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Start the Revolution Without Me, or, Confessions of a Menshevik

The editor emeritus of this publication, Jamie Sayen, and I frequently recognize—in the soup of energies abroad today, the unfolding of another revolution, at least a revolution dynamic.

Lenin supposedly said that true revolutionaries do not concern themselves with the "day after the revolution." In that case, The Northern Forest Forum, its writers, and the message we have sought to convey, cannot be truly revolutionary. For, collectively, we are indeed less concerned with the over-turn of institutions, the smashing of the ruling paradigm, with destruction, than we are with the basic necessities of a sustainable mode of life here in the forested region of northern New England and New York.

A few years ago, in the glow of a Desert Storm victory, George Bush proclaimed the end of the "Vietnam Syndrome." Bush was, of course, deposed, largely because he was considered patrician, and out-of-touch with the people. Recent events in the region of the Northern Forest do suggest the potential, in fact, for basic rifts in understanding that, for those with memories of Vietnam, are highly reminiscent of a society out of touch with itself.

In August, here in the North Country of New Hampshire and Vermont, a gunman decided he'd had enough of various figures of authority. He went on a rampage, killed four of them and wounded more. After his own death in a gun battle with police, his home place was discovered to harbor explosives and bombs sufficient to destroy much more than he did. The man's grievances involved issues of property and the infringement of authority upon property—"infringements" taken as a matter of course, and of self-government, by most citizens of this area.

To some who share this man's hatred of authority, he may become a hero, or perversely justified in his deeds, glorified for how far he got. However, to those of the area who knew the victims of his rage, and knew them for their humanity, as well as respecting them for their office, there is no such possibility. He was no hero, and he died for no principle.

We have grown up as a nation with the Lockeian idea that government exists by the consent of the governed; that this contract may be severed. Lincoln, faced with the multiple social ferment of his day, long wrestled with his commitment to democracy and the Constitution. What he arrived at was the conviction that the people, like any individual, must, in expressing their will, ground it in great moral cause. Of those who would raise a violent revolution on the basis of property rights, separate from any consideration of social well-being, the rest of us must wonder, what would life be like in this republic the day after the revolution?

The Chore of Government
It is a curious thing to be involved in saying what government "ought to do." It is a frustration to be up against government doing what it ought not. It is a complex matter to be pursuing cultural and social good. It is a subject of great debate whether, with respect to logging practices or wilderness and public land, government ought to be involved at all. Complicating the matter is the modern American feeling, here among unparalleled material abundance (and crap), that government is corrupt, money runs the show; and the individual is subject to "regime loss of liberty. Yet if we are to survive as a democracy we must, as the Buddhists might put it, act as if we had one.

Having been somewhat involved in Vermont's cutting debate, I can add that there is a leavening of anger, rage, and conspiracy-paranoia to modern discussion of government. For, there is a leavening of anger, rage, and conspiracy-paranoia to modern discussion of government. For, there is a leavening of anger, rage, and conspiracy-paranoia to modern discussion of government. For, there is a leavening of anger, rage, and conspiracy-paranoia to modern discussion of government. For, there is a leavening of anger, rage, and conspiracy-paranoia to modern discussion of government.

However, ignored problems multiply. Extremists do not make revolutions. The intersubjectivity of power does.

We are a democracy, committed to a Constitution, and committed to our historical directive of government of, by, and for the people. We are dedicated to somehow plucking out of chaos the blessings of liberty. Surely these must include, for the sake of the individual and society, a sustainable human-scaled economy, a connection to the land, a celebration of wilderness. At the very least we ought to be able to discuss them so that we can achieve them in a democratically-acceptable manner.

As Americans, we are doomed to optimism. Playwright Arthur Miller once wrote an essay comparing the Revolution of the 1930s with that of the 1960s. Among his many excellent points, he concludes:

"By 1949, a thirties man would never have known there had existed, but a few years before, a movement for social justice so loud and so pervasive—the word society itself had become suspect by 1949. But in ten years more justice was the issue again, and the blacks this time were aware. It was simply that the invention of the thirties had been absorbed, and it is the same procedure now, when the country has been rejected and digested the sixties idea. And that may be why, in my case anyway, a return from abroad to this country is always a faintly surprising experience of hope. It does keep changing here, it does go on with the blind, blundering search, which is not the case in most other, complete places. Evidently, we are not fated to be 2, 21, 31; Maineopoly by Jym Pierre & Jon Luoma
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The misguided gunmen whose mad conception of property rights drove him to wantonly waste and destroy the precious lives of others was himself killed at the foot of several large white pine trees near the site of springs sacred to the Abenaki people. Several people who grew up near the springs feel that the gunman's presence did not desecrate the place, but that the power and presence of the place symbolized in the commanding nature of its over-story pine, instead drew his malevolence in, to a place it could be neutralized.
In Memory of Janet Engle Cormier

Janet Cormier's cancer ended a wonderful trip she and her husband Dave were taking to Alaska. Instead, she had to come home to face hospitals and invasive therapies. She did not face her cancer passively; she initiated her own changes in diet and lifestyle to fight the disease from the inside. The result was that she was having ups and downs in health and energy. Some of her lows were scary—but then she would miraculously rebound.

When we planned the May 3rd conference on Low Impact Forestry in Ellsworth, we knew we could not plan to have Janet. We all felt that she, a soil scientist who had done recent research on Best Management Practices, would be a perfect fit. We made sure that one of her colleagues on her project, Alan Kimball, would be there to present their work.

I was surprised and delighted when Janet called just before the conference to tell me she was feeling much better and that she would attend the conference. Was Janet really beating cancer? I sure hoped so. I did not think she would actually make a presentation, but I knew she would enjoy being there.

Janet, wearing an impressive wig to cover up hair loss from chemotherapy, did make a presentation at the conference. Participants in their comments gave her high marks. Dana Marble, a logging contractor for several decades, told me hers was the best presentation he knew she would enjoy being there.

Janet, a soil scientist who had done recent research of her colleagues on her project, Alan Kimball, would be there to present their work. We all felt that she, a soil scientist who had done recent research on Best Management Practices, would be a perfect fit. We made sure that one of her colleagues on her project, Alan Kimball, would be there to present their work.

Janet's classmates from high school wondered what they could do in her name. Janet's request, they are contributing to a fund going to the Low Impact Forestry Project. Janet's participation has made us all much more aware of the importance of protecting land and water from severe impacts. It is in our intention to put that awareness into practice. We have, unfortunately, lost our teacher on the subject—our teacher and our friend.

Lowell Krassner Memorial Forest Gathering September 25-28

(from the Sierra Club)

Lowell Krassner was the heart and soul of the Sierra Club Northern Forest Campaign and the Vermont chapter of the Sierra Club. Lowell was the "activist's activist." His clear insight and understanding of the process and the political game made it easy for others to understand the big picture and follow his leadership. Chris Bellanusa, long-time friend and fellow activist said that "Lowell was known for his uncanny ability to pull together activists around kitchen tables and hammer out creative strategies for land and forest protection." He was just as effective in the "Vermont kitchen table campaigns" as he was in the halls of Congress, fighting for the Northeast wilderness that he so dearly loved. His many successes include: the Vermont Wilderness Act of 1984, the Sierra Club intervention in Appalachian Trail/Killington Ski Area

 congress. We will focus on two major issues in the Northern Forest: Air pollution impacts on the Northern Forest and proposed wildlands within the Forest. We hope to educate and train you, our concerned forest activists and leaders, to have a passion for right and wrong, a sincere commitment to community and doing your homework, too. Finally and most importantly, we want to appeal to your sense of honor to keep us all safe in the long haul to protect the Northern Forest!

Lowell, we miss you! Thank you for your guidance . . . .

The Lowell Krassner gathering includes field trips, talks by local activists and technical experts, and opportunities to visit. The full weekend costs only $45 per person. For more information call Baret or Chris at the Sierra Club office: 512-756-4213 or Pete McCall at 202-947-5149 or Charles Gandy at 512-756-4213.

CRWC Spearheads American Heritage River Designation Drive for the Connecticut

The Connecticut River Watershed Council is coordinating a drive to have the Connecticut River be one of the 100 rivers that President Clinton will nominate for American Heritage River Designation. The designation would make local initiatives to conserve and restore environmental, cultural and historical resources and support heritage tourism in the Connecticut Valley eligible for federal funds. The Connecticut River Watershed Council encourages letters of support from "groups, organizations and institutions" to be sent by September 15th. The Council also welcomes your participation in the nomination effort. If you wish to join, write a letter, please call the Council at 413-529-9500.

Wolf Recovery Workshop Offered by Antioch Oct. 25

The Antioch New England Graduate School of Keene, NH is hosting a wolf recovery workshop on Saturday, October 25, 1997, in celebration of the new New Hampshire Wolf Awareness Week. (The first Wolf Awareness Week was established by proclamation of New Hampshire Governor John G. Clinton in 1996. Governor Shaheen will sign a similar proclamation on September 1, 1997.)

Sponsored by Wild Canines Unlimited and Antioch, the day long conference features keynote speaker and wolf researcher Dr. Fred Harrington; panels and presentations addressing wolf re-introduction, natural recovery and wolf advocacy, with particular reference to the Northern Forest region. An evening of art, music and theater centered on the wolf will also feature wildlife biologist Mike Jenner, photography by Jim Brandenburg, and performance by Heather Henson, daughter of the puppeteer Jim Henson, as well as a live appearance by MaisonWolf.

The full conference costs only $45 but registration must be completed by October 1st; seating is limited.

For registration information please contact Conference Director Wendy Van de Poll (also of Wild Canines Unlimited) at Antioch New England Graduate School, 40 Ayars St., Keene, NH 03431-3516 Tel. 603-357-3122 ext.249 E-mail wvandepoll@antioch.edu. Wolf conference website: www.antioch.edu/NHwolf/

Congress Fiddles with ISTEA - Lobby Now

All bicycle boosters and running-walking-blading advocates should use the present opportunity to lobby. Congress to save funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the nation's major transportation law, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA).

ISTEA provides funding for nine different transportation programs. In July, the House and Senate passed transportation bills of about $42 billion. The '98 appropriations bill will be negotiated in a Senate-House conference committee in September.

ISTEA will determine which portion of funds goes to bicycle, pedestrian and eco-transit causes in programs titled Enhancements, Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) and Surface Transportation.

But there is always a risk, in the conference committee, that opponents will force cuts in funding that benefits cyclists and others. Therefore, eco-trans-advocates favor the ISTEA "Works" S. 586, introduced by Sen. Moynihan and Rep. Susan Molinari.NEXTEA, S. 468, also is supported.

But serious threats are in S.335 ("STEP 21"), introduced by Sen. Warner, which would threaten the multimodal and local control of ISTEA spending. Bicyclists and pedestrians should also oppose "STARS 2000," S.332, from Sen. Baucus, which cuts CMAQ and lets states spend more on new highways instead.

Supporters of a balanced transportation policy should write local newspapers and their Congressmen today in support of ISTEA. For more information: Tel.: 1-888-GOISTEA (888-464-7832) or 1-800-288-2453 or e-mail: goistea@aol.com; Bikes Belong! at: www.outdoorlink.com/bikes-istea;
or Pete McCall at 202-947-5149 or Charles Gandy at 512-756-4213.

-Submitted by Justin G. Paulinich, member of the Onondaga Cycling Club

The Watershed Council encourages letters of support from "groups, organizations and institutions" to be sent by September 15th. The Council also welcomes your participation in the nomination effort. If you wish to join, write a letter, please call the Council at 413-529-9500.

The Connecticut River Watershed Council is coordinating a drive to have the Connecticut River be one of the 100 rivers that President Clinton will nominate for American Heritage River Designation. The designation would make local initiatives to conserve and restore environmental, cultural and historical resources and support heritage tourism in the Connecticut Valley eligible for federal funds. The Connecticut River Watershed Council encourages letters of support from "groups, organizations and institutions" to be sent by September 15th.

The Council also welcomes your participation in the nomination effort. If you wish to join, write a letter, please call the Council at 413-529-9500.
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This summer, Robert Torricelli (D-NJ) introduced in the Senate the most comprehensive forest protection in the United States' history. The Act to Save America's Forests (S. 977) would protect forest biodiversity by banning clearcutting on federal lands and ending logging and road-building on millions of acres of core forest areas nationwide.

"This Senate's going to have a very clear choice," said Torricelli. "Twenty years of clearcutting forests can end with a simple vote in the United States Senate."

Earlier this year in the House of Representatives, Anna Eshoo (D-CA) and Carolyn Maloney (D-NY) introduced a companion bill (H.R. 1376) which already has more than 60 co-sponsors.

The Act to Save America's Forests is "the first federal legislation in history that would halt and reverse deforestation in the United States," said Carl Ross, director of the Save America's Forests coalition. After centuries of logging, less than 5% of the country's billion acres of original forests remain standing, with only 1% of the original forests remaining in large blocks in the lower 48 states. "This is the last chance to save these forests," said Rep. Maloney.

The introduction of S. 977 comes at a critical time for the forest protection movement, since Senator Larry Craig (R-ID) supports legislation which would suspend environmental laws on the national forests. Craig was the leader of a group of pro-timber members of Congress who succeeded in passing the "timber salvage rider," an amendment to a 1994 appropriations bill which suspended all environmental laws on the National Forests for nearly two years. Craig's new bill would make the terms of the salvage rider permanent. Torricelli's bill serves as the environmental alternative to Craig's. "For the first time we have a leader in the Senate who is willing to challenge Craig head on," said Save America's Forests co-director Mark Wustein. Torricelli has promised to bring S. 977 to the floor of the Senate for a vote, forcing each Senator to take a position for the record.

"The Act to Save America's Forests represents a 180-degree turn from the federal government's current approach to managing federal forests," said Rep. Eshoo. "Instead of encouraging federal agencies to continue looking for ways to sell off this nation's natural heritage at below-market prices, it requires them to preserve and enhance forested areas for future generations."

Based on the principles of conservation biology, the Act to Save America's Forests places "core areas" of biological diversity off limits to logging and roadbuilding and only allows ecologically sustainable "selection logging" outside the protected areas.

Among the core areas protected by the bill are the Ancient Forests of the Pacific Northwest, where thousand-year-old trees are home to the endangered spotted owl and where streams provide habitat for declining salmon stocks. These Ancient Forests were open to some logging under Clinton's forest plan, but the salvage rider forced even more cutting in these areas, placing many species in danger of extinction.

The bill also protects roadless areas that are greater than 5000 acres in size in the West and greater than 1500 acres in size in the East. Having experienced relatively little human impact, these areas represent some of the last places in this country that are truly wild. They are key habitats for numerous species of animals and plants.

Finally, the bill ends logging in more than 100 "special" forest areas which have great importance for the protection of biodiversity, especially in Eastern forests. Most of these areas have been logged or roaded and therefore do not qualify for protection as roadless or Ancient Forests. Nevertheless, they are rich in native forest species and critical to protecting local forest ecosystems and habitats, ranging from the giant sequoias of California to black bear habitats in Vermont. Selection for inclusion in the bill was based on information from scientists and local forest protection experts across the country.

Among the special areas protected by the bill are three in the Green Mountain National Forest: the Robert Frost Mountain, Lamb Brook, and Glastenbury Areas, with a total of 49,000 acres. They provide important habitat for sensitive species such as mountain lion, black bear, pine marten and interdependent species of songbird.

On all national forests, the bill makes protection and restoration of native biodiversity the primary goal of federal forest management practices. It bans the planting of tree farms and requires the Forest Service to either actively restore native species or allow natural succession to re-establish native ecosystems.

"Scientists and activists have been waiting for years for legislation that's scientifically valid, ecologically comprehensive, and politically achievable," said Save America's Forests legislative coordinator Eric Goldsmith. "That legislation has finally arrived."

The Brattleboro based conservation organization Green Mountain Forest Watch is challenging what it calls "transparent and illegal" clearcutting by the US Forest Service in areas of the Green Mountain National Forest set aside in the Forest Plan to protect their unique remote character.

According to Forest Watch, while some logging in MA 6.2A is clearly above the highest level of protection given to any areas in the Forest Plan. These areas were often designated as buffer areas around Wilderness and to protect other remote areas for solitude, feeling of closeness with nature, primitive recreation, and wildlife species intolerant of human disturbance. Now the Forest Service is clearcutting the areas they promised to protect, closing down trails and destroying remote habitats. Once again the Forest Service is demonstrating that they have no regard for the law, the land, or the public they supposedly serve.

According to Green Mountain Forest Watch, "We've still working on the exact figures, but it appears the Forest Service has clearcut thousands of acres of these lands."

The most recent clearcutting proposals in MA 6.2A are:

- The Moss Glen Timber Sale near Rochester, Vermont, with cuts adjacent to the Breadloaf Wilderness
- The Ulley Brook Timber Sale, which included 87 acres of shelterwood clearcuts adjacent to the Breadloaf Wilderness
- The Burnt Hill Timber Sale near Middlebury, Vermont, also with cuts adjacent to the Breadloaf Wilderness
- The Uley Brook Timber Sale, near Peru, Landgrove and Londerdonry, Vermont, with cuts adjacent to the Peru Peaks Wilderness.

