings" to allegedly identify "any deficiencies in the Offshore Project as proposed". The North Shore Anti-Pipeline Group which is totally against this project, sees the panel seems to be orchestrating a show that has to be gone through, but for which the players know the outcome. Yet for many of us, there are fundamental ecological and social issues which this project raises. The North Shore Anti-Pipeline Group asks for the following changes:

1) All members of the Joint Public Review Panel need to have legitimacy for the people of Nova Scotia. This means members of the panel must have just cause in their position and their record of defending the environment, speaking out for social justice, and defending the public's interests including their economic interests. Members must not be beholden to the oil and gas industry in any way.
2) The past environmental record of the people and companies involved in this natural gas project must be part of the mandate of the Public Review. (Offshore: Mobil, Shell and Imperial Oil; and onshore: Westcoast Energy, Panenergy and Mobil.) The project documents falsely claim that "no significant adverse environmental or adverse socio-economic impacts are likely to occur", in order to try and sell the public a lie.

Mobil and Shell are invoking past extractive activities in the North Sea and in the Gulf of Mexico as somehow proof that they can do the job in Nova Scotia. But what really are the past environmental and social justice records of these companies?

Remember the Newfoundland Ocean Ranger disaster? The then world's largest semi-submersible drill rig on the Grand Banks sank, with a loss of all 84 crew members. This rig was under contract to Mobil Oil Canada Ltd. Greenpeace in a 1992 document "Mobil Greenwash Snapshot #21", notes the following about the Gulf of Mexico:

"In the Gulf, Mobil and other oil companies discharge daily 1.5 million barrels of "bathtub" taintened with chemicals and heavy metals that can concentrate in tissue of marine organisms. This discharge has generated millions of tons of mud and cuttings that can smother bottom-dwelling life. This degradation, plus that from rig air pollution, tanker traffic, and spills, affects not only ocean but coastal ecosystems. In Louisiana's coastal plain and barrier islands, for example, wetland loss is occurring at a rate of 50 square miles per year."

Shell Canada Limited has foreign ownership of 72.9% and the Netherlands/Britain is the major shareholder. Shell tried to dispose of the Brent Spar oil platform, when it was finished with it, by dumping it in the North Atlantic. Protests by Greenpeace and other environmental groups, consumer boycotts of Shell, and other oppositional tactics, forced this company to back down. Shell produces half of Nigeria's daily output of oil and has close links with the military who run the country. Ken Saro-Wiwa who courageously articulated the environmental and social costs resulting from Shell's operations, was executed along with eight other activists by the Nigerian government. There had been 10 ruptures in gas pipelines over a 13-year period in Canada.

In British Columbia and Alberta, through publications like the B.C. Environmental Report, and the Alberta Wilderness Association's Wild Lands Advocate, environmentalists have criticized the negative environmental record of the oil and gas industry, which have fragmented ecosystems and severely degraded wildlife habitats. Dr. Brian L. Horgan, of the Speak Up For Wildlife Foundation, in an article "Shell Canada's Land Donation—Putting It In Perspective", (see Wild Lands Advocate, Vol. 1, No. 1, March, 1993), has stated:

"Shell is a company that has routinely destroyed unique environments and important wildlife habitats in the process of road building and drilling...It is a company that has taken legal action against Canadians who wanted an open, fair decision-making process about whether such destruction should be allowed to proceed...Shell is a company whose exploration and development activities have fragmented wildlife ecosystems and severely degraded wildlife habitat effectiveness throughout the foothills and mountains of Alberta, southeastern British Columbia...and the northeastern part of this province."

Environmentalists in the West familiar with the oil and gas industry, have also often noted the consistent bias of the National Energy Board and this industry in public hearings, like those being undertaken in Nova Scotia. Thus Michael Sawyer of the Rocky Mountain Ecosystem Coalition, writing in the B.C. Environmental Report, June 1994, in an article called "The Rape Of The Northern Rockies" noted:

"At a so-called public hearing in January 1994 the National Energy Board approved a total of 16 gas export licenses for a total of 33 billion m3, much of the gas coming from northwest B.C. In this hearing, the National Energy Board refused to hear evidence about the environmental effects of approving these gas exports."