According to Forest Watch, while some logging in MA 6.2A is clearly permitted by the plan, it must be "in harmony" with the greater objectives of the area. This industrial-scale clearcutting directly contradicts the promises of the Plan.

On Thursday, August 7, Forest Watch appealed the Moss Glen Timber Sale, which included 87 acres of shelterwood clearcuts adjacent to the Breadloaf Wilderness on the Rochester District of the Forest.

According to Economic Report of the President this year, recreation on our National Forests accounts for 30% of the Forest Service contribution to the gross domestic product, and generates more than seven times the income and employment of all extractive pursuits on the National Forests (timber cutting, grazing, and mining) combined.

According to The Economic Importance of Vermont's Forests, a study commissioned by the Vermont Economic Resource Commission of Maine, New Hampshire, New York, and Vermont, nearly four times as many jobs are created in Vermont by forest-based recreation than by logging-based extraction and manufacturing, and the State of Vermont generates fifty-four times more revenues from forest visitor expenditures than from timber receipts.

"The Forest Service isn't creating jobs with this logging, these forests create far more jobs standing than on the back of a logging truck. This is not a case of the balance of the economy - this is a case where the Forest Service is sacrificing both in order to pad their own budget."

For further information contact: Mathew Jacobson, Green Mountain Forest Watch, 48 Elliot St. Brattleboro, VT 05301, green@over.net
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Green Mountain National Forest Watch Challenges Clearcuts On Remote Areas of Green Mountain National Forest

The Brattleboro based conservation organization Green Mountain National Forest Watch is challenging what it calls "transparent and illegal" clearcutting by the US Forest Service in areas of the Green Mountain National Forest set aside in the Forest Plan to protect their unique remote character. According to the Forest Plan for the Green Mountain National Forest, these areas of the Forest were designated as Management Area 6.2A in order to provide "semi-primitive recreation," an opportunity for solitude and a feeling of closeness to nature and, for animals which are intolerant of the sights and sounds of people.

But according to Mathew Jacobson, Executive Director of Forest Watch, "since the signing of the Plan, the Forest Service has been systematically logging these remote areas, using clearcutting and shelterwood clearcutting (clearcutting in two stages), in complete disregard for the wishes of the public, the agreements made in the Forest Plan, and the laws which mandate that the Forest Service honor those agreements.

"Management Area 6.2A is just about the highest level of protection given to any areas in the Forest Plan. These areas were often designated as buffer areas around Wilderness and to protect other remote areas for solitude, feeling of closeness with nature, primitive recreation, and wildlife species intolerant of human disturbance. Now the Forest Service is clearcutting the areas they promised to protect, closing down trails and destroying remote habitats. Once again the Forest Service is demonstrating that they have no regard for the law, the land, or the public they supposedly serve."

According to Green Mountain Forest Watch, "We're still working on the exact figures, but it appears the Forest Service has clearcut thousands of acres of these lands."

The most recent clearcutting proposals in MA 6.2A are:

- The Moss Glen Timber Sale near Rochester, Vermont, with cuts adjacent to the Breadloaf Wilderness
- The Ulley Brook Timber Sale, near Peru, Landgrove and Londerdonry, Vermont, with cuts adjacent to the Peru Peaks Wilderness.

According to Forest Watch, while some logging in MA 6.2A is clearly permitted by the plan, it must be "in harmony" with the greater objectives of the area. This industrial-scale clearcutting directly contradicts the promises of the Plan.

On Thursday, August 7, Forest Watch appealed the Moss Glen Timber Sale, which included 87 acres of shelterwood clearcuts adjacent to the Breadloaf Wilderness on the Rochester District of the Forest.

According to Economic Report of the President this year, recreation on our National Forests accounts for 30% of the Forest Service contribution to the gross domestic product, and generates more than seven times the income and employment of all extractive pursuits on the National Forests (timber cutting, grazing, and mining) combined.

According to The Economic Importance of Vermont's Forests, a study commissioned by the Vermont Economic Resource Commission of Maine, New Hampshire, New York, and Vermont, nearly four times as many jobs are created in Vermont by forest-based recreation than by logging-based extraction and manufacturing, and the State of Vermont generates fifty-four times more revenues from forest visitor expenditures than from timber receipts.

"The Forest Service isn't creating jobs with this logging, these forests create far more jobs standing than on the back of a logging truck. This is not a case of the balance of the economy - this is a case where the Forest Service is sacrificing both in order to pad their own budget."

For further information contact: Mathew Jacobson, Green Mountain Forest Watch, 48 Elliot St. Brattleboro, VT 05301, green@over.net

http://www.vermontforestwatch.com
by Brian S. Dunkiel

While regrouping after a long push for the inclusion of tax laws that would benefit the environment as part of the federal budget reconciliation bills, some information that might interest the readers of the Northern Forest Forum was brought to my attention. During the budget debate on taxes, there were several occasions when tax lawmakers in the Senate referred to the tax provisions contained in the Family Forest Preservation Tax Act of 1997 (FFPTA)—Senators Leahy and Gregg are co-sponsors. The legislation is built upon recommendations made by the Northern Forest Lands Council.

The Congressional Research Service (CRS), a non-partisan research service for lawmakers, reviewed the legislation, and came to some frightening conclusions. The CRS review is outlined in a January 29, 1997 memorandum, and its conclusions ought to concern those interested in protecting the Northern Forest from unsustainable logging.

The CRS memorandum concludes:

"The bill implies several perhaps incompatible goals. Two sections (101 and 202) serve to reward owners who take timber out of production; two (102 and 203) could serve to reduce taxes for owners and their families who continue growing, although not necessarily harvesting, timber; and one section (201) by far the most important in reducing taxes, rewards the harvesting of timber..."

But since the largest incentive by far in the bill is for cutting timber; it could possibly serve as more of an incentive for immediate harvesting of current forests than for the creation or preservation of future forests.

For full disclosure, Friends of the Earth has supported variations of this bill, including using estate, capital gains and income tax breaks to reward land owners for permanently protecting land, especially land that has imperiled, threatened and endangered species habitat. However, our support for pro-environment tax incentives stops before they amount to more than hand-outs to wealthy corporations. The FFPTA, as the CRS memorandum indicates, is overwhelmingly a huge potential tax handout to large corporate timberland owners.

FFPTA, Section 201 is where the huge taxpayer giveaway originates. Section 201 provides for a sliding scale taxable income exclusion for capital gains from the sale of timber. In other words, it rewards cutting and selling of timber by allowing sellers to keep more of their proceeds. This might be acceptable if sellers were cutting their own timber, and not timber on public land.

Under Internal Revenue Code definition of capital gains, timber companies could benefit greatly from this tax break even when they do not grow their own trees because capital gains include timber harvested on contract from national and state forests. That's correct, the FFPTA would extend the favorable tax treatment to sales of timber cut on our nation's public lands thereby further rewarding the unsustainable stewardship of national forests. This giveaway could be largely avoided by limiting the availability of the capital gains tax break to small operators of family holdings.

The cost of this tax legislation in the form of lost revenue to the federal government has been partially researched by the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT). Interestingly, JCT has been only able to put a price tag on the provisions that would benefit smaller landowners, and has been unable to provide estimates for the more expensive tax breaks which largely benefit the large corporations.

It is promising to see more consideration given tax laws as a tool to protect the environment. But because most conservation organizations have relatively little experience with and credibility on tax policy we ought to proceed with caution. Certainly before the conservation community backs a tax law some basic questions ought to be asked, such as:

- Who benefits from the tax law?
- How much does it cost?
- What incentives does the tax law create?
- Are these incentives consistent with long and short-term environmental goals?
- How long does the tax break last?

Once a tax break is enacted, it often is difficult to eliminate. The billions of dollars in tax breaks for wealthy oil and gas corporations enacted decades ago is proof of this fact.

- Is the tax incentive an effective method at accomplishing its intended purpose? Are more effective tools available to achieve that purpose?

Brian S. Dunkiel, an environmental attorney, works for Friends of the Earth on reforming tax policy and other alternative conservation tactics from Burlington, Vermont.

Perspective on the Federal Tax Initiatives

The recently enacted federal tax bill could have included tax reductions for the voluntary protection of endangered species habitat by private landowners; thereby rewarding environmental stewardship with favorable tax treatment.

But even the bipartisan recommendations by Senators Kempthorne (R-ID), Chafee (R-RI), Baucus (D-MT) and Reid (D-NV) to ease the burden on private landowners conducting proper management of endangered species habitat was not included in the final bill, in part because it was not supported by the Clinton Administration.

The signal this law will send to investors in the energy sector highlights its serious anti-environmental consequences.

Passed by the Senate, negotiators had an opportunity to extend a tax credit for the production of electricity by wind. The tax credit extension for the renewable source of energy which does not emit greenhouse gases was ultimately not included in the final bill because of vigorous lobbying by utilities heavily invested in more polluting energy production methods.

Nonetheless, this tax legislation, characterized by some as forward looking, contains yet another subsidy for the production of fossil fuels like oil and gas. This is particularly troubling because it comes only weeks after United Nations "Rio +5" meetings and a new effort to educate the public about the potential dangers of global climate change by the President Clinton.

Such an unwise allocation of limited government fiscal resources calls into serious question the commitment lawmakers and the Clinton Administration have to protecting the environment for future generations.

Sincerely,
Brian S. Dunkiel
Director, Tax Project
Friends of the Earth
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Let the Rivers Run Free

Federal Officials Recommend Removal of Edwards Dam

In an almost unprecedented action, staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) have recommended that the 160-year-old Edwards Dam in Augusta, Maine be removed in order to benefit the habitat and spawning potential of nine migratory fish species that use the Kennebec River. This staff recommendation and its analysis of other options will be addressed by FERC commissioners when they meet in September. Owner of the dam, Edwards Manufacturing, has promised an appeal of a license denial, asserting that FERC does not have the authority to order removal.

FERC's final environmental impact statement (FEIS), released July 28, states, "We recommend retirement of the Edwards Project and complete removal of the Dam." This is the first time in history that FERC has recommended removal of an operating dam seeking license renewal (the Clyde Dam decision in Vermont involved FERC's first recommendation that a licensed, but breached, dam be removed in the interests of restoring a fishery).

Today's announcement was applauded by members of The Kennebec Coalition who have been waging a decade-long campaign to restore the Kennebec by removing the dam. The Coalition includes American Rivers, the Atlantic Salmon Federation, Natural Resources Council of Maine, Trout Unlimited and its Kennebec chapter.

Pete Didsheim of NRCM stated, "This is great news for the fish of the Kennebec. Once the dam is gone, migrating fish once again will have access to 17 miles of vital spawning habitat that have been beyond their reach since 1837 — when the dam was built."

Among the species expected to benefit are Atlantic salmon, shortnose sturgeon, striped bass and alewife. FERC's final Environmental Impact Statement also mentions positive impact for wetlands and wetlands habitat with dam removal.

Maine's major daily newspapers, Maine Times and even The New York Times editorialized in support of the FERC recommendation, adding to the river restoration constituency, which includes the state of Maine and agencies of the federal government. The Bangor Daily News editorial stated, "FERC's recommendation is a reminder [however] that Maine has a much larger decision to make about energy and the environment. Whether it is storage of nuclear waste, right-of-way for gas lines, dirty air from oil-fired plants or windmills whacking songbirds, there is an environmental consequence to flipping a light switch." The Portland Press Herald suggested that a final decision to remove Edwards Dam will establish Maine as "the nation's environmental leader."

Compiled from a Kennebec Coalition press release and press reports.

Maine Energy Path

A Riddle Wrapped Inside An Enigma

by Pamela Prodan

The confluence of pending electric utility restructuring with two recent developments has raised numerous as yet unanswered questions. On July 28, the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) recommended decommissioning and removing Edwards Dam on the Kennebec River in Augusta. On August 8, Maine Yankee officials announced the permanent closure of the Wiscasset nuclear power plant. While Maine Yankee at one time supplied about 29% of the total electricity consumed in Maine, Edwards Dam is a 3.5 MW facility that contributes less than 1% of Maine's hydroelectric power. It is the first time FERC staff has recommended that a functioning hydroelectric dam be decommissioned and removed.

Despite being a low-present cost source of power when operating, Maine Yankee's reliability was marred in recent years by lengthy down-time for repairs. Nonetheless, there is widespread speculation about what impacts the permanent closure will have on Maine's economy, electric industry, and environment.

• Does the closure make Maine utilities more or less vulnerable to corporate take-overs?
• Will air pollution increase?
• Will pressure increase on already-threatened wildlands for new wind, hydropower and biomass plants, all of which create less air pollution than nuclear or fossil fuels, but can also have severe impacts on land and natural resources?
• What is the Edwards Dam removal evokes perennial questions:
• Is a sustainable future with decentralized and locally-controlled energy resources closer or farther away than ever before?
• Will wind power make us more or less green or do we need to own our own supply in order to be sure it's truly green.

Consumers Beware

Until we radically reexamine the different forces at play in each of the components of energy consumption—demand, production, use and disposal—we will blindly struggle to make an unworkable system work. And, until there is widespread recognition that appropriately sized and scaled energy technology is intimately linked to sustainable community development and environmental justice, utilities will have a field day making their so-called "green energy" promises to unsophisticated consumers. Ironically, despite all the hoopla about "customer choice," we may find we have to own our own supply in order to be sure it's truly green.

Group Continues to Oppose Wind Plant

On June 26, the board of directors of Friends of the Boundary Mountains issued a statement that it will oppose efforts of Zond Development Corporation to build a wind plant in the Boundary Mountains of western Maine. Zond, a subsidiary of Enron Corporation, recently acquired the Boundary Mountains wind development rights from now bankrupt Kenetech Windpower, Inc.

"The mission of Friends of the Boundary Mountains is to safeguard the Boundary Mountains from development and to conserve this area for traditional uses of recreation and forestry. Wind power development is plainly incompatible with keeping the Boundary Mountains free from development," said the statement.

Pamela Prodan, attorney for Friends of the Boundary Mountains said, "The Boundary Mountains have value as a remote, undeveloped area and they could never be restored if lost to development. We wish the efforts of the new owner to use the deregulation of the electric utility industry as an opportunity to 'green-wash' this wind power project."

—Pamela Prodan
Conde National Wildlife Refuge Offers Third Annual Challenge Cost Share Program

Long time Forum readers will recall the pitched battle by property rightists that occurred in 1995 against the implementation of the Conde Refuge in the Connecticut River watershed. "The Refuge" is a bit of a misnomer; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's eventual arrival here bringing neither the black helicopters of conspiracists' fantasies nor a traditional refuge based on outright land acquisition.

Although land purchases remain an option—yet to be funded—and research grants and technical assistance remain the Conde's primary vehicle for achieving the Fish and Wildlife Service's goal of conserving Connecticut River watershed habitats. Program director Larry Bandolin recently stated that "the vast majority of our rare species lack quality habitat."

It is curious that while the property rightists are assailing the shortcomings of the federal Endangered Species Act for failing to protect threatened species, the same ideology attacks non-regulatory efforts such as the Fish and Wildlife Service has brought to the Connecticut.

It is also well worth noting that, contrary to the predictions of Bryant Watson, whose Vermont Association of Snow Travelers (VAST) now joins the POST campaign in Vermont to protest a cutting bill, towns in the Northeast Kingdom have not dried up and blown away as a result of the Conde.

The third round of grants from the Challenge Cost Share Program has begun; this year's emphasis is on long-term habitat protection. Applications must be postmarked by November 5, 1997. Projects require a 1:1 matching of funds, grant requests ought to be between $500 and 10,000.

For more information contact: Silvio O. Conde Refuge 38 Avenue A Turner Falls, MA 01376 Tel. 413-863-0209

1996 Conde Challenge Cost Share Program Highlights

Last year, the Conde dispersed $200,167 to 37 projects throughout the watershed. One flagship project has been the publication and distribution of Flora Conservanda: New England by the New England Wildflower Society. The Society's New England Plant Conservation Program reflects the collaboration of botanists and conservation organizations since 1991 in an effort to prevent further loss of rare and endangered flora of the region. Flora Conservanda: lists over 500 plants of concern to conservationists in New England.

The Wildflower Society and the Conde Refuge will be sponsoring a rare plant conference on October 18, 1997 address conservation in the Connecticut watershed. For more information contact the USFWS at the above address.

Some other projects funded by the Refuge in 1996 included:

- Vernal pool documentation and education (Bonyvale Environmental Education Center, Brattleboro and GIL, MA)
- "Birds of Pondicherry," an historic and contemporary bird survey in Jefferson, NH that will further future research
- A Peregrine falcon monitoring project involving high school students
- A GIS mapping project for Vermont towns in the watershed for conservation land planning
- A satellite imagery mapping project to identify suitable habitat for north-eastern Vermont's black-backed woodpecker, a bosal species
- A reptile and amphibian inventory in the Pine Mountain Wildlife Mgt Area in the Groton-Ryegate area which is part of a new ecosystem approach on state lands in Vermont
- Multiple projects relating to salmon restoration

US Fish & Wildlife Service Responds to Earthblaw Suit to Protect Harlequin Duck

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) announced in August that it will consider Endangered Species Act protection for populations of the Harlequin duck in eastern North America. This includes Maine's population which is the last significant population of the species remaining in the region. It presently numbers 1,000 individuals.

The decision by the USFWS is in response to a lawsuit by RESTORE: the North Woods, the Coastal Waters Project, Biodiversity Legal Foundation and Northern Rendezvous Biodiversity Project. As reported in the Summer Police issue (v.5, # 4) of the Northern Forest Forum, (ip) the suit came after five years of petitioning the USFWS. The groups now await a timely full review and determination of "threatened or endangered" status.

The harlequin is a bird of both inland, mountain streams, where it nests, and coastal waters. Much of the Maine population winters along islands offshore of Acadia National Park.

The deadline for public comment in the USFWS is October 31st; contact RESTORE at 508-287-0320 or visit www.restore.org for more information.

'Might Makes Right' New Hampshire Herbicide Update

by Daisy Goodman

July—In response to continuing public opposition to aerial spraying of herbicides, Champion and Mead paper companies both held meetings for the public and (chicken and lobster served) a woodland tour for legislators to defend their spraying programs. Champion's presentation in Pittsburg featured Monsanto's University of Maine contact, Dr. Max McCormack.

Although information offered at these meetings ranged from one-sided to blatantly inaccurate, no meaningful opportunity was offered spray opponents to make their case. Industry controlled the process. New Hampshire has yet to experience a real exchange of ideas and research between proponents and opponents in a balanced forum.

- During July, the Division of Pesticide Control approved Champion's application to spray 1200 acres in the town of Pittsburg, despite concerns raised by area residents over water quality and drift contamination.
- Meanwhile, across the river in Vermont, an aerial application of sulfonyleurea herbicide on a Shoreham farm (in the Champlain Valley) apparently drifted onto a neighboring organic farm, causing thousands of dollars of direct crop damage and jeopardizing the operation's organic certification for at least three years. Vermont's Department of Agriculture responded with a temporary ban on all aerial herbicide applications, hard on the heels of the legislature's enacting an indefinite moratorium on all broad-scale herbicide applications in forestry. Despite New Hampshire having experienced a similar drift episode from a ground spray which also impacted an organic farm several years ago, thus far state policy has failed to respond in a comprehensive manner.

- On August 13, Champion notified the Division of Pesticide Control that it intended to spray for the next five days. Mead Corporation, also contracting with AgRotoors, Inc., notified the DPC of intent to spray immediately following the Champion applications. At this writing, conditions on the ground had prevented Champion from beginning to spray.

- On August 25, the Pesticide Control Board will meet to hear recommendations by rule change review committees for extremely limited changes in regulation of aerial and right of way pesticide applications. This meeting is open to the public, although you will not be allowed to speak if you do attend.

- News Flash! At press time we learned that the NH Electric Coop has announced it is discontinuing its herbicide program, at least for 1997. Credit for this victory should be given to the Coalition for Alternatives to Herbicides; PO Box 38, N. Sandwich, NH 03259. Good Work!
Maine Forest Compact: Endorsing Mediocrity?

After last year's contentious vote on the forestry referendum, many voters in Maine wish the issue would just go away. This fall, however, we get to vote on the Compact (a 28-page compromise between some environmental groups and the 15 largest landowners) again. Maine's governor, Angus King, will soon be telling us again about the significant reductions in clearcutting that the Compact will bring. Paper industry advertisements on television and radio are already bragging that the companies have agreed to clearcut less than 1% of their land a year.

One percent seems insignificant. And this number only applies to landowners who plant and thin. Without such practices, the maximum percent of ownership that can be clearcut is 0.25%. Compact supporters have not been averse to letting people believe that these two numbers require 100 or 400 year rotations. But clearcutting is not the only form of cutting. Indeed, less than 10% of all acres cut each year are clearcut (as defined by the state). Landowners can cut stands on 40-year rotations if they want to.

One wonders why we need a statewide vote to determine whether we, the public, can put 7/100 of 1% of the state into reserves where anything that moves is game. Or why we need to vote over whether these landowners will voluntarily follow guidelines from an audit committee that operates by consensus. Since the committee may have compact members, these members would have veto power over any standards that they do not like.

Passage of the Compact would not prevent landowners from improving their practices. Indeed, we can expect Compact supporters to take credit for any improvements. After all, Forest Practices Act (FPA) supporters have tried for years to negotiate with industrial landowners to determine whether we, the public, stock the Tree Growth Tax (reduced to 5/100 of 1% after the legislature left its mark) on public land—into reserves where anything that moves is game. Or why we need to vote over whether these landowners will voluntarily follow guidelines from an audit committee that operates by consensus. Since the committee may have compact members, these members would have veto power over any standards that they do not like.

One wonders why we need a statewide vote to decide if landowners will continue to do as they please. Or why we need a statewide vote to decide to do more studies. Or why environmentalists had to bargain with industrial landowners to determine whether we, the public, can put 7/100 of 1% of the state into reserves where anything that moves is game. Of why we need to vote over whether these landowners will voluntarily follow guidelines from an audit committee that operates by consensus. Since the committee may have compact members, these members would have veto power over any standards that they do not like.

Passage of the Compact would not prevent landowners from improving their practices. Indeed, we can expect Compact supporters to take credit for any improvements. After all, Forest Practices Act (FPA) supporters have claimed that recent reductions in clearcutting were because of, rather than in spite of, the FPA. The FPA, while it allows better management, does not require it. In the short-term, it looks as though the Compact does little to raise the bottom line.

If the Compact passes, the legislature will probably reject all significant forestry legislation for the next five years, just as it did with the FPA. Significant legislation (such as LD 1200, which would require minimum standards for landowners to qualify for the Tree Growth Tax) is on the table, ready to be debated if the Compact loses. The Compact, therefore, should be rejected.

—Mitch Lansky

Vermont's POST campaign seeks to close land to recreation and force repeal of a cutting law that establishes review of clearcuts over 40 acres in size. Drawing © Elye Alexander.
by PETER BAUER

This installment of the Adirondack Park Report focuses on the several important events in New York over the past three months. Though four months late, New York State passed a state budget (and a bond rating tied with Louisiana for 49th in the country), but also managed to announce a deal to purchase a 3,600-acre conservation easement over the Massawepie Mire. New York State finally has a state Landmark acid rain legislation died in the last minute. (This was actually a good thing for the state's business climate.) What was needed was a large, selling pollution credits to companies in the mid-west. Through the transfer of pollution credits to the mid-west, from outside the Adirondack Park, for within it, acid rain levels in the Adirondacks have continued to receive higher levels of acid rain deposition.

**Mirror Mirror on the Wall Will I Still be the Fairiest of Them All?**

This and other questions were pondered by millionaire socialite Mary Lou Whitney as her plans to build forty mansions around one of the jewels of the Adirondacks, Little Tupper Lake, were shelved, perhaps for good. Until the first few days of August, Mary Lou Whitney (age 72; net worth roughly $100 million) and her fiancée and development project manager John Hendrickson (age 32; net worth roughly $18,000) played hard ball with the State of New York. Hendrickson cut his political teeth to four terms as a New York State Senator Wally Hickel, whose claim to fame is opening Alaska's north shore to oil exploration.

First Whitney and Hendrickson complained angrily about the project's review by the Adirondack Park Agency (APA), referring publicly to the APA as "Gestapo," "communists" and "tyrants." Then they threatened to sue the APA for imposing their "inordinate growth restrictions" until the matter was resolved. A press conference was held on the shores of Little Tupper Lake highlighting facts about how the trees and wilderness of the Whitney Estate had been subsidizing the Whitney's extravagant lifestyle and not vice-versa. A country-western station in Albany aired a parody called "Hello Mary Lou, Good Bye Park" that featured solos of screaming chainsaws. The Sierra Club chartered an airplane with a trailer reading "Governor Save Whitney Park" to fly over the Saratoga horsetrack during the annual Whitney Cup races. The Wilderness Society listed the Whitney Estate as one of its 10 most important tracts of land in the U.S. Last, a black tie protest was organized to picket the annual Whitney Ball on August 1st, but was called off at the last minute. (This was actually a good example of various advocacy groups coordinating their individual special talents to change the course of events.)

Enough was enough. Hendrickson was dispatched to work something out. In the last days of July, the Whinleys struck a deal with the Adirondack Nature Conservancy (ANC). The ANC agreed, for the first time in the process, to enter into good faith negotiations through the end of the year with the ANC on the 15,000 acres around Little Tupper Lake, or more (Mary Lou Whitney owns 51,288 acres). A New York Times editorial followed this announcement, written as a personal letter to Mrs. Whitney urging her to act in the best interests of the Adirondack Park.

Governor Pataki will stay close to the negotiations, but let the ANC take the lead; the ANC has protected over 270,000 acres across the Adirondacks in the last 25 years, often purchasing land and holding it until the state is prepared to purchase it. (In New York better than 60 steps are required before the state can send the landowner a check.) Governor Pataki is also working with his political mentor Senator Alfonse D'Amato to get $10 million in federal funding to help New York complete this deal. D'Amato was similarly helpful in protecting the Sterling Forest. The recipe for success for the Sterling Forest is being replicated: non-profit land protection groups take the lead on negotiations; Governor Pataki stays close to the negotiations, but primarily lines up state funding; Senator D'Amato works to get matching federal funding; advocacy groups agitate; important land is protected for the public. For the first time in years, New York State actually has money to buy land. In the recently passed budget the Environmental Protection Fund provides $36 million for land protection. Additionally, another $20 million is available from the Environmental Quality Bond Act passed last fall.

**Down in Flames**

Earlier this year the Long Island Lighting Company (LILCO) sold thousands of tons of pollution credits through various brokers to utilities in the mid-west. These mid-west utilities, like LILCO, from selling pollution credits that would return to the state in the form of acid rain. In short, pollution credits would have to be sold outside the Adirondack Park. The New York Assembly quickly passed the bill and many people, including all the Adirondack Park Senators co-sponsored a bill in the Senate.

The only problem was that Governor Pataki didn't like the bill. He never offered a coherent reason for opposing it; he made obtuse arguments about harming the state's business climate. The Governor asked the Senate not to act on it so he could submit an alternative. His alternative was a joke and couldn't find a sponsor in the Senate. In the end of the session, Governor Pataki traded favors with the Senate majority leader Joe Bruno so that the bill wouldn't move. The Continued on next page
Wolf in Sheep's Clothing: Wilderness Foes Advocate Disabled Access

Maynard Baker charged the DEC wasn't complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) passed by Congress in 1990. (Supervisor Baker punished an environmental activist during a confrontation over motorized access on a wilderness road in the Adirondacks in 1990.) Herb Doig, appointed Deputy Commissioner of Natural Resources after Gov. Pataki was elected, assumed leadership of the disabled issue in 1995. Representing the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) was its Chairman, Gregory Campbell, newly appointed by Patoka.

To help set the stage, earlier, as a board member of the Adirondack Conservation Council (ACC), Mr. Campbell had voted yes on a resolution calling for the opening of all state land for unlimited motorized use by Everybody, disabled or not. (Dirt bikes, ATVs, 4-wheelers etc. for use on all roads, trails, ponds, lakes.) Mr. Doig of DEC was popular at the ACC and was known to have similar sentiments about unlimited motorized access in the Adirondacks.

The policy for motorized access on state lands is set by the State Land Master Plan (SLMP). It can be revised and updated. This is the legal way to increase motorized disabled access in areas that are now off limits to motorized vehicles. Under the present law, no motorized vehicles are allowed on what are classified as "trails" in the Adirondacks. The disabled access committee was committed to work within the parameters of present state law.

In a November 29, 1995, letter from Charles Scafford (Supervisor of Regional Planning at the APA) to Robert Berthick, Director, Division of Lands and Forests for DEC, Mr. Scafford pointed out that the SLMP was not in conflict with the ADA. But, he pointed out, allowing even specially permitted motorized disabled access to areas in the park where motorized vehicles are not allowed can come under attack as "trails" under the new Edition of the SLMP (The APA is a watchdog over the SLMP). On Dec. 1, 1995, Mr. Campbell faxed a copy of Mr. Scafford's letter to Sandra LeBaron, who is a DEC Commissioner on Adirondack Affairs (at that time, Mr. Zagata was DEC Commissioner). She was also on the working committee, at stake.

When this letter was brought up at a disabled access committee meeting, Mr. Campbell declared the letter was not an official position of the APA, that he represented the APA and he did not want the letter included in the committee's material. So early on, Herb Doig, Gregory Campbell and Sandra LeBaron knew about a potential legal
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The Adirondack ATVers protest that wilderness discriminates against the handicapped. Photo © Tom Parsons.
The so called disabled access protest of June 14th, 1997, in Newcomb, New York

The scheme was to gain motorized access to the wilderness and the hiking and backcountry experience for all people. The program in wilderness is like horses and canoes, the use of motorized (electric) and non motorized (non-wheelchair) vehicles can be used under the ADA. According to Ms. Zeller, the "program in wilderness is like solitude and self-reliance ... More: one reaches the area is not in the program — the program is defined by why the majority of people (task and without disabilities) need to be in that area. She urges "careful deliberation of the areas in which motorized vehicles can be used under the permit system." As an example she says, "Administrative roads, where all people expect to encounter motor vehicles occasion- ally, would be easily appropriate." According to Ms. Zeller, damage to the resource by motorized use must be taken into account when deciding appropriate access sites.

As far as opening up all state lands for motorized access this is what Janet Zeller has to say: "The integration of all recreationists, with and without disabilities, is in fact not the intent of the ADA.) In areas that are classified non-motorized access, the ADA (and the DEC) allows for, among other things like horses and canoes, the use of motorized (electric) and non motorized wheelchairs. At a trailhead, any "barric" or "barrier" that wouldn't allow a wheelchair to go through would not conform to the ADA. According to Ms. Zeller, the ADA definition of an acceptable wheelchair is "a device designed solely for use by a mobility impaired person for locomotion, that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area." Any test that excludes ATV's from ADA acceptability.

Final Thoughts
I am troubled by the prominent use of "disabled veterans" or "veterans" in the protesters' literature. This isn't a veteran issue. It should be a disabled issue, veteran or not. It's bad enough that it has been turned into a wilderness issue.

Less time should be spent on the patriotic spin on 

... pointing out exactly where the DEC policy conflicts with the ADA. It's even more upsetting if veterans are being duped into protesting under false pretexts. This veteran (enlisted, U.S. Army 1967) is not going to be intimidated by questioning my patriotism. I served for honest principles like equality, free speech and freedom of conscience, not to gain deference or preferential status. It was a privilege to serve, but those who didn't or couldn't, in my view, to that extent, are emasculated. Veterans served to protect the right to disagree and debate in the marketplace of ideas that is so important in a constitutional democracy.

My brother Ted (Warrensburg Central School 1981) was killed in a training accident while serving in the Army at 18 years of age. So my family knows something about sacrifice for our country. I remember his love of the wilderness and the hiking and backpacking he loved, especially in the Adirondacks. I think it is fair to say that to make the service a career and talked to me about coming home during leave and getting back into the wilderness. I can imagine how that could have been dulled by the demise of wilderness sought by Mr. Baker and his supporters, veterans or not.

Wilderness is a great part of the Adirondack heritage. You would expect Adirondackers, especially those who hike and backpack, would support the effort to maintain a portion of the harsh environment that millions of New Yorkers managed to live and thrive in. It helped shape our character and culture and should be a legacy for future generations to explore and cherish as well as to be challenged by. To some there is an important spiritual aspect that shouldn't be belittled. There is very little wilderness left on the east coast, and yes, the exact definition of wilderness is subjective, but I am thankful I live where we can still at least debate the issue. Considering that many of the ten million annual users to the Adirondacks also value wilderness and many of us profit from their visits, we also need to recognize the importance of wilderness to the economy of the Adirondacks.---
The Maine Woods is the greatest remaining wildland east of the Rockies. However, there is no conservation in 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.

Good Dirt: In 1989, the Richard King Mellon Foundation, working through the Conservation Fund, bought 12,000 acres of forestland in eastern Maine from the Hearst Corp. About 2,000 coastal acres were quickly resold to the Land for Maine's Future program. This summer Mellon generously donated most of the remaining 10,000 acres to the state. That is the second largest gift of land to the state, after Percival Baxter's 202,000 acre park. The Maine Coast Heritage Trust, which had been overseeing the property, choreographed the transfer. (The Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands will manage the area. To offset tax effects, the towns of Cutler and Whiting will split the annual income from a $200,000 endowment.)

The LMF program also has acquired conservation easements on superlative lands in western Maine: 3.5 miles of frontage on the Rapid River, 6,450 feet on the Rangley River and over 4,000 feet on Mooseheadmegantic and Cuspucptic Lakes. The Maine Dept. of Inland Fish & Wildlife and the Rangley Lakes Heritage Trust did most of the leg work.

More than fifteen years ago I helped negotiate the donation by Great Northern Paper to the State of Maine of conservation easements on most of the West Branch Penobscot River would remain undeveloped. But there were a few gaps where the company was not ready to give up development rights. Now, several ownership changes later, GNP has donated new easements to fill in the holes on Lobster Lake and says it will give three more parcels along the river below Ripogenus Dam. Last year 6,000 campers and 23,600 rafters used the Penobscot wayway.