3) Eliminate the existing rules of procedure (see National Energy Board Information Bulletin IV, "How to Participate in a Public Hearing") because these rules are intimidating, complex, and designed to exclude citizen participation in favor of lawyers and professional lobbyists for the oil and gas industry. I have participated in a number of hearings on various environmental issues, but I will not participate in the formal Sable Gas Hearing as presently structured.

4) Artificial separation of the Hearings. The present terms of reference of the Review Panel, by artificially separating its hearings into two components, exclude consideration of the overlapped pipeline projects in New Brunswick and New Brunswick. This is a non-wholistic viewpoint, and is also insulting to the hundreds of land owners who face the threat of a gas pipeline running through their backyards. The violation and destruction of people's home spaces and their dreams—and the destruction of onshore wildlands and wildlife—must be part of the evaluation of whether or not to go ahead with the marine component of the Sable Offshore Gas Project.

5) Project ethics, only a business viewpoint. The "Project Ethics" by the corporate proponents (Project Overview, Vol. 1, p. 19), are defined only from a business perspective: "We hold ourselves and our contractors to the highest standards of business ethics and professional performance." Apart from legal and business terms, it is not acceptable that a deeper ecological and social perspective should be part of the Review Panel's mandate. This should include, but not be limited to, a discussion of:

a) How do we reduce our industrial impact upon the Earth? What are our vital needs as a society, taking into consideration ecological sustainability and social justice and, does this project undermine or contribute to such needs? Is this project really needed?

b) Why should more natural gas be extracted from the earth given the reality of global warming? The federal government, to which the National Energy Board reports, has shown no commitment to upholding the Framework Convention on Climate Change which was supposed to freeze our net emissions of greenhouse gases at 1990 levels. The federal Energy Minister Anne McLellan, in a recent newspaper article ("Federal environmental reviews no more", The Chronicle Herald, September 26, 1996), stressed "voluntary" controls for greenhouse gas emissions and said these will not be "the expense of Canadian industry". In
Natural Gas - A Clean Fuel?

The corporate selling of the Sable Gas Project has emphasized that natural gas is a "clean" and "environmentally friendly" fuel. Some mainstream environmentalists emphasize how natural gas is much preferable to "dirty" coal and oil. Sometimes mainstreamers and the natural gas industry seem to be on the same team, when they both speak of this particular fossil fuel as a "bridging" fuel to a more environmentally friendly world. We have seen e-mail exchanges between members of the U.S. Sierra Club, cautioning each other not to become involved in opposing the extraction of Sable gas and the construction of a pipeline to U.S. markets.

Natural gas is not an environmentally friendly clean fuel. If we consider only combustion, then natural gas does contain less carbon than oil and coal and has fewer emissions of sulfur. (The carbon content by weight is approximately one-third for oil and one-half that of coal). Yet natural gas is not replacing oil or coal but merely adding to fossil fuel consumption and an expanding industrial/consumer economy. Natural gas, being a greenhouse gas, both adds to energy consumption and therefore to greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide (from combustion) and methane leakage from methane which makes up about 60 percent of sales quality natural gas. Do we need sea level rise, an increase in hurricanes and other dramatic weather changes? The proliferation of fossil fuels, carbon emission, of course, is part of a fossil fuel, continuous industrial growth ideology. When we know that the International Panel On Climate Change, the scientific body on greenhouse gases, has called for a 50 to 80 percent reduction, merely to stabilize the concentrations of these gases, then any increase is truly criminal behavior. This is reason enough to oppose the Sable Island Gas Project.

Also, to talk of environmentally friendly natural gas, is to totally disregard the environmental degradation in the production of offshore natural gas from Sable Island and in its distribution by onshore gas pipeline across Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Maine, New Hampshire, and into Massachusetts.

—David Orton

---
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The Northern Forest Forum
Energy Deregulation: More Acid Rain for Adirondacks?

At the United States races toward energy deregulation, environmental impacts appear to be getting short-shift. It is unclear whether President Clinton's approach to deregulation of utilities will take environmental damage into effect. This is of particular concern in the Adirondacks where the problem of acid precipitation has not been resolved.