There are spectacular gains for conservation in Maine Woods and the parties deserve huge credit for their good deeds. Still, in the big picture Maine remains near the bottom of the list of states in percentage of public con­ servation land. That is one reason Gov. Angus King created a Land Acquisition Priority (LAP) Advisory Committee last year. Following hearings last spring, the LAP committee has come up with a draft long range goal: double the amount of conservation land in Maine by the year 2020. Not bad, but not enough. Better would be a 2020 Clear Vision Program with a goal of increasing public conservation land in Maine to 20% by 2020. That would put us in the same range as Massachusetts and many other states that have a more reason­ able balance of private and public lands. The public will have a final chance to comment to the LAP committee at one more round of hearings in mid-September. Don't miss it. (Contact Mark Desmeules, State Planning Office, 38 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333.)

The LAP Committee has also endorsed a short-term goal proposed by the Maine Economic Growth Council of increasing conservation lands in Maine by 106% (100,000 acres) by the year 2000. However, no one had said how that would be achieved. Not until The Nature Conservancy announced in full page ads in the state's major newspapers, assuring that "Maine's community has set its sights on adding 100,000 acres to our state's public lands." Forty member companies of TNC's Corporate Conservation Council of Maine are poised "to protect unique Maine habitats and secure public lands where we can all stretch our legs and renew our spirits." Leading the pack are L.L. Bean and MBNA New England. Large landowners include J.M. Huber, Great Northern Paper, Hancock Timber, Pretis & Carlisle and Seven Islands Land Company.

Maine Woods Watch is trying to fit too many conservationists complaining the past couple of years about the few crowded spots in our national parks and far too little attention given the magnificent natural and cultural treasures our national parks safeguard. For a refresher course on why the national parks are the best idea America ever had, don't miss a photo exhibit by that title on display through September in the Maine Woods Visitor Center in Bar Harbor. (Contact MWVC, 160 Main Street, Bar Harbor, ME 04609.)

The concept of conducting a feasibility on what could become America's next great national park continues to gain legitimacy. The Millinocket Fin & Feather Club got a bill introduced in the Maine Legislature recently to head off the idea of creating a Maine Woods National Park & Preserve. To their credit, the Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry Committee voted to kill the bill and instead send a letter to the state's congressional delegation asking to be kept informed of any hearings on the park study. (Contact RESTORE, 7 N. Chestnut Street, Augusta, ME 04330.)

A revised Northern Forest Stewardship Act (S.546 and HR.971) has been reintroduced in Congress. According to the Northern Forest Alliance (NFA), the bill would create a federal-state partnership for land protection. Ironically, the far right has targeted the Stewardship Act as a federal land grab, even though all the major industry and forest owner groups are backing it. Indeed, Steve Schley, head of Pinetree Heirs and former president of the Maine Forest Products Council, worked with Senator Olympia Snowe to rewrite the bill so that it is now a ringing endorsement of private property rights. (Contact NFA, 271 State Street, Augusta, ME 04330.)

You may want to catch a few upcoming newspaper and TV pieces that promise to be interesting. The Maine Sunday Telegram will run a three part series on Thoreau and the Maine Woods. Beginning on September 15, WMGE-TV will do a companions series at the same time. The September 15 television episode of the Amphibian Wild program will be on whitewater canoeing in Maine.

Chills, Thrills & Shills: The failure of any of the forestry options (2A, the Ban Clearcutting Referendum; 2B, the Forest Compact; or 2C, neither) to get a majority of votes last fall means that Maine voters will cast ballots again this November on the Forest Compact fash­ ioned by industry, government and mainstream environmental leaders. However, the Compact is in trouble. While there is little energy and incentive by last year's supporters of the Compact for another major push, oppo­ nents are fired up to do battle. Polls suggest public support is at best on the fence. If opponents nudge harder than proponents, the vote on the Compact is likely to tip into the no columns. One July poll indicated the Compact had solid support from no more than a third of the likely voters.

It is not what they are saying publicly, but now that the forest industry has run the anti-clearcutting referendum off the track, they would have to let the Compact quietly roll into the breakdown lane and out. Jim Robbins of Robbins lumber helped lead the charge against the Compact last time. The Maine Forest Products Council led the charge for it. Now Robbins is presi­ dent of the MFPC and he has been working to change the group's strategy. That is not tough. The major landowners do not want to spend big bucks and major political capital again to convince voters to impose more regu­ lations on their forest practices. (One sound bite you will not hear: "Please hit us again, harder this time.") So the landowners, through the MFPC and Maine Pulp & Paper Association, have devised an alternative: convince the public that they have seen the light and now intend to voluntarily be exemplary forest stewards.

The industry kicked off their new approach in June with a three part program. First, they hired popular Maine humorist Tim Sample, for an undi­ sclosed sum, to tape a series of soft sell ads telling people in TV and radioidol that "Good things are happenin' in the Maine Woods." Paid newspaper and magazine advertising supplements the broadcast ads. Second, they scheduled summer and fall tours at six papermills and eight forestry operations where they can tell people face to face that good things are happenin' in the Maine Woods. Third, they are stumping the state to get stories and editorials which tell people, through the voices of reporters and editors, that good things are happenin' in the Maine Woods. The underlying message in each case is that the companies already have their self­ policed Sustainable Forestry Initiative and they can and should abide by the spirit of the Compact even if it does not pass, so there is no good reason to pass it.

What about the other Compact supporters? Gov. King is still popular, but most forest industry executives have made more voters distrust him than last year. It is doubtful he will offer himself as spokesperson for the Compact again this fall, especially with the credibility new posterboy Tim Sample brings to the campaign. Maine Audubon Society is still exhausted and bruised by the last round. The Natural Resources Council does not want to lose face, but would probably be happy just to start the game over. Look for both groups to invest no money and little energy to campaign for the Compact, especially when they realize their indus­ try partners have essentially bailed out. Meanwhile, at the other end of the field the Compact foes are massing. The weird combination of anti-clearcutting advocates and anti-government teabag­uists that denied the Compact a majority last year will be even more powerful this time. The two camps do not even speak to each other, but, for very different rea­ sons, they share the goal of defeating the Compact. They will probably suc­ ceed thanks to the industry's realign­
From Canoe and Camera: A Two Hundred Mile Tour Through the Maine Forests by Thomas Sedgwick Steele, published in 1886.
According to the mother of all conspiracy theories, government is not merely cumbersome and inefficient. It is evil. But it is only a front. Behind the front, argue the self-described patriots, is a secret regime (historically the Illuminati, now the New World Order) that seeks to disarm American citizens and subjugate them to a totalitarian one-world government. One of the subsets of this Master Conspiracy theory is the so-called Wise Use Movement, whose goal is to crush and replace the environmental movement with an ideology of maximum privatization and exploitation of natural resources. The anti-government fervor that swept the country in the early 1990s gave great hope to the leaders of the brown brigades. With incendiary rhetoric they stirred up considerable public concern that every birdwatcher was an unindicted, unwitting, co-conspirator in some pagan-minded push to prevent maximization of private profit. Now, however, the WUM is fast becoming frustrated and fractured. The movement's congressional agenda has been crashing into walls left and right and at least one of the brown field commanders, Chuck Cushman, head of the American Land Rights Association, is openly biting some of the hands that have been feeding him.

None of this means the movement has fizzled in Maine. In fact, Maine continues to be a national backbead for the unwise movement. Indeed, it is becoming an international center for nervous extremists who decree action to preserve the common good. Witness a few examples.

Two opponents, private property rights zealots, and self-described relativists, is a current and emerging theme that environmentalists are pagan nature worshipers in cahoots with the UN to turn national parks into "ecosystem," and the UN is going to turn them into "human exclusion zones." The John Birch Society and other "scream-sounding" environmental groups are plotting an agenda "to destroy the character of life in Maine," taking a cue from her mentor, Dr. Coffman, who invents a new organization every six months or so to try to confuse his critics. She is now starting another group called Traditional Maine Sportman. (Contact R. McKay, UTU, HC 62 Box 458, Kingsmead, ME 04452-3077.)

If you want to read some of the ideas these folks believe, drop them a card or get a copy of Flickery Notes, Farming & Forestry Today (HCR 32 Box 3, Sullivan, ME 04481.)
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If you want to read some of the ideas these folks believe, drop them a card or get a copy of Flickery Notes, Farming & Forestry Today (HCR 32 Box 3, Sullivan, ME 04481.)
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MAINEopoly is a board game in which players compete in determining possible futures for Maine's North Woods. On the next four pages, you will find all you need to entertain your family, community group, dorm, government agency, board of directors, or cell block on a rainy afternoon, or to liven up a dull party or stockholder meeting. Just follow the instructions below (or use your own creativity to make the rules more realistic or fun). Maine is on the move, so get going!

INTRODUCTION

During the 19th century, timber barons amassed vast forest holdings in the legendary Maine Woods. They sent virgin logs to hundreds of sawmills on Maine's mighty rivers, transforming the state into the lumber capital of the world. But in the 20th century, most timber barons were replaced by huge multinational corporations which acquired control of millions of acres of forest. Many of these companies also employed tens of thousands of workers to build and run gigantic pulp and paper mills. Today, Maine has the largest amount of industrial and the greatest proportion of foreign land ownership of any state in the country. The forest products industry represents the largest economic and political force in Maine. As a result, absentee paper companies, in particular, exert enormous influence on Maine's environment, economy, and government.

However, the traditional patterns of ownership, use and management in Maine's so-called "working forest" are changing. In many respects, the old ways no longer serve the natural and human communities very well. Most of Maine's paper mills are now outdated and at a competitive disadvantage compared to those in other states and countries. The forest industry has been "downsizing" thousands of workers out of jobs. While Maine is statistically the most heavily forested state, in recent years clearcutting and overcutting have degraded thousands of square miles of its forest ecosystems. There is virtually no old-growth forest left. In fact, there are too many small trees, seedlings and saplings crowd each other in an overabundance of immature forest stands. At the same time, demands are increasing for residential, commercial and industrial development in Maine's wildlands. The future for Maine could be as an increasingly impoverished, resource-extractive third world economy with an industrialized landscape dominated by the forest industry.

But there is another possible future. Public pressure to return timber harvesting to sustainable levels is mounting. Equally significant, more and more people recognize that non-timber values are increasingly outweighing the traditional commodity uses of the forest. There is growing recognition that park lands and ecological reserves, large and small, can preserve and restore native biodiversity and natural scenic beauty, safeguard clean water and air, protect essential wildlife habitat, maintain public access to large tracts of unspoiled wildlands for backcountry recreation, and can help diversify Maine's economy.

On the eve of the 21st century, the future of the fabled Maine Woods is up for grabs. MAINEopoly is designed both to entertain and to educate. It is a rough model, but a reasonable facsimile, of a state in transition. What would you do if you could decide the future of the forest in Maine?

OBJECT

There are two ways to "win" the game of MAINEopoly:

1. Accumulate personal and corporate wealth and power by buying properties, building mills, malls and second homes, cutting forests unsustainably, exporting raw logs, busting unions, and dominating government and public agencies, in order to become rich, reduce taxes, minimize environmental regulations, and pass corporate welfare legislation.

2. Become richest in spirit, celebrate the natural and cultural heritage of the Maine Woods, and leave a great public legacy by permanently protecting conservation lands (to preserve fragile soils, waters, forests, wildlife, recreation, and aesthetics and to encourage economic diversification), as well as by ensuring that future activities on harvested forest lands are ecologically sound, socially responsible, and sustainable.

Of course, in the real world a balance of approaches is necessary. As you play MAINEopoly, think about what you believe would be the ideal mix of private and public ownership, of managed and wild lands, of consumptive and nonconsumptive recreation, of young and old-growth forests.

PREPARATION

1. Photocopy Properties from the board (use as deeds) and Stakeholders, paste onto old manila folders and cut out.

2. Photocopy Risk It! cards onto red paper and Community Values cards onto green paper and cut out.

3. Make 20 copies of each So-called Improvement and Public Investment. Cut out and assemble.

4. Make 20 copies of each denomination of FleeceBank buck for each Stakeholder playing.

5. Give each Stakeholder 10 of each type of FleeceBank buck to start. Put remaining money in bank.

6. Designate Stakeholders to serve as CEO of the FleeceBank (to handle the cash) and President of the SurReal Estate Agency (to handle the deeds).

7. Borrow a pair of dice.

PLAY

1. (Each player chooses a Stakeholder. Take turns throwing the dice and moving the Stakeholders clockwise around the board.

2. Stakeholders may purchase any Property they land on by paying the price to the FleeceBank.

3. Players may add one So-called Improvement or one Public Investment to each Property they acquire. Pay cost to FleeceBank. For the purposes of this game, So-called Improvements may be placed on conservation lands and Public Investments may be placed on private lands.

4. When you land on another Stakeholder's Property, pay the owner a use fee of $5 million if it is on TooLost Road, $10 million if it is on Harsh Reality Road, $15 million if it is on Buzzsaw Road, or $20 million if it is on Golden Road. If there is a So-called Improvement on the property, pay an additional fee of $1 million for a second home, $5 million for a Wall-to-Wall-Mart, or $10 million for a mill. (There is no additional payment for Public Investments.)

5. For each doubles rolled take another turn. Three doubles in a row puts you in the slammer. Roll doubles (3 tries) or pay a $10 million fine to get out of the slammer.

6. Put $100 million in the Maine Outdoor Heretics Lotto to start and each time it is won. Pay all penalties, fees and fines to the MOH Lotto.

7. You may form ad hoc alliances, coalitions, councils and affinity groups. However, you are not required to stick with any particular team for the whole game.

8. If you get into a jam make up your own rules.

STAKEHOLDERS

Multinational Company Exec

Politician

"Wise Use" Extremist

Preservationist

Moose

Happy Campers
SO-CALLED IMPROVEMENTS

A

B

C
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F
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Second Home
Cost $10 million

Wall-to-Wall-Mart
Cost $50 million

Paper Mill
Cost $100 million

PUBLIC INVESTMENTS

Backcountry Trail System
Cost $1 million

Interpretive Center
Cost $5 million

Ecosystem Restoration
Cost $10 million

FLEECE BANK BUCKS

$1,000,000

$10,000,000

$100,000,000

HANCEROCK TIMBER GROUP

255,000 acres

JUST

SLAMMER
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$10,000,000

$100,000,000
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RISK IT!

Purchase “green certification” for your family forestlands, you stly dog. Claim win-win. 
(Next you can lobby for an even bigger estate tax break.)
Because you manage your cash well, happily donate $20 million to each Stakeholder.
Join Unorganized Territories
Disorganized “wise use” group. Hysterically claim violation of private property rights and government “takings.”
Collect $20 million from each Stakeholder and stop whining for 15 minutes (or else refund cash).
Claim global competition as justification to break union and redouble wages in paper mill. Get caught disturbing American woods workers depressed, import Canadian crews to harvest trees on your company’s forestlands.
Get elected governor of the Soreign Republic of Maine. Streamline environmental regulations and create generous new business tax breaks.
Win Paul Bunyan Forest Mauling & Win Paul Bunyan Forest Mauling & Hauling Award from 
Pulpmakers’ Resource Council for timber trespass into wilderness area.
Give thumbs up sign and roll again.

COMMMUNITY VALUES

Receive Noble Peace Prize for donating 20 million acre “forever wild” international peace park to the public.
Collect $1 million for each acre donated ($20 million), give peace sign and roll again.
List imperiled Atlantic salmon under Endangered Species Act. Wild fish are inspired to spawn prolifically.
Pause to contemplate the ageless magic of these majestic fish leaping upstream, then roll again.
Create a win-win situation by shifting from high-impact logging, which damages fragile soils and seedlings, to low-impact forestry. Good work.
Collect $10 million bonus.
Set up a new value-added furniture factory to stem the export of high quality logs and to employ skilled local workers.
Collect $50 million in first year profits.
Proposed Big Z and Basic Mills Dam would block critical fish migration. Your group, DAM (Defend Against the Madness) successfully blocks both dam licenses.
Take a bow and another turn.
You are hired by ski mogul Lex Olsen to build a mountain out of a mole hill for his expanded resort, Somedays River.

You are appointed paper corporation CEO and immediately downsizes company out of existence.
Retire with $50 million golden parachute to write book about mean[ing]less business.
Illegally lobby land use commission to water down wildlands comprehensive plan. Activists claim it is a hostile takeover of agency, but you get away with it.
Get out of the slammer free. Keep this card until needed.
Advance to S.D. Warnin’. If owned, you may acquire the company in a bargain sale financed with junk bond. (It would not be the first time.)
Pay $50 million.

State and local officials offer you income, property and equipment tax breaks to not relocate your mill to a third world country.
Collect $50 million for successful corporate blackmail.
Buy special political access through soft money contributions financed by insider trading of paper company stock.
Join news conference to call for election reform.
Hand each Stakeholder $10 million in cash money under the table.
Dioxin discharges from your paper mill may create a “cancer valley.” Public television does an expose, but then is too nervous to air the program.

Win Pressley Paul Buntan Forest Mauling & Hauling Award from 
Pulpmakers’ Resource Council for timber trespass into wilderness area.
Give thumbs up sign and roll again.

Get caught disturbing a rare mylly protected by ESA in a LURC P-FW zone with your PW while not wearing your PFD. Fail to convince IFW you were looking for your lost GPS. 
Go to slammer free.