Environmental leaders fear that energy deregulation will make it profitable to re-open mothballed Midwestern coal-fired plants and to return plants to full operating capacity that are currently operating at reduced capacity. The resulting acidic emissions will have serious consequences not only for Adirondack ecosystems, but for drinking water quality and human health (see "Lead in Drinking Water: The Acid Rain Connection").

The Adirondack Council has been a leader in the fight against acid rain since the 1970s. The Council proposes to use the 1997 reauthorization of the federal Clean Air Act to curtail harmful smokesmoke emissions from coal-burning electric companies in the Ohio River Valley.

The New York Congressional delegation, led by House Rules Committee Chairman Gerald Solomon, (R-Glens Falls), has sponsored legislation aimed at cutting Midwestern utility smokesmoke emissions by an additional 50 percent by the year 2000. This fall, Congressman Solomon noted that the Clinton Administration is expected to unveil new proposed legislation designed to restructure and deregulate the electric industry. "The Administration, so far, has yet to convince the public that their proposal may indeed worsen the effects of acid rain on the Northeast," he stated. "I am curious to see how they plan to address this problem."

In October," Republican New York Senator Alfonse D'Amato announced he would join Solomon in a push for federal legislation designed to curb the harmful effects of acid rain in the Northeastern states. "I am in clear that the problem of acid rain has not been solved," said Senator D'Amato. "We must stand by and see New York's Adirondack Park destroyed and with it the lives and livelihoods of countless New Yorkers. I will work with Senator [Daniel Patrick] Moynihan (D-NY), Congressman [Steve] Israel and the New York House delegation to put an end to acid rain when the Clean Air Act is up for the Congress.

500 of the 3,000 lakes and ponds in the Adirondack Park are too acidic to support most aquatic life. Despite recently added controls on sulfur-dioxide emissions from Midwest smokestacks, the Adirondack Council and the Environmental Defense Fund has been said to prevent acid rain damage in the Adirondacks.

A congressionally mandated EPA study revealed that, while changes enacted in the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments will reduce acid deposition, the measures are not sufficient in the long-term to fully protect the sensitive lakes and waters of the Adirondacks.

The EPA estimates that half of the Park's lakes and ponds and most of its 30,000 miles of rivers and streams will be critically acidified by the year 2040. Acid rain has also killed thousands of acres of forest in the High Peaks region of the Adirondack Park. Both fish and trees are killed by the leaching of aluminum by acid rain from natural sources in soil and rock. Aluminum tracers as low as one part-per-million can cause plant damage. The roots of dead spruce on Whiteface Mountain contain 4800 parts-per-million.

Sable Gas Project

Scotia Resources Limited (6%). The companies involved in the project are Westcoast Energy Inc. (37.5%), PanEnergy (37.5%), and Mobil Oil Canada Properties (25%). Westcoast seems to be the lead company.

A U.S. section of line then carries the gas through Maine to Portsmouth, New Hampshire to Dracut, near Boston, in Massachusetts. PanEnergy Corporation is reported to be responsible for the U.S. portion of the line. In Canada, the pipeline companies have marked out a one-kilometer preferred route and within this a 25-centimetre permanent path will be appropriated with or without permission by the landowners. In the Canadian section, the pipe will normally be buried three feet underground in agricultural areas and four feet in forested areas. The companies claim 95-90% of the pipeline corridor passes through forested areas. There are, according to company documents, 229 watercourses in the corridor boundaries, 10 lakes, plus a large number of wetlands. The on-land environmental destruction will be cumulative as the pipeline passes through.

A wild card is an alternative proposal for a gas pipeline recently made (September of 1996), by Montreal-based Gaz Metropolitain and TransCanada Pipeline. This is to move the Sable gas to the New England markets via Quebec City, crossing the border in Vermont. This proposal comes late in the day but can be seen as the "most nationalistic," in the first time as a genuine link-up for the Maritime provinces with an existing trans-Canada gas line. This proposal also has economic inducements for Quebec. Given the lack of practical work done so far to sell and justify such a proposal, it is unclear at this time if this is a serious contender to the proposed Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline Project.