Win Paul Bunyan Forest Mauling & Hauling Award from 
Pulpmakers’ Resource Council for timber trespass into wilderness area.
Give thumbs up sign and roll again.

Receive Noble Peace Prize for donating 20 million acre “forever wild” international peace park to the public.
Collect $1 million for each acre donated ($20 million), give peace sign and roll again.
Create a win-win situation by shifting from high-impact logging, which damages fragile soils and seedlings, to low-impact forestry. Good work.
Collect $10 million bonus.
Write expose of interlocking directorships among forestry companies, banks and fat-cat law firms.
Win $10 million Pulitizer Prize for investigative journalism.
Guided by Canadian seeing-eye wolf, set land speed record while hiking Hundred Mile Wilderness section of the Appalachian Elulus Playground Trail.
Skip next turn to let Phideaux rest.

You are appointed paper corporation CEO and immediately downsizes company out of existence.
Retire with $50 million golden parachute to write book about mean[ing]less business.
Illegally lobby land use commission to water down wildlands comprehensive plan. Activists claim it is a hostile takeover of agency, but you get away with it.
Get out of the slammer free. Keep this card until needed.
Advance to S.D. Warnin’. If owned, you may acquire the company in a bargain sale financed with junk bond. (It would not be the first time.)
Pay $50 million.

State and local officials offer you income, property and equipment tax breaks to not relocate your mill to a third world country.
Collect $50 million for successful corporate blackmail.
Buy special political access through soft money contributions financed by insider trading of paper company stock.
Join news conference to call for election reform.
Hand each Stakeholder $10 million in cash money under the table.
Dioxin discharges from your paper mill may create a “cancer valley.” Public television does an expose, but then is too nervous to air the program.

Get caught disturbing a rare mylly protected by ESA in a LURC P-FW zone with your PW while not wearing your PFD. Fail to convince IFW you were looking for your lost GPS. 
Go to slammer free.

Win Paul Bunyan Forest Mauling & Hauling Award from 
Pulpmakers’ Resource Council for timber trespass into wilderness area.
Give thumbs up sign and roll again.

Receive Noble Peace Prize for donating 20 million acre “forever wild” international peace park to the public.
Collect $1 million for each acre donated ($20 million), give peace sign and roll again.
Create a win-win situation by shifting from high-impact logging, which damages fragile soils and seedlings, to low-impact forestry. Good work.
Collect $10 million bonus.
Write expose of interlocking directorships among forestry companies, banks and fat-cat law firms.
Win $10 million Pulitizer Prize for investigative journalism.
Guided by Canadian seeing-eye wolf, set land speed record while hiking Hundred Mile Wilderness section of the Appalachian Elulus Playground Trail.
Skip next turn to let Phideaux rest.

You are appointed paper corporation CEO and immediately downsizes company out of existence.
Retire with $50 million golden parachute to write book about mean[ing]less business.
Illegally lobby land use commission to water down wildlands comprehensive plan. Activists claim it is a hostile takeover of agency, but you get away with it.
Get out of the slammer free. Keep this card until needed.
Advance to S.D. Warnin’. If owned, you may acquire the company in a bargain sale financed with junk bond. (It would not be the first time.)
Pay $50 million.

State and local officials offer you income, property and equipment tax breaks to not relocate your mill to a third world country.
Collect $50 million for successful corporate blackmail.
Buy special political access through soft money contributions financed by insider trading of paper company stock.
Join news conference to call for election reform.
Hand each Stakeholder $10 million in cash money under the table.
Dioxin discharges from your paper mill may create a “cancer valley.” Public television does an expose, but then is too nervous to air the program.

Get caught disturbing a rare mylly protected by ESA in a LURC P-FW zone with your PW while not wearing your PFD. Fail to convince IFW you were looking for your lost GPS. 
Go to slammer free.
State Gives $4 Million Support to Industry to Plan to Chip 300,000-Plus Acres of Northern Maine Hardwood Forests

by Ron Huber

High volume wood chipping of large areas of northern Maine hardwoods may commence in October, following a recent decision by the Finance Authority of Maine (FAME) to approve the town of Millinocket's proposal to float a $4.1 million dollar bond to pay a local contractor to build and operate a high-volume hardwood chip mill on a 40 acre tract on the edge of town on land leased from industrial forest owner JM Huber Corporation.

JM Huber, whose 300,000+ acre holdings span 14 townships and stretch from the eastern border of Baxter State Park north to Fort Kent, will be the initial supplier of trees for the chipmill. The company simultaneously received permits from the Maine Dept of Environmental Protection to fill wetlands and a stream at the chipmill site.

While noting that "two letters were submitted in opposition to the Project" (Julian Holmes & Ron Huber), FAME approved the bond issue based on four "determinations and findings of fact":

(1) The Project will make a significant contribution to the economic growth of the State, the control of pollution in the State and the betterment of the welfare of the inhabitants of the State.

This would be achieved by providing 12 jobs, and by reducing paper mill chlorine use by supplying mills with "clean hardwood" woodchips, which, FAME stated "require less chemical processing than chips contaminated with bark, leaves, dirt or other matter, allowing Maine paper mills to operate efficiently.

"Further FAME noted, "because the paper companies using the chips produced by the company will use less chlorine in the paper manufacturing process, the project will indirectly result in the lessening of pollution from the paper making process, further contributing to a cleaner environment."

(2) The Project will not result in a substantial detriment to existing businesses in the State. FAME based this finding on their receiving no opposition to the chipmill project from sawmill companies in the region.

(3) Adequate provision is being made to meet any increased demand upon public facilities that might result from the Project. The certificate states that log trucks would enter the chipper site via JM Huber's private haul roads and not on public roads. Outgoing woodchips will depart the site on rail cars via a spur line leading to the Bangor & Aroostook Railroad.

(4) The Department of Environmental Protection has certified to the Authority that all licenses required by the Department with respect to the Project have been issued or that none are required based on a certificate issued by the Department to the Authority dated 7/21/97.

As noted above, Maine DEP has issued permits under the Natural Resource Protection Act, giving permission to fill wetlands on the mill construction site, and has certified that the project will produce no water or air pollution.

At public hearings held in Millinocket and Augusta, supporters of the chipmill said it would create 12 jobs turning "an abundance of low quality hardwoods" into "clean high quality wood chips.

Recipient of the bond money will be Gardner Chipmills Millinocket LLC, owned by longtime logging and trucking contractor William Gardner of Millinocket. Gardner, who plans to debark and grind a minimum of 100,000 cords of hardwood trees into chips per year, said that declines in softwood were causing a vast area out there of millions of acres of under-utilized hardwoods, and traditionally, these lands have been so-called wasteland.

Gardner has no export plans at present, though he wouldn't rule it out if market conditions were favorable.

"Citizens also fear that chipping of hardwood trees too small for the sawmill will deplete the growing stock, leaving the cutover areas unproductive. Because many of the areas that will be cleared will not support softwoods, these areas will require an 80 year rotation for hardwood pulp, and a 140 year rotation for logs.

It was also noted that, as the JM Huber 'optimizer' mill exists solely on the drawing boards, with no date given for actual construction, all hardwoods harvested on JM Huber lands will end up as woodchips for the foreseeable future, regardless of size and quality.

Another critic, Green forestry activist Tom Foote, says that Gardner's high volume woodchippers will dump a huge amount of chips into the markets, likely driving down the price of pulpwood paid to small woodlot owners of the region. In addition, he said, the drop in hardwoods will impact wildlife by reducing forest complexity, sharply dropping the yield of wild nuts and seeds that many wildlife species feed on, and destroying deersyards and nesting trees.

OPPONENTS also wonder whether the half of Gardner's 100,000 ton/year woodchip production for which he has no identified buyer will be slated for export from Maine. A JM Huber official told the Bangor Daily News in June that the product of the two mills could be loaded onto railcars on a new spur to the Bangor & Aroostook RR and sent, depending on the buyer, north to rail in Canada or south to a marine terminal at Searsport. However, Gardner Chipmills' attorney told the writer that Gardner has no export plans at present, though he wouldn't rule it out if market conditions were favorable.

Two opponents of the project, Ron Huber of the Coastal Waters Project and Main Green Julian Holmes, urged FAME to deny Millinocket permission to float the $4.1 million dollar industrial bond, or at least delay the decision until the agency reviewed a similar JM Huber/local chipmiller deal that was turned down by the state of Kentucky last year.

Kentucky's Forest Product Council requires logging companies that want public subsidies to show that their operations will not reduce the long-term productivity of forest resources and will not harm watersheds. JM Huber was not able to demonstrate that its proposed chipping operations would meet these requirements.

While Maine has issued the permits for the operation to commence, a number of Maine forest activists intend to file an appeal of the project to the Maine Board of Environmental Protection in August, saying that the state Department of Environmental Protection failed to study the offsite ecological impacts of the project on Maine's forest ecosystem before granting its permits.

For more information, contact Ron Huber at POB 94, Lincolnville ME 04849 Tel. (207)789-5310 or by email: coastwatch@acadia.net. Ron Huber is not a member of the JM Huber family.
Calming Troubled Waters: An International Peace Park in the Gulf of Maine

by Martin Wilson

Popular advocacy in the 1930s led to the world’s first international peace park, a combination of Glacier and Waterton Lakes national parks. By proclaiming this park, the governments of the United States and Canada not only acknowledged the friendship of neighbors, but also recognized that wild nature is immune to political boundaries. Earth’s wildest remaining places are now in the oceans, which cover two thirds of the globe, but there are as yet no oceanic peace parks to recede the receding frontier of the wild ocean. It would be fitting for the United States and Canada to repeat their wild west conservation policy, this idea has been clearly in North America.

While the concept of protecting specific areas of land is a cornerstone of conservation policy, this idea has been little used in the ocean realm, particularly in North America. In the oceans, conservation is generally limited to catch quotas, a tactic which is successful only when environmental conditions are stable and fishermen are cooperative. Quotas often do nothing for most forms of ocean-wildlife, many of which are obscure even to specialists. Hundreds of types of creatures with few friends are crushed to death by the bilge and other forms of sea life for food, and we will continue to search for oil and other minerals beneath the ocean floor. Nevertheless, should we not give up these activities in some representative parts of the oceans, so that the creatures that live there can continue to live undisturbed? If we did so, benefits that might accrue to us will in the long run greatly outweigh those which we have foregone.

Reserve Theory & Practice

In Nova Scotia, my home province in Canada, most moose hunters head for the boundary of Cape Breton Highlands National Park. The park provides a sanctuary for a core population of moose, and the moose herd is conserved as a result of this provision of protected habitat. Although the park was not established to provide moose hunters with a supply of prey which would be available outside the park, it works that way. Several scientists have wondered whether this simple principle might also provide for conservation, while also allowing exploitation of marine species of commercial interest that migrate out from protected wilderness areas. The idea that marine protected areas might be a strategy for sustainable fisheries has just begun to be tried in a few parts of the world.

Unfortunately, the traditional concept that the ocean is a commons, owned by no one and open to all for exploitation, has made it difficult to experiment properly with the concept of the marine protected area. In the United States, for example, the National Marine Sanctuary Program (administered by the National Oceans and Atmospheric Administration) regulates fishing in only about one per cent of the area “protected” by this program, despite it being the most significant non-fishery marine conservation program in the United States. In ninety-nine percent of the sanctuary area, fishing by any method is treated as a benign activity. This is not because most of these practices are benign, it is simply that the current exploited population. At current fishing pressure, scallops barely make it to reproductive age before they are scooped off Georges Bank. Furthermore, non-fishery practices are far more capable of reproduction than little ones — there is a logarithmic relationship between scallop size and fecundity.

Most of the scallops caught in the Gulf of Maine are scooped off Georges Bank, and if that fifteen year old female scallop produced a dainty three hundred million eggs per year, which is about three hundred times the number of eggs produced by a five year old (i.e., a thirty thousand percent improvement in productivity).

Rick’s doctoral thesis was an analysis of the Georges Bank scallop fishery, and he found that it was regulated by the relationship between fishing effort and scallop fecundity. When the fishing effort is high, not enough scallop eggs are produced to replenish stocks, when the effort declines the egg supply increases and the stock recovers. This creates a fishery with a classic economically-destructive boom and bust cycle. If we could flatten this cycle, we should be able to produce a healthier, more stable economic situation.

We can do this most effectively by working on the egg supply component of the system and by ceasing to keep some of those big old scallops. On average, the entire scallop-bearing region of Georges Bank is raked by a scallop dredge twice a year, so it is no surprise that the prolific egg suppliers are hard to find.

Academic & Grassroot Support

While it was relatively easy to come up with a marine protected area model to protect the scallop fishery, it was less easy to think of an effective strategy to get there. Both the United States and Canada have at times tried to establish a protected buffer on both sides of the rich Georges Bank scallop beds, and scallopers will not give up even a small part of their ground with ease. As it happened, I backed out by being a talkative academic. I ran into a Nova Scotia fisherman, Kirk Munro, who, like many fishermen, is a marine ecologist without the bells and whistles of scientific jargon. Kirk immediately recognized the potential of the idea of protecting a small part of the scallop stock. Really excited, Kirk said something along the line of, “you could do it on the Hague Line, it’s the only place, they hate it on both sides”.

Jim Bohnsack, a National Marine Fisheries scientist at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center in Miami, Florida, has written that marine protected areas “enhance fisheries, reduce conflicts and protect resources”. Conflict resolution is critical politically. New England scallopers are mad as hell when they get hauled into a Canadian court for straying over the Hague Line, but it continues to happen, so a protected segment of the line would literally create a “peace park”. While the area available for fishing would be reduced by a small amount (5% should suffice for scallops in theo-
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- **Scallops, For Example**

  The Gulf of Maine is a distinctive ocean ecosystem, bounded to the south by Cape Cod, to the north by Nova Scotia, to the west by some of the New England States, and to the east by the outer edge of Georges Banks. The boundary between the gulf waters of the United States and Canada lies along the so-called “Hague Line”, after the decision made in The Hague by the International Court of Justice. If we were to follow this line in a submarine, hugging the bottom, we would cross a complex of marine habitats: kelp forests inhabited by urchins and lobsters, mud flats with marine worms and snails, rocky ledges with various crustaceans, great flats rich in scallops, a water-blown sandy desert, and forests of sponges and corals in the deeper canyons. Each of these habitats has its own suite of fish, just as on land a marsh, a field and a forest has its suite of animals.

  A “peace park” just a few miles wide, along the Hague Line boundary would protect much of the ocean diversity of the Gulf of Maine. To scientists, a protected area of this sort would be a gold mine of information, not just about this piece of undisturbed marine environment but also about the impacts of fishing and other activities on marine environments in general. At present, it is hard even to work out how fast many marine animals grow or how long they live, because they all get caught before they have a chance to live out a full life.

  In 1994, Rick McGarvey and I presented the idea of a Hague Line marine protected area to an international workshop on marine protected areas and sustainable fisheries. We reported work we had done on the Georges Bank scallop fishery. Rick, an American, was a graduate student at the time and an expert bio-economic fisheries modeler. He crunched lots of numbers and found that, in theory, if we left about four percent of the scallops where they were to grow as big as they could get, they would produce just as many young as
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- **Eggs spawned by a typical female scallop (recruited at age 2) as a function of age, considering mortality and fecundity, for the cases of exploited and protected populations. The area under each graph represents the lifetime eggs produced by an average individual in exploited and protected populations.**
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Maine and Georges Bank? The search impacts on the vast ecosystem found into sharper focus the need for decision makers to dare to adopt what should be the most fundamental element of any natural resource management plan—the setting aside of large areas as undis­turbed 'control' areas, against which manipulative management techniques applied elsewhere can be judged.

More examination of this most basic notion of using unmanaged control areas as part of a resource management process has brought to the fore hitherto largely submerged differences in the vision of the Gulf of Maine's future and "ownership" by a wide spectrum of "marine stakeholders". But the impending creation of a formal marine protected areas research program as a part of the University of Maine's Marine Resources Center, University of Connecticut

"Dragging along with force over considerable areas of marine bottom, it tears away, promiscuously, hosts of the inferior beings there resident, bringing destruction on the multitudes of smaller fishes; the whole of which, be it observed, are the appointed diet of those edible species sought as human food."

—James Bellamy, 1842

As such public information material becomes available, the challenge then will be to marshal public opinion in support of marine wilderness designation, because wilderness designation—be it in the Northern Forest or offshore—is ultimately a political decision. As we have seen in terrestrial park designation campaigns, the political class is notoriously hard of hearing unless the call for marine wilderness designation is a deafening chorus.

Maine's Marine Protected Areas Project

One tool in developing this chorus is an offset of the April 24-25 workshop, "Marine Protected Areas In the Gulf of Maine." Workshop participants decided to create a three-tiered Marine Protected Areas Project, consisting of an MPA Committee, a Management committee, and an Advisory Committee.