The North Shore Anti-Pipeline Group, within which the Green Party is working, is requesting assistance through the Northern Forest Forum. We are seeking environmentally conscious people in the Northeast join hands with us to help stop the Sable Island Gas Project on your side of the border, using whatever creative interventions are appropriate.

To contact the North Shore Anti-Pipeline Group write to: Citizens Against the Sable Island Pipeline, POB 878, New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, Canada B2H 5K7.

To contact David Orton or the Green Post office in Guysborough County Nova Scotia also has economic inducements for Quebec. It comes late in the day but can be seen as the "most nationalistic," in the first time as a genuine link-up for the Maritime provinces with an existing trans-Canada gas line. This proposal also has economic inducements for Quebec. Given the lack of practical work done so far to sell and justify such a proposal, it is unclear at this time if this is a serious contender to the proposed Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline Project.

The North Shore Anti-Pipeline Group, within which the Green Party is working, is requesting assistance through the Northern Forest Forum. We are seeking environmentally conscious people in the Northeast join hands with us to help stop the Sable Island Gas Project on your side of the border, using whatever creative interventions are appropriate.

To contact the North Shore Anti-Pipeline Group write to: Citizens Against the Sable Island Pipeline, POB 878, New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, Canada B2H 5K7.

Water Solvity 1996

When aluminum attatches itself to the gills of fish, the fish suffocate. Mercury is also being leached out of the soil and rock and is accumulating in the flesh of certain sport and food fish that are able to withstand acidity better than the vanishing trout population. The NYS Health Department issued warning this year to avoid eating small fish from lakes near industrially acidic waters in the Adirondacks because mercury can cause nerve cell damage in humans. Mercury is also highly toxic to birds. The Adirondack Park is a year-round and seasonal home to more than 200 species of birds, many of which are migratory.

This article is based on press releases from the Adirondack Council and the office of Congressman Gerald Solomon. For further information, contact John Skehan of the Adirondack Council, (518) 432-2770.
Hundreds Participate in Maine Low-Impact Forestry Demonstrations This Autumn

by Mitch Lansky

This fall in Maine, hundreds of people got to witness demonstrations of low-impact forestry equipment and techniques at the Common Ground Fair in Windsor and at the farm of consulting forester Barrie Brusila in Whalom. For both events, the weather was cooperative, and interest was high.

At the Common Ground Fair, sponsored by the Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association, visitors had the opportunity to view a slide show presentation by Mitch Lansky as well as a demonstration of Sam Brown's tracked Dion forwarder. Sam had no trouble attracting a crowd when he revved up the engine of his Dion and loaded logs on its tracked trailer. Another attraction was Sam's radio-controlled winch. By pushing a button on his belt, Sam could start and stop the winch, as he pulled logs to his forwarder. For those with more curiosity, Sam had a booth with a display of pictures and articles concerning low-impact forestry.

The next week Sam put on a working demonstration at the 80 acre farm of Barrie Brusila, his husband, Mitch Kihn, and sister, Sara Lynne Brusila. This demonstration was co-sponsored by the Low-Impact Forestry Project, the Small Woodlands Owners of Maine, and the University of Maine Cooperative Extension.

In the previous century, much of Barrie's woodlot had been cleared as pasture, but now it is well stocked and on the way to recovering a more stately appearance. Curting in recent years has been key to the yarding here. Barrie took advantage of Sam's felling abilities and yarding equipment to harvest some of these larger pines that were dying.

During a visit to a neighboring farm, Dave Smith of Yale has stated that all logging is ugly and ought to be hidden from view, this was not an opinion shared by those observing the logging operation at Barrie's farm. There were no gashes in the soil, large slash piles, scarred-up tree trunks, or deep tire ruts. Careful directional felling by Sam led to minimal damage to residuals. Use of self-releasing snatch blocks avoided damage to residuals from winching and helped to keep wood-trails distribution at a minimum. The woods yard on most skidder operations is a huge muddy, rutty mess. Skidders must push tree-length logs onto large piles. With Sam's forwarder, the yard was neat and was mostly done by horse. Some of the white pine were too large for Cindy, Sara's horse, to drag a short distance, let alone all the way to the yard. Barrie's woodlot had been cleared as pasture, but now it is well stocked and on the way to recovering a more stately appearance.