The 29 member MPA Committee "will be expected to make major decisions on substantive issues, respond to pertinent questions, provide input and comment on work products and contribute some level of time and/or resources when necessary." A 4-member Management Committee will keep on top of the project's financial and operational infrastructure, while the 23 member Advisory Committee will be kept apprised of the other two committees and provided opportunity for input into the work products of the Project. [Note: NARP's Coastal Waters Project is on the Advisory Committee]

The Marine Protected Areas Project has published its list of twelve actions it intends to carry out:

1. Review of existing data on the Gulf of Maine ecosystem and identification of information gaps;
2. Creation of an electronic database on MPAs in the Gulf of Maine;
3. Compilation and analysis of existing laws, programs and legal mechanisms relating to MPAs;
4. Production of a GIS map displaying existing MPAs in the Gulf;
5. Investigation and recommendations.

Continued on page 22
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"Some research, mostly by industry, has been conducted to assess the impacts of after-reef fishing on the seabed. This has revealed that sediment clouds result from movement across sandy and muddy bottoms, but the clouds are temporary and have not adversely affected catch rates when trawls over the same ground were made within the next 24-hour period."

—Canada Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans website 1997

The 29 member MPA Committee will be kept apprised of the other two committees and provided opportunity for input into the work products of the Project. [Note: NARP's Coastal Waters Project is on the Advisory Committee]

From THE-OLDER-I-GET-THE-LESS-I-KNOW DEPT.

"'Dragging along with force over considerable areas of marine bottom, it tears away, promiscuously, hosts of the inferior beings there resident, bringing destruction on the multitudes of smaller fishes; the whole of which, be it observed, are the appointed diet of those edible species sought as human food."

—James Bellamy, 1842

As such public information material becomes available, the challenge then will be to marshal public opinion in support of marine wilderness designation, because wilderness designation—be it in the Northern Forest or offshore—is ultimately a political decision. As we have seen in terrestrial park designation campaigns, the political class is notoriously hard of hearing unless the call for marine wilderness designation is a deafening chorus.

Maine's Marine Protected Areas Project

One tool in developing this chorus is an offset of the April 24-25 workshop, "Marine Protected Areas In the Gulf of Maine." Workshop participants decided to create a three-tiered Marine Protected Areas Project, consisting of an MPA Committee, a Management committee, and an Advisory Committee.

The 29 member MPA Committee "will be expected to make major decisions on substantive issues, respond to pertinent questions, provide input and comment on work products and contribute some level of time and/or resources when necessary." A 4-member Management Committee will keep on top of the project's financial and operational infrastructure, while the 23 member Advisory Committee will be kept apprised of the other two committees and provided opportunity for input into the work products of the Project. [Note: NARP's Coastal Waters Project is on the Advisory Committee]

The Marine Protected Areas Project has published its list of twelve actions it intends to carry out:

1. Review of existing data on the Gulf of Maine ecosystem and identification of information gaps;
2. Creation of an electronic database on MPAs in the Gulf of Maine;
3. Compilation and analysis of existing laws, programs and legal mechanisms relating to MPAs;
4. Production of a GIS map displaying existing MPAs in the Gulf;
5. Investigation and recommendations.

Continued on page 22

From THE-OLDER-I-GET-THE-LESS-I-KNOW DEPT.

"Some research, mostly by industry, has been conducted to assess the impacts of after-reef fishing on the seabed. This has revealed that sediment clouds result from movement across sandy and muddy bottoms, but the clouds are temporary and have not adversely affected catch rates when trawls over the same ground were made within the next 24-hour period."

—Canada Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans website 1997

The 29 member MPA Committee will be kept apprised of the other two committees and provided opportunity for input into the work products of the Project. [Note: NARP's Coastal Waters Project is on the Advisory Committee]

From THE-OLDER-I-GET-THE-LESS-I-KNOW DEPT.

"Some research, mostly by industry, has been conducted to assess the impacts of after-reef fishing on the seabed. This has revealed that sediment clouds result from movement across sandy and muddy bottoms, but the clouds are temporary and have not adversely affected catch rates when trawls over the same ground were made within the next 24-hour period."

—Canada Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans website 1997

The 29 member MPA Committee will be kept apprised of the other two committees and provided opportunity for input into the work products of the Project. [Note: NARP's Coastal Waters Project is on the Advisory Committee]

From THE-OLDER-I-GET-THE-LESS-I-KNOW DEPT.

"Some research, mostly by industry, has been conducted to assess the impacts of after-reef fishing on the seabed. This has revealed that sediment clouds result from movement across sandy and muddy bottoms, but the clouds are temporary and have not adversely affected catch rates when trawls over the same ground were made within the next 24-hour period."

—Canada Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans website 1997

The 29 member MPA Committee will be kept apprised of the other two committees and provided opportunity for input into the work products of the Project. [Note: NARP's Coastal Waters Project is on the Advisory Committee]

From THE-OLDER-I-GET-THE-LESS-I-KNOW DEPT.

"Some research, mostly by industry, has been conducted to assess the impacts of after-reef fishing on the seabed. This has revealed that sediment clouds result from movement across sandy and muddy bottoms, but the clouds are temporary and have not adversely affected catch rates when trawls over the same ground were made within the next 24-hour period."

—Canada Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans website 1997

The 29 member MPA Committee will be kept apprised of the other two committees and provided opportunity for input into the work products of the Project. [Note: NARP's Coastal Waters Project is on the Advisory Committee]
of a nomination process for MPA candidate sites which builds on existing programs;
6. Investigation of existing lists for candidate MPA sites;
7. "Building on existing programs to develop selection criteria for MPAs in the Gulf of Maine and conducting a case study to test its effectiveness;"
8. Development and publication of a case study of Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary that demonstrates the effectiveness of generating scientific understanding of a marine protected area;
9. Development of interactive education programs that articulate the need for and value of Marine Protected Areas in the Gulf of Maine;
10. "Evaluation and recommendation of methods to ensure the full participation, representation, and involvement of stakeholders in the development of MPAs;"
11. Press releases, community presentations, and meetings with editorial boards to disseminate the concept of MPAs;
12. Raise funds to support activities and projects relating to Marine Protected Areas in the Gulf of Maine.

Most of these proposed actions are important but routine consolidations of existing information from databases scattered around the region and the world. Actions 5, 7, and 10, are different, however, in that they would collectively develop marine protected area nomination and site evaluation processes.

Implementation Difficulties

Once such processes are developed, implementation will follow, provided advocates are vocal enough. Difficulties are likely to arise however. The nomination and evaluation process to be "built on existing programs" with "the full participation, representation and involvement of stakeholders".

As far as existing programs are concerned, on the federal level, neither the US National Marine Sanctuaries nor the National Estuarine Reserve Systems, restrict or even regulate commercial or recreational exploitation of marine life within protected areas before.

Canada's new "Oceans Act", on the other hand, gives the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans discretionary authority to close ocean areas within Canadian waters to conserve exploited species, unique areas, areas of high productivity or biodiversity, or to conserve threatened or endangered species. The Oceans Act only became law in December 1996. DFO is conducting a program to establish marine protected areas but it is unclear whether the political will exists to move the process forward, provided advocates are vocal enough.

New Zealand's Experience

Perhaps cognizant of the likelihood that discord among stakeholders will hold planning and development of the nomination and site evaluation processes to a glacial pace, the MPA Project's guidelines note that "policy makers should take full advantage of opportunities which arise independent of a planned approach to locate and protect significant areas in the Gulf of Maine." What such "opportunities" remain sketchy; a companion piece to this article reviews a proposal for a transboundary non-extractive marine reserve spanning the US/Canada Atlantic Ocean border. In this case, decision making would take place at diplomatic levels. At least one national marine sanctuary, in Hawaiian waters, was designated by federal legislation, without passing through the lengthy National Marine Sanctuaries Program's site evaluation process. Any member of the New England Congressional delegation could act similarly.

University of Auckland (New Zealand) biologist Bill Ballantine, a member of the MPAP Advisory Committee, has noted that in his nation, the government proceeded in the face of industry opposition in the 1970s with designating its first completely non-extractive marine reserve. The resulting gains in habitat complexity and in fish and shellfish productivity, captured the public's imagination. Similar in size to the Gulf of Maine watershed region, New Zealand now has 12 non-extractive marine reserves, with 24 more in various stages of discussion and designation. The fishing industry there, noting the gains in regional productivity in the waters outside the boundaries of marine reserves, is now one of their strongest supporters.

Will it take a similar designation-by-fact for the Gulf of Maine region to jumpstart the marine wilderness process in the Gulf of Maine region? Time will tell.

Sable Island Natural Gas Review Concludes: Corporate Lawyers Win Out

The Nova Scotia Anti-Pipeline Group's view of the "formal hearings" by the Joint Public Review Panel for the Sable Island Gas Project, and the Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline Project, which ended on July 14, in Halifax, is:

Corporate lawyers run the discussions, which from the public's perspective had a farricical quality. The hearings turned out to be an opportunity for big business and big lobby to hijack for business advantage. These were not environmental hearings.

- There was open corporate bullying of the panel by Mobil, Shell, Westcoast Energy and also by TransCanada Pipelines. The five-member Joint Review Panel never publicly responded to this bullying, which was a degrading example of the subservience of this panel to the oil and gas industry.

- The Panel "ruled" against the request for an independent environmental assessment of the proposed pipeline route and delaying the hearings until the公交 had been undertaken. Instead, corporate documents by those with a vested financial interest in pushing the Sable project — documents alleging a significant effect — shaped the main boundaries within which discussions took place.

- There was no attempt by the Nova Scotia government to defend environmental or wildlife interests, either around Sable Island or along the Pipeline Corridor. There also was no attempt to seriously examine the contribution of the Sable gas project to global warming and climate instability.

- There was no attempt by the N.S. government to defend the health and safety concerns of rural residents who could be forced by short-gun land easement sales, or through outright appropriation, to live in the vicinity of high pressure natural gas or gas liquid pipelines.

- The N.S. government's only claim to fame in the hearings was its changes of position on pipeline policy and its concession of substantive interests in Sable Island gas, including the manner in which it is conveyed to market. The token last minute polluting rate changes sought by the new Liberal premier of Nova Scotia, are insignificant in the larger context of Sable gas give-aways by the province.

- There are now three options for conveying Sable gas to (mainly) American markets: The Maritime and Northeast Pipeline Project, the TransMaritime Pipeline Project via Quebec, and the recent Tatham Offshore sub-sea proposal. We expect, given its track record, that the joint Public Review Panel will give the go-ahead for the offshore Sable gas project, but defer the decision for further consideration on how the gas will be conveyed.

Preliminary work by both onshore pipeline companies is now being carried out along their proposed routes, causing significant environmental destruction. The Anti-Pipeline Group has strongly protested this, and demands that all so-called preliminary work be terminated.

The Nova Scotia Anti-Pipeline Group is totally against the extraction of fossil fuel for American markets. The Sable gas project is presented as a "done deal" by governments and corporations, but this is only if the status quo is uninvolved. A stand has to be taken now.

We will continue to be a focus for resistance and opposition to all aspects of the Sable gas project.

For more information, contact Bernardes Romanowsky, (902) - 351-2826; David Orton (902) - 925-2514; or Mundy Avery, (902) - 923-2782.
by Jamie Sayen

This spring, after two years of intensive deliberations, a group representing a broad cross-section of the New Hampshire forestry community released a very important book (in notebook form so as to facilitate updates and additions) outlining ecologically sustainable forest management practices—Good Forestry in the Granite State: Recommended Voluntary Management Practices for New Hampshire.

Good Forestry was produced by a group that called itself the Forest Sustainability Standards Work Team (FSSWT) which was created in response to a recommendation by the Northern Forest Lands Council. I had the privilege of serving on FSSWT.

Good Forestry is aimed at landowners, foresters, loggers, and others interested in forest management that protects ecosystem integrity. Its recommendations are voluntary (although, some practices, especially regarding wetlands, are required by state law). No new regulations have been established by this effort. Due to the voluntary nature of the recommendations, Good Forestry provides guidance for sustainable forestry; however, it is in no way prevents abusive forest management practices. Hence, there remains a need for strict monitoring and regulations to prevent the most unacceptable and ecologically degrading practices of large clearcuts, herbicide spraying, and overcutting.

Good Forestry has introductory sections on: "First Steps in Forest Management"; "Your Land & The Larger Landscape"; "New Hampshire Forest Types". It then offers six chapters on: Soil productivity; Water Quality; Wetlands, & Riparian Areas; Habitats; Unique & Fragile Areas; Timber/Flow, & Aesthetic Beauty; Forest Quality/Recreation. Appended to the main body of the book is a glossary, an information directory of public forestry contacts, a list of things to look for in higher streams in NH, and a copy of Best Management Practices for erosion control.

Good Forestry deals with both traditional and less well-known issues confronted by a timber operation. Among the more traditional issues dealt with are erosion control, wetlands, endangered species, nesting areas, regeneration, forest structure, controlling logging damage, clearing trees, insects, diseases, & wind damage, truck roads & skid trails, landings, slash disposal, and recreational concerns. These sections—indeed, all sections in Good Forestry—adhere to the following format: an issue statement and discussion of the issue; a objective statement; considerations; recommended practices; cross references to other related sections; and literature cited in that section. The recommended practices are short, clear statements of ways to accomplish a goal with the least damage to the stand being harvested.

What makes Good Forestry such an important contribution to the evolving debate over ecologically sustainable forestry is its attention to issues that traditionally have not often received adequate attention. These include: soil nutrients; beaver-created openings; mast; cavity trees, dens, & snags; dead & down woody debris; and a chapter on "Unique and Fragile Areas" that has sections on: rare plants & natural communities; pools; seeps; wetlands; raptor nest trees; hexon colonies; bald eagle & osprey nests; bald eagle winter roosts; old-growth forests; and high-elevation forests. It is the treatment of some of these critical ecological issues that makes Good Forestry such a special book.

Responses to Good Forestry has been overwhelmingly positive both within and outside New Hampshire, and within and outside the forest industry. Producing it was a marathon exercise; every chapter was gone over by the entire group with a fine-tooth comb at least three or four or more times. The group spent at least seven or eight full work days on this often numbing, but critical task. Nearly all disagreements were resolved amicably and by consensus. (Note: I am no fan of "consensus" as it allows everyone to gloss over differences and marginalize dissenting voices; however, when consensus is achieved by hard work, grappling with the thorniest issues, and careful consideration of all points of view, it can produce extremely valuable results. Good Forestry is an example. No group from the timber industry alone, nor from the environmental community alone could come up with such a valuable product.)

The greatest controversy, in fact, the only one over which civility threatened to break down, was the issue of clearcutting. Due to pressures from proponents of clearcutting, some important statements were deleted at the last minute, even though they had passed muster with the group on earlier reviews and had been endorsed by public review and comments. Among the changes was a deletion of statements that were references to pre-settlement forests; increased forest fragmentation; and soil productivity. However, the first recommended practice for clearcutting practice states: "Due to ecological and social concerns, clearcutting should be used only where other silvicultural methods will not meet landowner objectives." In other words, to practice good forestry, avoid clearcutting.

One other issue is not addressed in Good Forestry: herbicide use. There is a simple explanation: herbicide use is not good forestry, and, as such, there was no need to describe the ecologically sound way of poisoning forest ecosystems for profit.

The thankless task of riding herd on the FSSWT committee fell upon Susan Francher of the NH Division of Forests & Lands and Tammara Van Ryn of the Society for the Protection of NH Forests. Not only did they have to facilitate the often lively discussions, they also had to incorporate the editing of the group in our endless rounds of revision and rewriting. Susan and Tammara did a fantastic job, and the finished product is a special testament to their dedicated and talented efforts.

Unfortunately for New Hampshire forests, Tammara took another job in another state this summer, and her knowledge, expertise, dedication, intelligence, and good humor have been removed from the ongoing NH forestry debates just as we begin to tackle the issue of ecologically degrading logging practices. I, for one, hope she returns to NH forestry issues soon. We already miss her; the respectful collaboration that has produced Good Forestry and the 1995 Forest Resources Plan, is breaking down.

Copies of Good Forestry are available from: Jane Gelles, Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, 54 Portsmouth St., Concord, NH 03301, tel. 603 224-9945. Price is $15 plus $5 for shipping and handling.

Sustaining New Hampshire Forests

The New Hampshire Forest Sustainability Standards Work Team continues to conduct workshops based on its Recommended Voluntary Management Practices for New Hampshire. The workshops are a cooperative effort by the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, the New Hampshire Timberland Owners Association, the Division of Forests and Lands, and Fish and Game Department. Workshops are $10 a session; four NH forester licensing credits available for each workshop; call 603-224-9945 to register or for more information.

• Friday, September 26, 8-10am, Preventing Erosion and Soil Damage at the Hubbard Brook Experiment Station in Thornton.

• Saturday, November 7, 8-10am, Preventing Erosion and Soil Damage at the Hubbard Brook Experiment Station in Thornton.
Logging, Soil, & Water Quality: Are Best Management Practices Working in Maine?

by Mitch Lansky

The Maine Woods does not consist merely of trees. It is laced with streams, rivers, ponds, lakes, and wetlands. In the unorganized territories alone there are 3,000 lakes and ponds and over 16,000 miles of rivers and streams. These waters are essential to the region’s wildlife, recreation, and beauty. Rivers, streams, and lakes were the major transportation routes in presettlement and early periods. Indeed, it is hard to imagine the Maine woods without seeing some water body.