Sam's forwarder shared the lime-light with Cindy, Sara's Belgian mare, and Melodie, a horse belonging to logger Del Ellis. Sam also brought his Radio Horse, a radio-controlled portable winch. The horse loggers were quite pleased to work in conjunction with Sam's forwarder. Since the horses only had to twitch out logs to the trail (rather than to a yard), their job was much more efficient and much less tiring. Del Ellis also brought a small horse-drawn trailer to demonstrate an even lower-impact forwarding system.

Horses helped make Sam's forwarding more efficient as well. Sam has rigged his forwarder with a radio-controlled winch to make his system a one-man operation. He did this primarily as a reaction to workers' compensation laws that make hiring others very expensive. Sam stated, however, that letting his forwarder stand idle while he cuts and limbs trees is hardly a cost-effective use of his machinery. With horse loggers pre-bunching logs at the trail, Sam is able to use his machinery for what it does best-forwarding.

The Radio Horse is a large winch on skids that is also used for pre-bunching logs at the trail. Sam gets the Radio Horse to location by hooking its cable to a distant tree and letting the machine winch itself along. Using self-releasing snatch blocks, Sam can keep the machine in one location and winch in logs from many locations, stopping and starting the winch by remote control. These winches (from Vermont) are no longer commercially manufactured, they were ahead of their time. With a new interest in low-impact forestry, however, perhaps some entrepreneur will manufacture an improved model.

The demonstration was featured in a full-page article in Central Maine Newspapers and on the news for Maine Public Radio. The reporter was evidently impressed by what they saw, because they both did an excellent job at summing up both the techniques and the philosophy behind low-impact forestry.

At all demonstrations, Sam brought a sign-up sheet for those interested in low-impact forestry. Our goal is to take this list of names and to help connect landowners with foresters and loggers who all share a commitment to a longer-term approach to forestry. We recognize that the economics are different for low-impact approaches compared to approaches geared to maximizing short-term profits. Loggers will have to be paid for the quality of what they leave behind, rather than just the quantity of what they remove.

Although we must move one step at a time, our minds are racing ahead to the possibility of having a series of loggers on a number of nearby lots using horses, radio horses, or small tractors with winches to pre-bunch logs for a forwarder. We can imagine woodlot owners combining small loads of high-quality logs to create efficiencies of scale for trucking to mills.

We can also imagine landowners with a commitment to low-impact forestry for not only this generation, but for generations to come. One low-impact cut does not assure that such management will continue, though it does keep future options open. Landowners can use long-term stewardship contracts, provisions in deeds, or the creation of land trusts to codify longer-term commitments. We are open to new ideas, and would appreciate hearing from others.

Write to: Mitch Lansky, HC 60, Box 86, Wryeputflock, ME 04497, or Sam Brown, RFD 1, Box 1940, Cambridge, ME 04923.

Industrial Foresters: Custodians or Merchants?

In his new autobiography, Mean Business, Chainsaw Al Dunlop, formerly of Diamond and Scott, boasts how he transformed his industrial foresters from stewards of the land to merchants of fiber.

"I promoted a man named Art Larsen to forest manager for Diamond, and he caught on to my tactics in a big way. Instead of just going through the motions, he sought out higher and better uses for land, including real estate sales and recreational leases, and turned his foresters from custodians into merchants."
The Maine Woods is the greatest remaining wildland east of the Rockies. However, today this region is under siege. Maine Woods Watch is devoted to documenting the good, the bad, and the ugly affecting the Maine Woods, with an emphasis on opportunities for citizen action to protect and restore the essence of the region, its wildness.

They Mean Business: As predict-ed, forest industry pundits continued the nose-dive this fall that started earlier in the year. Third quarter earnings for most companies were well below 1995 figures. But profit from a $111 million profit to a $2 million loss; Bowater slipped 50%; Champion's earnings plunged 86%; Georgia-Pacific's take home shelled 69%; Sappi freefell 75%.

In the pulp and paper sector, the price of the benchmark grade of softwood pulp, which peaked at close to $1,000 a ton a year ago, tumbled to under $500 as global demand shriveled in the face of tight supplies. The lumber sector also was down as new housing starts stumbled. Investors liked the adjustment seeing it as a sign the national economy was slowing "a more sustainable pace," but lumber dealers and home builders were ripped. In late November they asked the Clinton Administration to renegotiate an agreement signed with Canada just last spring. That limitless softwood lumber imports from our northern neighbor. The Office of the US Trade Representative said it had no intention of trying to change the Canadian deal.

The green Boise signs are coming down in Rumford and the blue-and-white Mead signs are going up. Following a 30-day federal review, on November 1 The Mead Corporation finalized its $640 million purchase of Boise Cascade's northern New England holdings in record time. In addition to the Rumford mill, which produces coated paper for National Geographic and other magazines and catalogs, the acquisition includes 670,000 acres in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont.

The Boise sale got most of the publicity but several other plants changed hands this fall as well. The VPS Coated Paper Co. of Boston, which was sold to Armor Holdings, a subsidiary of AT&T Commercial Finance Corp. Two idle Babcock Ultrapower biomass plants in Enfield and Jonesboro were bought by Indeck Power Oversized Ltd.

Four hundred Georgia-Pacific employees in eastern Maine got an unplanned vacation in November. The VPS Coated Paper Co. of Boston, which was sold to Armor Holdings, a subsidiary of AT&T Commercial Finance Corp. Two idle Babcock Ultrapower biomass plants in Enfield and Jonesboro were bought by Indeck Power Oversized Ltd.

Four hundred Georgia-Pacific employees in eastern Maine got an unplanned vacation in November. The company shut down its Woodland mill for the first time in 54 years due to loosing too much money. Fourteen percent of the local salaried staff had been permanently laid off a month earlier. When photographers showed up snapping pictures rumors started in Rumford that the mill was being put on the market. Workers fear a sale particularly to New Brunswick-based Irving Corp., but G-P managers say they are only preparing a new brochure.

S.D. Warren, a subsidiary of South African Pulp & Paper Industries, is giving permanent vacations to 200 employees at its American facilities. Almost four dozen workers were dumped at the company's Westbrook plant this fall and about 30 more were expected to be laid off from the specialty paper mill and containers in the company's American plants. An unspecified number of employees were summarily dismissed at the S.D. Warren mill in Skowhegan in late November. Serious flooding in southern Maine during October closed down the mill and has required expensive repairs, however, Warren management says that has nothing to do with the work force reductions. More likely it is due to the heavy fiscal burden parent corporation Sappi has been carrying since it bought S.D. Warren in late 1994 largely with junk bond financing. Unions representing workers at the S.D. Warren mill in Skowhegan say there has been a major breakdown in trust between labor and management over contract negotiations, grievances and disciplinary actions. The letter to Scuttlebutt is that some or all of Warren's two mills and 908,000 acres in Maine might be sold to reduce Sappi's debt.

By the way, the guy who sold off S.D. Warren two years ago and the rest of Scott Paper Company last year, has been back in the news. "Chairman At Dunlap, who is best known for salvaging companies by dismembering them, announced in November his latest restructuring scheme. Dunlap, CEO of Sunbeam Corp. since last summer, said he was eliminating half of the 12,000 jobs at the home appliance manufacturer. Within hours 37 workers at a Sunbeam plant in Maine were axed and the entire subsidiary was put up for sale. Dunlap also has published a new book which has caused a big stir in business circles. Mean Business: How I Save Bad Companies and Make Good Companies Great (Times Business, 1996, $25) details his breathless, no nonsense approach to corporate success. If you don't want to spend the twenty-five-bucks for the long version, here are Dunlap's four simple rules to trim corporate excess: get the right management team, pick pennies; know what business you're in; get a real strategy. As a former CEO of Sunbeam and founder of Dunlap, Dunlap says "Mean Business, "The process is painful. Sometimes, it's ugly. But in the end, it's worth it. There are no more prisons and poor houses for the unemployed."