It is well known that undisturbed forests yield the highest quality of water. Logging leaves break the flow of falling water, and forest duff and topsoil act as a natural filter. When trees are cleared away and the soil is bare, rutted, or compacted, water flows on the surface, taking soil with it. Where large areas of forest have been cleared for development and agriculture, water quality has suffered from siltation, nutrient leaching, and chemical pollution.

Maine has nearly 910,000 acres of its land classified as forest. But this forest is hardly “undisturbed.” In the unorganized territories, since 1972, nine times as many acres of forest have been converted by logging roads as by households. And millions of acres have been heavily logged. What does forest disturbance from logging do to water quality, and what is Maine doing to reduce the impacts?

By Federal Law, all states with commercial forests must have some rules or guidelines to minimize non-point source pollution (NPSP) to surface water bodies. Two-thirds of all U.S. states, including Maine, have these guidelines which are followed voluntarily. Maine’s guidelines, called “Best Management Practices” (BMPs), relate mostly to construction of roads, woods trails, landings, and stream crossings. They are designed to minimize or eliminate movement of soil from the forest to streams where the sedimentation can have adverse impacts to fish. The loss of soil can also have adverse effects on forest productivity.

Maine’s BMPs have been developed by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and the Department of Conservation (DOC) with the aid of the Forestry Advisory Team (FORT)—a Forest Advisory Team. The FORAT is composed of around a dozen members from various government agencies and public interest groups (see side bar). In 1995, the University of Maine established a research project to answer questions raised by the DEP. As best management practices were developed, compliance was measured. Are BMPs being followed? Are BMPs effective when used? What documented impacts on water quality are occurring and with what BMPs? The researchers broke the state into four regions—two in the organized territories and two in the unorganized territories. This was done, in part, to see what difference the rules of the Land Use Regulation Commission (in the unorganized territories) and the DEP (in the organized territories) make. The results were published last year.

Evidence of Sedimentation

Compliance with BMPs made a big difference in reducing erosion and sedimentation but did not stop all problems. For example, in one organized territory, compliance still resulted in major sedimentation (delivery of sediment to surface water), although to a lower degree than non-compliant sites. For example, around one fourth of compliant sites had major sedimentation in 80% of these sites. Scores were also low for BMPs dealing with diversion of water from trails, roads, and landings. These are critical for avoiding erosion and sedimentation.

BMPs dealing with putting sites to bed are important for lessening long-term impacts. Some of the BMPs in this group scored an “A.” Seventy-six percent scored “D” or lower. These BMPs included placement of water bars, revegetation of steep skid trail sections, and removal of culverts. Cross drainage culverts were removed on only 25% of sites where this action was appropriate. Over time these culverts become obstructed, contributing to erosion of nearby road banks. Compliance was also very low (34%) for stabilizing drainage ditches—another BMP with long-term consequences.
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Both Kahl and Cormier emphasized that the timing of practices is crucial. Winter logging can do a fraction of the damage that would occur in early summer. There is less compaction, rutting, and soil disturbance. There is also higher survival of seedlings and other vegetation that help stabilize soils and take up nutrients that otherwise would be lost.

Both Kahl and Cormier expressed concerns that some of the more egregious operations could have impacts not only on streams, but even ocean estuaries. There is currently no research to confirm such a connection.

Sampling over long time periods cannot pick up evidence of sediment movement for stream crossing BMP compliant and noncompliant sites.

Conclusions & Recommendations

How roads, skid trails, yards, and stream crossings are made can have significant impacts both in the short and long term on water quality. For example, the old way of building roads—by scraping the soil down to bedrock and piling the material outward—can continue to create erosion/siltation problems for decades. New methods of crowning and ditching roads can lead to major reductions of such problems. The statistical evidence from the University of Maine study strongly supports the contention that BMPs in general can significantly reduce or eliminate siltation of water.

According to the researchers, compliance for some BMPs requires "little additional cost, simply [..] paying more attention to detail." Others, do require modest additional costs, and others may require fairly large up front costs. A LURC handbook on erosion control makes the argument that these investments are well worthwhile.

Evidence of sediment movement for stream crossing BMP compliant and noncompliant sites. None = no sediment movement; minor = movement and no delivery to surface water; major = delivery to surface water.

Although current BMPs are effective in most cases, the new research shows that some require refinement. The FORAT sought to closely examine the University of Maine document and Janet Cormier's addendum to find which areas are weak and suggest ways to improve them. In refining the BMPs, the FORAT should consider widening criteria to include recommendations based on season, soil type, and watershed characteristics.

The research of Cormier and Kahl also suggests that BMPs do not go far enough at protecting water quality. More BMPs should be developed that take into account the intensity of cuts, the width and distribution of skid trails and yards, and the degree of soil disturbances the destroy the organic pad. The width of filter strips for small streams should be expanded due to their higher sensitivity to disturbance. Some states protect intermittent streams (which can also be sensitive to disturbance) by law. This should be state policy in Maine as well.

If the major causes of erosion/siltation problems are roads, skid trails, and yards, then low-impact forestry, which reduces the size and distribution of these soil insults, should reduce the degree of erosion and siltation. Low-impact forestry also reduces soil disturbance problems by keeping machinery on trails (instead of letting them wander through the woods) and by having forwarders carry short-wood loads, rather than have grapple skidders drag whole trees. Researchers should compare low-impact versus standard, mechanized operations. If the low-impact methods indeed have merit, public policy should reflect this fact.

One final recommendation: the phrase "Best Management Practices" should be changed. Vermont's term "Acceptable Management Practices," implies a floor below which you should not go, whereas Maine's term "Best Management Practices," implies a ceiling. After all, nothing can be better than the best. But it is possible for landowners to exceed Maine's BMPs. Some already do—and I hope they all do soon.
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Supreme Court Upholds Loon Mountain Decision

On June 27, 1997, the U.S. Supreme Court closed an important chapter in RESTORE's effort to halt the ill-conceived expansion of Loon Mountain ski area, Loon Mountain Recreation Corporation (LMRC), the ski area's parent company, had appealed to the high court a ruling of the U.S. First Circuit Court of Appeals which found that LMRC had not obtained necessary permits and that the U.S. Forest Service had not properly included the public in its study of the proposed expansion.

For the last five years, RESTORE has opposed the proposed expansion, which would create new ski runs, increase snowmaking capacity, and allow the construction of new lodges and other buildings. This includes development on additional White Mountain National Forest (WMNF) lands, and the use of water from Loon Pond and the East Branch of the Penagwasset River.

In an ironic twist, the Forest Service sided with RESTORE's opposition to the appeal to the Supreme Court. Their decision upholds the U.S. Appeals Court ruling, which sets the important precedent that ski areas may now be required by the Environmental Protection Agency to monitor water pollution caused by snow-making. The town of Lincoln, NH draws drinking water from Loon Pond.

—David Carle
Deconstructing the USFS Maine Forest Inventory

by William Butler

With the hope of some resolution of the forest controversy, we greeted the US Forest Service's Forest Statistics for Maine, 1995 on its emergence last year. This long-awaited set of tables follows the 1982 resurvey, as these efforts are known. In the study's span of 14 or 15 years, cutting in the industrial forest that the USFS formerly termed "liquidation" destroyed much of the woods as we knew it. Possibly as many feared exposure of their mismanagement as hoped to see numbers confirming the evidence on the ground and of aerial and satellite images.

With the computer as oracle, we tend to accept the information offered as beyond questioning. Perhaps it is only human to expect this inventory, as it is also called, to tell us the state of the forest now and to quantify the changes. The authors warn at once that this was not the case.

The long-awaited set of tables follows the 1982 resurvey, as these efforts exposed of their mismanagement as beyond questioning. Perhaps it is also called, to tell us the state of the forest now and to quantify the changes. The authors warn at once that this was not the case.

Furthermore, 1982 area, sawtimber and growing-stock volumes, measures you might want to compare with the 1995 results, have been produced by subtracting growth estimates from the current (1995) volumes—circular reasoning? This disclaimer leads some to ask why we do it this way? It was not our intention to analyze temporal data in this publication, "is stated up front.

We are promised later an analytical report on "the salient changes in the forest resource since the previous inventory... This is to focus on changes in the character of the timberland base, in inventory volume, compositions and structure, in cutting, mortality, and net growth. These will yield "coarse measures of forest sustainability and health," so the discussion begins.

Having been told what the present study does not afford, one is tempted to ask what good is it? What is the resolution of "coarse measure" in pursuing the grail (or weasel-word) of sustainability? Let us have a look at how the present study was designed, to help us see what is lacking, and to assess our chances for enlightenment.

Pining at a Wall of Numbers

Told that the Maine data were available for private study, I asked the USFS people in Randolph, PA for some numbers. These arrive on CDC 1600, with a descriptive manual. This is called the Eastwide Data Base, a reduced set of the Maine data. The structure of this database (and of later databases) is shown in Figure 1. The idea is to sample some 3000 plots to assess the forest conditions. Some of these points at which measurements are taken are new for this survey, some are points only surveyed and now re-measured. The re-measured plots are modified by increasing the area surveyed, a bit of a complication.

Other than the state, county, and unit designations, 33 data fields are recorded for each plot—owner, forest type, land use, site and stand descriptors, longitude, and approximate latitude. Factors to expand the plot data to the appropriate number of acres statewide are given. It will be seen that these essential factors are artifacts of the photointerpreter's skill.

The next (and far larger) record is of each tree on the 1/5 acre plot, saplings on five 1/200-acre plots, and seedlings at least 1 foot tall on five 1/1000-acre plots. There can be as many as a hundred records on one plot, probably only one. The summary 1959-1995 tree descriptions in 24 megabytes, the real basis of the forest inventory. More than 20 factors are measured for each tree with a diameter (dbh) over 4.9 inches.

When this one big file is assimilated into the computer, one sees a wall of numbers. Is there any flaw? One place to pry a bit was with the volume and growth numbers. Subtracting the growth since the last survey from the current volume should equal the previous volume of the particular tree. Often it did, but not always — some of the trees had grown from a negative volume to their present sizes. Eh? This is even faster growth than David Smith at Yale promises. When I mentioned this to Thomas Frieswyk, Radnor, PA, in charge of the study, he explained that there was some "fudging" involved, and he would send me the data set of the real Maine numbers. The reason given for the data massage is the necessity of making Maine data congruent with those from other states using differing procedures.

Sampling & Methods

Let me admit to only a primitive acquaintance with statistics and sampling. The question of bias in the sample, or in the method, both are a first, common-sense defense against fraud. I raised this point after the previous survey when, miraculously, the totals for spruce and fir, the principal softwoods, showed no change from 1971 to 1982. I knew that some paper company foresters had avoided cutting on their permanent growth plots, which were part of the USFS inventory process. This pads the inventory, but led Ken Stratton, then state forest commissioner and me both to tell Joe Barnard who ran the USFS resurvey that the space-fit volume he showed wasn't there; Barnard told Stratton, "Our numbers say it is.

Since 1959 we find that the Forest Service has repeatedly reconstituted the sampling base — the forest plots. Table 1 shows the changes; some older plots dropped, many hundreds of new plots created, switching in 1971 to a sampling method discarded by 1982, plot dimensions (simultaneously) of 1/5, 1/10, 1/6, and 1/12 acres. Only in 1995 did the latter adjusted to a uniform 1/5-acre plot. The effective date of these revisions is the next time they are remeasured, 1995.

How the repeated sloughing of thousands of established survey points affects or limits the information which can be derived from a survey is a concern not addressed in the several publications. How would new plots compare with those they replace? When the survey is called sampling-with-replacement, such as in drawing from a box of red and white balls, it is reassuring that this is a random process. But, we are told repeatedly that plots are located, stratification, a non-random process, is applied. Here, aerial photographs are classified (by people) by categories of cubic-foot volume per acre. This might be termed a subjective assessment; certainly it says plot assignment greatly pre-determines the survey's conclusions. Not all is the number of plots assigned affected, but also the area expansion factor for the plot data. (The photo-interpreter data are one of the fields not given in the samples.) Few few plots contain as much as 3500 cu.ft. of volume/acre (40 cords) might tell more than we are meant to know.

Talking to Washington

Each of the studies (1972,1982,1995) warns us not to compare it with its predecessor. Indeed, Tom Frieswyk told me early in our conversations that this inventory was not a "Continuing (Forest) Inventory." Asked why not, he said that decision came from "on high", from USFS people who may be doing a PhD dissertation on design of the resurvey. The report says improving the efficiency of the inventory requires procedural changes. This seems to frustrate the supposed purpose of forest inventory and analysis (FI&A).

One of those "on high" is in Washington — William "Brad" Smith, acting chief of the FI&A division. Listening to him is to be exposed to a torrent of information; he has been there for some twenty years, and is obviously interested in the history of these studies. A good part of our conversation was that other agencies intrude in forest inventory — the census bureau, EPA, and, recently, a DOD technical group offering their latest star wars technology to the plots (and USFS) unnecessary. When asked how plots could be "lost," he said, Smith says that this is usually personal data or error, and is mostly in western states. There have been fewer in the Midwest.

Smith revealed one flaw in the above deployment of 1/5 acre fixed-radius plots in 1973. Briefly, this scheme uses an optical seive to determine which trees at a point are to count in the survey, and how much they represent. (The authority I trust says, "Thus, when one 6-in.dbh tree is tallied, it is tacitly assumed that there are 51.02 such stems per acre (for a 10-factor prism.)" Tacit

Table 1. Anatomy of a Shell Game

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY YEAR</th>
<th>NO. OF PLOTS</th>
<th>PLOT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>1/5 acre - fixed radius new ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1/5 acre - fixed radius remeasured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>10 point - variable radius new ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>1/5 acre - fixed radius remeasured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>382</td>
<td>10 point - variable radius remeasured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>1/6 acre - fixed radius new ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,697</td>
<td>1/6 acre - fixed radius remeasured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1/5 acre - fixed radius remeasured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1/5 acre - fixed radius remeasured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>804</td>
<td>1/5 acre - fixed radius new ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>1/1000 acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF ALL MAINE INVENTORIES

Table 1. Anatomy of a Shell Game
assumptions or not, Smith admits that the coarse prism used, having a factor of 1.73, often tallied two trees or fewer per point. This was labor-saving, but blunted the point of the exercise. Smith also agrees that prism sampling doesn’t count stumps. Here, I think, is a compounding of the uncertainty inherent in sampling a population; further sampling of the sample-samples, with a bias for larger trees.

Asked of the landowners who had assisted in designing a survey, Smith referred to a “non-stop, blue ribbon advisory band,” comprising forest industry and environmental groups. A closer look shows that of twenty members, two, including the chairman, are with Weyerhaeuser, two from IP, one Potlatch, three from industry fronts, excluding Society of American Foresters, one university, all the rest but one from government. Strengths of this company is one Al Lucier of the National Council of the Paper Industry for Air and Stream Improvement, possibly the ultimate anymore. I expect that Mr. Lucier was more a match for Jeff Olson of the Wilderness Society than his smartest people at NCPIASI, certainly not in their forestry departments. These are the cooks — who did the books?

Concluding Remarks

At the recent Sustainability conference in Orono, Dale Solomon, a respected Forest Service analyst told me he was part of the group doing the reconstruction of growth, cut, and mortality that is promised, and that the mechanism is a computer model, FIBER. So, we are given another (version 3.0?) computer simulation, but not what we were paid for in money and lost time-value of information. (Had Maine voters seen an honest audit before the referendum, the Green Initiative might have prevailed.) It may be so that we don’t have to do these messy inventories in the field — we can model it all. I am reminded of a USFS geneticist spouting at Orono, bringing back in time that by 2000, all the wood would be cut by blown through balloon-supported company is one Al Lucier of the National Forest Service analyst told me that none of the information derived from USFS than they can deliver, given the parameters or not, Smith admits that UMaine have prevailed.) It may be so that we are given another (verification, commonly used as a surrogate for tree volume — the equation used by USFS employ tree diameter as one of the variables, height being the third. Basal area, as square feet of live trees per acre represented by the plot is reported in the Eastwide record, type 20. We are warned that basal area growth cannot be used as a surrogate for volume growth in a relevant article on thinning vs. growth in the July 1997 Journal of Forestry, p.21. “Stump,” an out-of-fashion word for tree history, better depicts what the semantics mean the style — harvest or removal — terms suggestive of short-term, intensive big- machine agriculture. The mortality category is complicated by the instruction to put them through the 441 tree generally measured that cannot be accounted for. Here the danger is that cutting may be reported as mortality.

Table 3 sums cut and mortality relative to plot geometry for each of the five counties. For both mortality and cut, the disparities in basal area from the inner plot area vs. that from the equivalent outer plot fraction is not random; it is an artifact of the hit-or-miss sampling employed. Possibly the designers will say, “Of course, all this is adjusted in the various factors applied to the individual tree components.” If this is the argument, it mutes the point; the data understate the volume of removal, growth, and mortality on the outer fractions of the plots tabulated, and are completely blind to those on the 1/3 acre plot vs. the perimeter of the 1/6-acre plot. This should be considered structural bias.

Who Will Certify the Certifiers?

This summer a working group has begun a year-long process to draft regional forest management standards for the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), the international organization that evaluates and accredits forest certifiers. The working group will collaboratively prepare a draft set of standards for comment by New York and New England’s natural resource community, for eventual submission to FSC. A collaborative, inclusive and open process is seen as the best way to give certification meaningful and value.