International Paper is scooping one win after another. The United Paperworkers union has failed for the second time in as many years to get back into IPS Androscoggin Mill in Jay. The union was broken when it lost a big strike at the plant in 1988. The company is also poised to get a chance from the Environmental Protection Agency to police its own operations. Since 1991, IP has paid over $3 million in federal and state fines for violations in Maine, but starting in 1997 the EPA is going to let the company audit itself. The company was given a part of a program the agency wants to become a national model. Less regulatory oversight is not enough. IP also wants more tax breaks; in fact, it wants double its money back. It has asked the town of Jay to refund local taxes paid for mill upgrades. At the same time, the company is applying to the state for reimbursement of business equipment taxes for the same investments. Sounds like IP managers have been reading Mean Business.

Two years ago a large number of recycled paper mills coming on line at once caused a spike in the price of waste paper. That price hiccup drove the Sturtevant Tissue mill in Augusta out of business. In April 1996, a group of investors bought the factory and started Tree Free Fiber. Immediately the new company ran into trouble when the market for de-inked pulp nearly evaporated. Now management says it has a new plan to focus on wholesaling tissue for which demand is projected to grow faster than supply. The company wants more state-backed financing for a multi-million dollar upgrade that could add 50 to the work force.

Search & Destroy or Protect & Restore? The shouting match between those who want to exploit and those who want to conserve Maine's remnant wildlands is never ending.

A Superior Court ruling has upheld the wording of a referendum proposal to ban aerial pesticide spraying in Maine. However, the Maine Farm Bureau Association says it will appeal to the state supreme court. Nancy Orden, director of Citizens for a Livable Environment in Alliance with Nature, had intended to collect voter signatures on the citizens' initiative in November. However, she has decided to do more grassroots organizing first, then try probably in 1997 to get the more than 50,000 signatures to take the referendum to a vote. As a gateway at the event, the News蕈s, where the CLEANS: Maine, PO Box 186, Jonesboro, ME 04683. In a separate ruling in federal district court in October, the EPA will no longer be able to control the identity of "toxic" pesticide ingredients.

A logging operation adjacent to the Schoodic section of Acadia National Park has started despite heroic efforts to prevent it. The 1,600 acre cut is a few miles from the town of Jay to refund local taxes paid for mill upgrades. At the same time, the company is applying to the state for reimbursement of business equipment taxes for the same investments. Sounds like IP managers have been reading Mean Business.
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tests for approval. Worst, Gardner paid too much for the lands, immediately heavily logged the area to recoup some of their costs, then tried to recover more of their investment by seeking permission to intensively develop some of the most valuable shorelands under the guise that they could only afford to do sustainable forestry if they could subdivide the land. In the mainstream news media never figured it out, the real story was that the public was being asked to bail out a landowner who got in financial difficulty with a speculative purchase of forestland.

Troubled Waters: In the effort to balance the public and private interests in solving the famous waters, the Penobscot West Branch, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has issued a new 30-year license to intensively develop some of the six dams on the river. Conservationists like the provisions for a protected shoreline buffer on more than 200 miles of waterfront within the flowage boundary in the license. However, they are requesting a rehearing on the license condition that allows Bowater to dewater the six-mile back channel. They insist that the endangered flows in the publicly owned river would help fisheries and recreation and not hurt the company's power generation. (Contact Appalachian Mountain Club, 5 Jay Street, Boston, MA 02108.)

With prices high and global demand outstripping supply, cranberry growers and wamen are scrambling to expand production in the state. A new state plan calls for expanding the 70 acres currently in cranberry plantations in Maine to 1,000 acres by the year 2000. The Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry is going to let wetland protection rules get in the way. Officials have said they will ask federal agencies to let them develop some wetlands into plantations. If that fails they intend to seek to have the Clean Water Act amended.