The FSC working group invites your interest, consideration and dialogue. For more information, visit http://www.fscus.org, or contact Dennis Robertson crfam@pgoth.net or 802-655-0728.

From a FSC press release
A Conversation With Russell Barnes - An Independent Logging Contractor

Russell Barnes is a "woods philosopher" and independent logging contractor working in the Upper Valley of New Hampshire and Vermont. With over twenty five years of experience, Russell has established a well deserved reputation as an exceptional logger with real concern for ecological and silvicultural issues. Russell sits on the LEAP steering committee and is a member of the Vermont Sustainable Forestry Initiative consortium. He is the former director of the Northeast Loggers Association.

He is currently working to lower the accident rate among loggers and bring down workers compensation costs through the formation of a regional logger safety group. The project is being organized through the Northern Vermont Resource Conservation and Development Office in Barre, VT.

Jim Hourdequin (JH): Why did you become a logger?

Russell Barnes (RB): Something I always wanted to do. From when I was four years old, I wanted to cut wood.

JH: How did you become a logger?

RB: I started out 27 or 28 years ago doing residential tree work outside of Boston. Then I went off to college and studied geology for three and a half years. On a field trip out west in the last semester of my sophomore year, I was working in a big desert and I was miserable. Then we took a little trip up to the Yellowstone where it was green, and hot, and I had a revelation. I had a revelation that said, "go do forestry".

JH: What do you like about logging?

RB: I like working with the trees. I like growing trees. I don't really get a big thrill out of a field of stumps. I get a big elation that said, "go do forestry".

JH: How would you describe the type of equipment do you use?

RB: Well, we'd like to think we could cut a million feet a year. But, every year seems to be different. It's hard to say what you really do—sometimes breaks or sometimes we do more TSI [Timber Stand Improvement] work.

JH: How much wood do you cut?

RB: Well, we'd like to think we could cut a million feet a year. But, every year seems to be different. It's hard to say what you really do—sometimes breaks or sometimes we do more TSI [Timber Stand Improvement] work.

JH: How much wood do you cut?

RB: Well, we'd like to think we could cut a million feet a year. But, every year seems to be different. It's hard to say what you really do—sometimes breaks or sometimes we do more TSI [Timber Stand Improvement] work.

JH: How much wood do you cut?

RB: Well, we'd like to think we could cut a million feet a year. But, every year seems to be different. It's hard to say what you really do—sometimes breaks or sometimes we do more TSI [Timber Stand Improvement] work.

JH: How much wood do you cut?

RB: Well, we'd like to think we could cut a million feet a year. But, every year seems to be different. It's hard to say what you really do—sometimes breaks or sometimes we do more TSI [Timber Stand Improvement] work.

JH: How much wood do you cut?

RB: Well, we'd like to think we could cut a million feet a year. But, every year seems to be different. It's hard to say what you really do—sometimes breaks or sometimes we do more TSI [Timber Stand Improvement] work.
need to respect and work together. But, loggers need to clean up their act and be trustworthy. They need to earn the respect of the public. And the only way they can get that respect is if they act like professionals. And that means training, getting better, and learning as much as they can. I think that the logging trade needs to figure out what professionalism is. And they need to set some standards that they're going to live up to.

JH: What problems have you found in working from management plans?

RB: I'd say that sometimes they are awfully vague. Sometimes I think that if you took four foresters out and gave them the same management plan, you would have four different opinions as to what the thing says. Only the guy who wrote it knows what it means, and that's not a plan.

JH: What are your thoughts on long-term stewardship contracts?

RB: I think it's a great concept. It's going to require that the loggers who engage in them are professionals. They need to know as much as they possibly can about every aspect of silviculture and forestry.

JH: Now I wanted to talk a little bit about the condition of the forests. What are the major silvicultural problems that you see?

RB: I would say that the biggest problems is the lack of early intervention, the lack of Timber Stand Improvement work. It seems that we always get to wood ten years too late. There's a lack of silvicultural activity and not enough investment.

JH: How would you describe the appearance of forests that have not been sufficiently managed?

RB: The better quality stands have slow diameter growth, much slower than it needs to be. Trees are crammed in with no room to grow.

JH: You see a lot of that?

RB: Yes, most of this work we do is in forests that are much too tight. We're the first people to get there and we're always 20-30 years too late.

JH: So, there needs to be a lot more consistent management all along.

RB: Yes, there needs to be more investment. This whole thing won't run with every operation standing alone financially. In other words, it won't work if every time you go into the woods, you have to cut enough wood to pay for everything. Maybe on your whole forest you could cut in one area to finance work in another area. But, you can't go into an area that needs improvement, cut the right kind of wood, and always make money at it. You can't cut garbage. You can't exist on pulp or firewood. Just because someone will buy it doesn't mean you can make any money cutting it.

JH: Why do you think landowners are so unwilling to invest in pre-commercial thinning and improvement work?

RB: They're unwilling to invest. People don't have the faith that trees can make them money. They think that trees grow for free. And they do. But if you can't tell the difference between a good tree of high economic value, and a tree of low economic value, then you can't see the need to do anything.

JH: What are the ecological issues that concern you the most?

RB: The major ecological issue that I see is nutrient depletion from over-harvesting. Whole tree harvesting is a problem. Every time we remove wood from the forest, part of the nutrient capital is depleted. Nutrient inputs from rock weathering and deposition are balanced by leaching; so there's no gain in nutrient inputs. Therefore, we can't take out removing nutrient capital.

I also think high-grading is a problem. High grading slowly degrades our forests. It is one of those things that no one says they're going to do, but they end up doing it anyway. They cut the good wood.

JH: If nutrients are being depleted in the absence of logging, then no form of logging can be truly sustainable without nutrients additions to the forest.

RB: Theoretically there's no such thing as "sustainable logging" without nutrient inputs. Its not a question of whether we are going to deplete nutrient capital, but a question of when.

JH: That's a pretty despairing reality. How do you reconcile it with the work you do everyday?

RB: Well, I'm for stretching it out long as possible by removing of little wood as possible. We need to remove only the highest quality usable product and leave everything else to be recycled into higher quality wood.

JH: That sounds like high grading.

RB: No, it's different. I'm for taking the very best wood, but not leaving the very worst to continue to grow. That's high grading. The low quality trees should be cut, but they should not be removed from the forest. We should leave as much slash, cull trees, and boles behind as possible to decompose and be recycled into high quality products. We know their costs, they're not in a very good position to negotiate with the people who sell them the wood.

JH: Why haven't loggers done more to figure out costs?

RB: We have very small businesses and we can't do everything. And the one thing that gets left behind is the record keeping. Keeping track of your business is a full-time job. But we also have to find the wood, cut the wood, truck the wood, and market the wood. And even if we could keep the records, we're probably not skilled enough to know what to do with those numbers if we had them.

JH: So, how is that playing out in terms of the wood that's getting cut and sold?

RB: There's too much low quality wood out there. And we keep creating more of it. There's too much low quality wood to the nickel exceed the revenue generated, so it doesn't make economic sense. In a lot of operations, the good sawlogs are subsidizing the removal of non-profitable material. Just because someone will buy the pulpwood doesn't mean that you can make money selling it.

JH: Why do loggers continue to sell so much poor quality wood for such low prices?

RB: Many of us are not good business people. We don't have a good handle on the cost to produce a particular product. If loggers don't know their costs they're going to produce things that don't make them any money. And if they don't know their costs, they're not in a very good position to negotiate with the people who sell them the wood.

JH: Why are contractors choosing to mechanize?

RB: I think they feel that they can make more money and that the work will be easier. Cutting wood by hand is not the easiest thing to do.

JH: Does the high cost of worker's compensation insurance make mechanization more attractive?

RB: Yes, the high cost of worker's compensation also pushes people towards mechanization. We pay a very high rate, about 37% of gross wages. That's a big hit.

JH: Why are workers compensation rates so high?

RB: Because we have a terrible loss record. And until we improve our loss records, our worker's compensation costs will be high. Unfortunately, the high cost of worker's compensation means that our money goes out for premiums and is not invested in training to improve the loss record. We're caught in a vicious cycle of getting into more training and not getting more training until we have more money to spend on it.

JH: You're trying to organize loggers to lower workers compensation rates by forming a safety group.

RB: I'm trying to organize loggers to create a safety group and ultimately a self-insurance group where the premi-ums will come down based on an improved safety record. The idea is to get losses under control. A safety or self-insurance group would have mandatory training for members and on-site safety inspections.

JH: Do you think there's an interest in this among loggers?

RB: Well, I think the interest is there. In New York State, there's a self-insurance group that has lowered their work-er's comp rate to 13% to 14% of payroll. So, I think a 20% savings would be of interest. But, it doesn't come easy. It requires some work. And, the only way it can happen is through some sort of organization. Loggers need to work together as professionals to get this...
Example of residual stand damage from rutting. Not a Russell Barnes job.

NWF Opposes OSHA Snag Rule

Montpelier, VT June 9 - The National Wildlife Federation (NWF), the Wildlife Management Institute, the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, and the Forest Trust are petitioning OSHA (U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration) to change a rule involving standing dead trees—snags. The rule requires that for all logging jobs nationwide, every "danger tree" must be felled, removed or avoided.

"On the face of it, this seems like common sense," said Mark Lorenzo, researcher at NWF's Northeast office. However, the OSHA danger-tree rule mandates no-work zones around snags, irrespective of the actual danger involved.

"This inflexible rule stands in the way of constructive forest practices that benefit people, the economy, and wildlife at the same time," said Lorenzo. The ecosystem role of standing snags is well known to forest observers. Snag and cavity dependent species in northern New England include the black-backed woodpecker, hermit thrush and pine martin.

JH: What laws are being broken?

RB: We have a lot of contractors who are working with so-called 'subcontractors' who have no workers compensation. And the health and safety rules are not enforced. There's no one out there to really enforce them. There's only five or six OSHA inspectors for every business in the whole state of Vermont. The only time a logging contractor has to worry about an OSHA inspector showing up is if there's been a fatality or a very serious accident. Or a complaint. But they're never going to show up on their own.

JH: What was your response to the recent Vermont cutting bill?

RB: We don't have any standards yet for judging a good job from a bad job. We may not need regulation, but we do need some standards. There's no accountability. A consulting forester is only accountable to his landowner, to his client. And the client depends on the consulting forester to determine the quality of the work. There's a conflict of interest there. There's no outside accountability to a logging job. No one comes and checks afterwards.

JH: There's no state agencies that check?

RB: There's no checking and there's no standards. Whether it's consulting forestry or logging. There's nothing to say you did a good job or a bad job. The only thing people notice is an outrageous job. But no one ever notices a good job of high-grading.

JH: So do you think there might be a role for some sort of state involvement?

RB: No, I think that's what professional organizations need to do. They need to be accountable. They need to say what they're going to do and then do it. It's not necessarily a role for government, though government has some role, and that is to enforce already existing regulations. They don't enforce the regulations that exist. And, mainly I'm thinking about employment laws.

JH: What was your response to the NWF Snag Rule?

RB: I don't have a problem with it one way or the other. It's probably not going to solve the problem that people want it to solve. But I also think that it's not going to negatively impact too many loggers. The smart loggers aren't worried about it; they're just figuring out a way to live with it and make money. Adapt. It's a big emotional issue, but I think the smart ones aren't wasting their time on it.

JH: It doesn't affect you.

RB: It has no affect on me, whatsoever. I have never been involved in that type of a cut.

JH: I want to talk lastly about your vision for forestry. Mitch Linsky, a NARP activist in Maine, has been promoting what he calls 'low impact' forestry. He challenges the idea that jobs depend on highly mechanized industrial forestry. And he argues that mechanization, and industrial forestry have a serious impact on the forest and have resulted in the loss of many jobs. First of all, what is your view of technology in forestry?

RB: The trend will be towards more machines. We need to be more productive as people—which it's through machines, more knowledge, or better use of computers in managing our businesses.

JH: Is there a point, though, when greater efficiencies end up taking something away? You were talking before about losing contact with the forest. Is there a point where we should back off?

RB: Well, in Sweden the harvesting crews also have the forester's role of laying out the sale. They take the measurements, do the inventory, and are responsible for costs. So, they're not just a bunch of machine operators. They operate a machine, but they also do ground work. The follow up with measurements on spacing and stand damage. So, there's less specialization. And that's what will happen here with a more professional work force. They will blend the role of the field forester and the logger into one. That's what's going to happen.

JH: Right. You envision more mechanization but less specialization on the individual level?

JH: What about the over-harvesting, high-grading problem?

RB: Yes, less specialization for individuals. Running a machine every day, day after day, is boring and also physically dangerous. These machines are stressful and create some really serious problems—back problems and muscle problems. So we need to get the people out of the machines for a certain portion of the day. If the person is only qualified to run the machine, then he's going to be stuck in that machine. In the future, the logger is going to have more input in forest management.

JH: That sounds like a new vision for logging and forestry.

RB: That's where it's headed. I think we're going to get to that point where loggers and foresters will be making decisions together. The logger will make the more detailed decisions, and the forester will make the more general decisions.

Agronomist Win Way's View of Forest Practices

Clear-cutting, hardwood spraying and whole tree harvest of forests do irreparable damage to Vermont's most precious asset. The leaching of potassium as well as other plant nutrients cannot be compensated for. Bare soil areas suffer great losses.

Potassium is especially vulnerable to leaching and its loss is damaging to future growth. Being found mostly in tree leaves, bark, buds and twig, it is a nutrient best conserved by continuous cover of trees, especially hardwoods.

Vermont soils were first vandalized when virgin forests, many already marginal in potassium, were sacrificed to clear land. Millions of pounds of potash were exported to Europe for the soap and glass industries. Much of the remaining potassium was subsequently lost to leaching, runoff and crop removal. . .

Potassium deficiencies are common in abandoned farmland, much of which is now what we call forest. Remember that 80% of Vermont forests were denuded by the mid-1800s, primarily for sheep. I have observed deficiencies on mountain soils, in Christmas tree plantations, on many farm crops, on home lawns and in gardens.

Potassium is a nutrient used in large quantities by most plants. It is essential to sugar production, winter hardiness and disease resistance. I believe it is related to the success of Vermont's maple industry. Mountain beauty and so-called acid rain damage to mountain forests. It is of paramount importance for the return of productive hardwood and conifer forests to our landscape.

Vermont soils have given up their potassium several times already. Whole tree harvest and clear-cutting can only aggravate a problem that will become progressively worse . . . .

Win Way
North Hero, VT

From a letter to the editor of the Burlington Free Press, 2-2-87
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Vermont's Forest Resource Advisory Council held the last meeting of its current mandate in June. The report of its work group on rural economic development was the feature topic of discussion. Sprouting of horticulture and clearcutting had hitherto dominated FRAC's agenda, but the report on economic development reflects a wide-ranging and detailed information gathering process.

Work group members agreed on recommendations addressing log exports from Vermont's public lands and promoting sustainable harvest practices. The work group was chaired by Eric Palola of National Wildlife Federation and Nancy Brock, a financial consultant; members included sawmill operators Fred Burnett, Walter Malnquist and Gary Carrier. Members hope that the report will do more than gather dust, and assist groups focusing on rural development assess priorities.

The report found that the forest products sector in Vermont is second largest source of manufacturing jobs, and has experienced considerable growth during a period in which log exports have grown significantly as well. Timely timber inventory and well-trained high school graduates were ranked as top priorities, as was a regulatory approach emphasizing assisting rather than punishing mills and work groups toward compliance with pollution and safety standards.

Workmen's compensation rates were predictably found to be burdensome. While recent re-entry into Vermont by a private insurance carrier and the linkage of logger training to reduced rates are encouraging, the Rural Development work group concluded that, in the absence of improved rates, Vermont follow Maine's lead in creating a state-sponsored insurance pool with a tiered-deduct system, and assisting groups focusing on rural development assess priorities.

In the area of low impact forestry, the Rural Development group recommended:

- Vermont Department of Forests and Parks technology transfer program promoting the benefits of low impact systems.
- Research into timber value losses from residual stand damage; capital and operating costs of low impact systems, impacts of differing harvesting systems.
- The blending of vocational with forest education.
- Using state forests as the locus of research and demonstration of low impact harvesting systems.

The work group also looked at current use taxation, non-timber forest products and wood energy. Among its recommendations:

- Non-timber products should become an active part of University and Extension research and information dissemination.
- While "strongly" urging that wood energy be part of any renewables portfolio required by the Legislature under restructuring, the report also noted that Vermont lacks adequate timber inventory to determine whether expanded capacity is sustainable. The conventional wisdom is that another 200 MW from wood is possible.
- Substantial opportunities exist for small scale wood gasification heating systems and 6-10 MW power plants.

Highlights from the Forest Resource Advisory Council's Rural Economic Development Work Group's Letter of Inquiry to Senators Leahy and Jeffords Requesting that the Congressional Research Service Answer

The work group's discussion of the domestic processing clause sparked some debate between Gary Carrier of Cerossimo Lumber and Conrad Motyka, Commissioner of Forests and Parks. Carrier commented in support of the state's ability to enforce such stipulations. "[This recommendation] is a significant shift of focus—we can't take it lightly," concluded Motyka.

Andrew Whittaker was a member of the Rural Development work group.
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