Fish Stories: When you cannot beat them, join them. The King Administration is so nervous that federal agencies might list the imperiled Atlantic salmon under the Endangered Species Act it is trying to protect the species. In official comments to the US Fish and Wildlife and National Marine Fisheries Services on October 10, Gov. Angus King paragraphized the agencies for failing to cooperative so far while arguing against listing. But in case the feds still harbor any serious thoughts of finding the salmon worthy of ESA listing, the governor made it clear that "all options are on the table", and we will pursue all available avenues, including litigation and legislative solutions." In other words, he will both sue, threaten, and give them the benefit of the doubt. Techincally speaking, the governor has said he will sue the federal agencies for failing to seek to have the salmon listed as endangered under the ESA.

Neglie Doggie: The weather may be cool, but wolves remain in Maine. A mysterious one, too. A 66-pound female canid shot north of Moosehead Lake in 1993 was DNA tested. Reportedly the forensic tests showed the critter was, in fact, a wolf linked to packs in Quebec, but the US Fish and Wildlife Service mysteriously will not release the actual results. Nor would the agency charge the hunter with an Endangered Species Act violation. Now this November an 81-pound wolf-like male canine has been killed by a Hancock County trapper. The carcass, which is twice as large as a coyote, is being tested. Despite this physical evidence and numerous reports of wolf sightings across the state in recent years the official position of the Maine Department of Inland Fish and Wildlife on wolves is...a mystery. Craig McLaughlin of MDIFW says the agency neither denies nor confirms that there are wolves in Maine. For the last three years state biologists have been looking for signs of wolves in winter furbearer census counts, but have found a cause for concern. In a bold move they plan to continue to look, but they refuse to do any education other than a news release planned for sometime this winter. They instruct hunters to really ought not to kill the federally protected animals. To nudge the bureaucracy contact MDIFW, 41 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333.
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The Northern Appalachian Restoration Project
A Network of Grassroots Activists in Northern Forest Communities
Working to Assure Sustainable Natural & Human Communities

Northern Appalachian Restoration Project Activities Include:

• Publication of The Northern Forest Forum
  Six issues a year of the nationally acclaimed journal featuring
  the work of many of the most talented activists, writers, artists,
  photographers, and poets of the Northern Forest Bioregion

• The Forestry Reform Project
  Includes the Low Impact Forestry initiative in Maine & grass­
  roots forestry initiatives in NH & VT

• The Herbicide Project of NH & VT
  Citizens of the Connecticut River Headwaters working to ban
  herbicides as a tool for forest management in our communities
  and states

• Wildlands Protection
  NARP is promoting a proposed 8-million acre HEADWATERS Regional
  Wilderness Reserve System in northern Maine, NH & VT

• Renewable Energy Assistance Program
  Promoting a decentralized sustainable energy policy for the
  Northern Forest Region that does not conflict with wildlands
  protection

• Coastal Waters Project
  A Citizen's Network dedicated to protecting and restoring the
  Gulf of Maine's coastal ecosystems & economies

• Support for Northern Forest Grassroots
  Organizers and Activists

NARP Needs Your Financial Support

• NARP Activists accomplish much with little money. In the past year
  they have:
  ➠ Promoted Low Impact Forestry through demonstrations and pre­
    sentations in Maine & Vermont
  ➠ Halted aerial herbicide spraying by paper companies in Vermont in
    1995 and 1996 & appealed the issuance of NH herbicide spray
    permits to the NH Supreme Court
  ➠ Helped halt the proposed Sears Island Cargo Port in Maine
  ➠ Helped educate Maine voters about the Ban Clearcutting
    Referendum and the crisis in Maine's Industrial Forest

• Citizen Activists Rely on NARP for information, inspiration, &
  assistance
• NARP Activists are helping to set the environmental agenda for the
  Northern Forest for the 21st Century

Yes! I want to support citizen activists working with
NARP to assure sustainable natural & human
communities in the Northern Forest Region.

I would like to become more involved in protecting the natural &
human communities of the Northern Forest Region.

Enclosed is a contribution to the Northern Appalachian Restoration
Project for __________ to support this important work.

Name__________________________
Address________________________
Town________________ State______ Zip_______
Phone__________________________

Please make checks payable to NARP and return to:
NARP, POB 6, Lancaster, NH 03584

NARP is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation