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EUSTIS TILLEY & HIS FRIENDS

The reaction of established commentators to the WTO/IMF/World Bank protests in Seattle and Washington have been fairly consistent: Come to the table and behave civilized and all will be well. This is not the 1960s, when they met and made history; this is the 21st century, we need MORE global trade, not LESS," hector the sheep-herds for the New World Order.

The dismissive tenor of such criticism can also be found in the pages of The New Yorker these days. A November 22, 1999 profile of Kieran Suckling and the Center for Biological Diversity by Nicholas Lemann arrives at a most peculiar conclusion after a sanitarium examination of this outfit of crusaders against mega-development projects in the American Southwest (Governor Angus King is rumored to have read the article and added it to his battery of criticisms of radical environmentalists.) The article concludes that the Center's obdurate defense of Nature has moved policy in its direction: "This isn't quite the same thing as ushering in an era of biodiversity, though. Another metaphor, more appropriate to the history of the region, captures better what Kieran Suckling and his mates have done. They're outlaws. Outlaws cause trouble, alter the established order, and make authority figures angry. And, in the end, they get dealt with." Hammon . . .

Resistance to the increasing sheepishness of the consumer

Ecologically speaking, the pot is on the boil. Globalism might be characterized as a system that turns humans into consumers and separates the act of consumption from knowledge of the impact of consumption. We eat fish; we have no knowledge of the ocean. We use paper, we don't know the forest. We burn gas, we feel a vague sympathy for the environment. What has all that to do with us in our pursuit of happiness? The system works so incredibly well we are on the verge of consuming significant pieces of the Earth, once and for all. Absent in this and you are sane, resist, and you are -- an outlaw!

At a recent (well, April) EnviroFair in Brewer, Maine, a woman born and raised in Maine engaged me in conversation about what she, having returned to her home state after a career elsewhere, sees as the complete crowning and demoralization of the people she grew up with. Maine, she said, is run by and for outsiders. Another woman, from Minnesota originally, concurred: Maine is like Alabama, she said. Both were noting the triumph of economics, the economics of serfdom and individualism in the extreme. Eat your food, spend your wages, pay no attention to the man behind the curtain.

It is conveniently assumed, often, that the working class and environmentalists are at odds; or, that environmentalism arises out of affluence and urban disconnection with Nature. This may be, insofar as environmentalism is equated with recreational initiatives, or divorced from questions of social justice and economic scale. A radical environmentalism, on the other hand, one that addresses root problems and poses the goal of placing Nature beyond the control of humanity, has much common ground with the disenfranchised. Nature is disenfranchised, too.

By no means does this issue of The Forum bring you all the news, regional and global, that inspires this line of thought. In particular, we failed this issue to bring you the exemplary story of Nova Scotian longiners, the fishermen caught between an over-capitalized, resource-exhausting segment of industry and a government that refuses to treat the issue of sustainability of the ocean ecosystem seriously -- indeed, a government that fails to view the ocean as anything other than a resource, and a resource less and less available to the sustainable, small scale fisherman.

True, many gaps and gulfs remain between those who articulate for preservation, and those who would like to make a living from natural resources. But there is a greater and inescapable gap in values between both of these and the mega-capitalized who are busy using the instruments of globalization to hammer down the sovereignty of Nations and localities over matters environmental and social. Those who know the issues of world trade know the threat is real. Ralph Nader challenged members of Congress to actually read the Marrakesh Agreement which established the WTO. Hank Brown, the Colorado Republican senator who was the only one to take up the challenge reversed his earlier support and voted against its ratification. Paul Hawken, who supplied this anecdote in a story run by Whole Earth (Spring 2000) and Orion Afloat (Spring 2000) concludes his observations on the Seattle protests with this:

"Commerce requires the governance of politics, art, culture, and nature to slow it down, make it helpful, to make it pay attention to people and place. It has never done this on its own. The extermination of languages, cultures, forests, and fisheries is occurring worldwide in the name of speeding up business. Business itself is stressed by rapid change. The rate of change is unwavering to all, even to those who are benefiting. To those who are not benefiting, it is devastating." So, who is benefiting? And, what is being devastated? Read on! Hope you enjoy this issue of the paper!

The Global Context

ASSAULT ON FORESTS & RELATED STORIES

BOISE CASCADE PROCEEDS WITH PLANS TO LOG MEXICAN OLD GROWTH

Activists waged protests both inside and outside the April 20th Boise Cascade shareholders meeting in Boise, Idaho. Over 350 dissenters chanting in support of jailed Mexican eco-activist Rodolfo Montiel. Montiel has been actively campaigning against Boise’s old-growth logging in Guerrero, Mexico.

His activities earned him arrest by the Mexican military, electric-shock torture and the Golán Environmental Prize. While the prize may be small consolation, it is drawing international attention to Montiel’s case and on-going detention, as well as forest destruction, both in Mexico and Chile.

Boise protesters also attended the shareholders meeting and managed to pass a corporate resolution denouncing the action that Boise CEO George Harad has said will have no bearing on Boise activities. The resolution was pointed at Boise activities in Guerrero as well as Chile. Pat Ratner Montiel, who has been in Boise’s plans proceed. The Central Bank of Chile predicts destruction of Chile’s national forests in 10 years if logging is not curbed. Harad also claimed to have not heard of Montiel.

For more information contact Pat Ratner at the American Lands Alliance 509-548-7640 (WA state); email patr@ucwmct.com

RAINFOREST DESTRUCTION REPORT SUPpressed

A report detailing rainforest destruction and the complicity of Western nations and financial institutions has been suppressed for three years, the British newspaper the Guardian reports in a May 29 article by Paul Brown. The European Commission and World Wildlife Fund authorized the report, and then forced several revisions fearing opposition in the wake of logging in 11 countries in the Pacific, Africa, and Caribbean threatens. The authors found massive violations involved, citing rampant corruption and inefficient enforcement of standards, as well as further ecological harm and violence against indigents in the wake of logging operations.

IRVING BOYCOTT

Regional activists are calling for a boycott of Irving gas stations (see note below) pending the New Brunswick government’s agreement to fail the labor and environmental practices.

The company now owns both sides of the international border, having picked up Great Northern access into Canadian lands. The company is also part of the wider industrial forest pattern in Maine that sees wood shipped to Canada via the famous town of Cribbs. Undercut by Canadian bond labor, boycott organizers point out that American unionized American loggers sustainably being quickly cleared by fellers - bunchers brought in from Canada — all on land enjoying Tree Growth tax subsidies. Domestic processing of exported logs has also been undermined by corporate loggers of the supply. Opponents also are pressuring gate fees at border crossings in the Alaskan region that apply to local townpeople. Irving operations in Maine are now green certified.

NOTE: Boycott organizers are targeting only Irving Maimiey gas stations, not Mom & Pop/ convenience stores which also peddle Irving products. The boycott is being organized by Native Forest Network: boycotting Irving.com

WELCOME TO MY PARLOUR SAY US SENATORS TO GUESTWORKERS

Beverly Brown, writing in the newsletter PRACTITIONERS, house organ of the National Network of Forest Practitioners, draws attention to two Senate bills that would “diminish the already paltry worker protections” for guestworkers, who are largely brought into the United States by “agricultural and forestry employers facing local labor shortages.” (fnmp). Senator Gordon Smith and Bob Graham propose changes to the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. Senate bills 1814 & 1815.

Guestworkers are employed by timber companies to plant trees after clearingcut (in areas usually subjected to herbicide). Brown’s article concludes, “Community forestry activists should be directly challenging guestworker program[s] and proposed amendments before they find the perverse effects of guestworker programs spreading.”

A query to Maines Department of Labor drew this information concerning Maine employment of temporary foreign workers: “So far this year Maine has received request for 941 forestry workers to do tree planting and brush saw work. This is for 11 companies who contract with the landowners. In addition Maine has received request for 243 workers in a variety [sic] agricultural work and this number will increase with the upcoming apple harvests.” The California Forestal Legal Assistance Foundation monitors these issues. Their website: www.cflaf.org/workers.htm

MOTHER JONES Profiles SOUTHEAST PLANTATION FORESTRY

Ted Williams meanwhile has written a piece in the current (May/June 2000) MOTHER JONES profiling the aggressive institutional of tree plantations across the rural Southeast. Chauncey Baetz sits in the article, as it is the subject of at least one study by an attorney disturbed by a "tenure" management event. Pine plantations may cover 70% of the South by 2020, according to the U.S. Forest Service. Private landowners are encouraged to clearcut, spray, and plant: too, 156 chips mill dots the booth, busy grinding trees into chips for export in barges on public waterways such as the Tennessee-Tombigbee, a $2 billion dollar project.

Other tax subsidies encourage intensive company practices, as does a tax-to-non-existent regulatory structure. Arrayed in opposition is the cast of characters familiar to forest activists everywhere: ecologists witnessing rampant ecosystem destruction, traditional loggers and foresters concerned about loss of productive forests, sawmill owners, and everyday citizens who are not bamboozled by elected leaders who vilify “extreme environmentalists.”

LOGGING TIMES runs an article that such policies go against the grain of the environmental movement. William’s article does not refer to foe temporary workers, but Beverly Brown (see above states, “In the South, a large portion of reforestation-related workers are 112 [guestworkers] forest workers from Mexico.” Given the prevalence of rural poverty in Mississippi and across the Mississippi Delta County — it is too bad that quality work and quality wages are not a social priority.

CLERGY OF MEXICO’s SIERRA TARAHUMARA DENOUNCE FOREST DESTRUCTION

Citing the demands of their Christian faith and concern for the people of northern Mexico, leaders of several churches have facilitated a resolution on March 29 denouncing forest destruction in the Sierra of Chihuahua.

Bishop of the Tarahumara, José Luis Dílloches Martinez and other signers of this declaration stated that the pace of forest destruction has accelerated with the implementation of NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, while local employment and other measures of community well-being have not risen. The letter states in part: “The lack of local employment is a serious problem. But it is one of the main sources of jobs in the Sierra, the forest must be treated and worked in a sensible manner in order to preserve it for future generations. We are obliged to express our reflections publicly because the scarce and racist that have been part of forest exploitation are destroying God’s creation and undermining its spiritual dignity.”

The letter also states that “that the life that the forest used to nourish has virtually been annihilated, not only by increased ecological changes related to forest destruction that are also disrupting traditional cultures of the Sierra.” The only economic opportunities in the region seem to be related to the drug trade and they have extended to timber companies, which are ineffectively regulated.

The letter appealed to “all Christians to take responsibility for preserving our environment on our planet that God entrusted to our care.”

More News Next Page
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PUT YOUR JOHN HANCOCK ON KOALA HABITAT

The Native Forest Network argues that the legislation of Australia’s Strzelecki mountain range (Victoria). Logging is apparently being allowed without any legitimate ecological audits and as part of the State Government’s proposed conversion of the native forest to plantation, a practice denied by the company but alleged by activists. The area is now regarded by the United States as an endangered species throughout its range under the Endangered Species Act. The Strzelecki region is the only area in Victoria to which the eucalyptus-growing eucalyptus is endemic.

PAUL REVERE RIDES AGAIN!

VTAC is an anti-nuclear group targeting Vermont Yankee in Vermont for the People. Republican, a booth-sized and labor-saving practice. VTAC activists warn that Vermont Yankee is out of money and then they redistribute the decommissioning fund and a probable strategy of leaving the public with the bill is to get the legislature to devote funds to safeguarding nuclear waste being stored on site. VTAC activists have networked a pool, largely African-American, seasonal workers and community currently absorbing low-level waste from VT Yankee as well as with opponents to provide a productive environmental alternative to cleaning up sites in Sierra Blanca, Texas and Nevada. They point out that Northeast Conservation Coalition and related groups have been very supportive of blocking these disposal plans — with the notable exception of Vermont’s US Senator. Vermont’s US Senator and members included activists working to decommission sites near Syracuse, NY, on Long Island Sound and elsewhere. They put on a highly successful and all-embracing public road show. Contact them at: can@shaynet.com or 413-339-5781.

THE MAINE SUN

Do you want inexpensive alternatives at the St. Johnsbury meeting was enlivened by the presence of former H-320 utility tag that mentioned the disheartening task of confronting short-term greed for the benefit of society. There is a full discussion of the costs of various energy alternatives.

How about that big reactor in the sky so high? To keep up with sunny developments, subscribe to The Maine Sun, newsletter of the Maine Solar Energy Association, 111 SEAB, RR 1, Box 7751, Jonesport, ME 04649. They can put you in touch with the Northeast chapter of the Sustainable Energy Association as well. Editorial material can be sent to The Maine Sun editor, Maryhelen Sanders, at RR 2, Box 56, Ellsworth, Maine 04605 or mares@areca.jct.

US FOREST SERVICE FEES "Income from (from Scott Silver of Wild Wilderness)"

This morning [May 17], Rep. Ralph E. отношения with the US Forest Service and Appropriations Subcommittees voted to table a newly written PERMANENT Recreation Fee Authority. There was no debate.

This recommendation will now go to the full committee who will place it as a rider upon this year’s Appropriations Bill. Unless this rider is removed, PERMANENT Recreation Fees authority will be authorized when the budget is passed later in the year.

This has got to stop. Fee Demonstration Program was originally passed as a rider. It was extended (twice) as rider and is about to be made permanent as yet another rider. This program issue has a test in the Senate, only a Demonstration of Congress’ utter arrogance and contempt for the American Public. We have bought and paid for by special interests such as the American Recreation Council.

"If there is any doubt that the Fee Demonstration program is anything other than an attempt to profit Wild, and is part of the Corporate Takeover of Nature, I would suggest you please read the following quoted passage. It is brand new and comes directly from the president’s former Chief Operating Officer."

APPLYING PRINCIPLES OF SOUND PRIVATE SECTOR MARKETING TO PUBLIC LANDS

By: Francis Pendlon
United States Forest Service Washington, D.C. A product or brand could be defined as "this is what it is", "this is how the consumer interacts with it", "Camping", "Hiking", and other activities. Thinking of outdoor recreation as an outdoor recreation activity is very simple: it is about producing and providing a product or service that allows us to do various outdoor activities.

"Have we fully explored our gold mine of recreation opportunities in this country and made it even better through consumer product brands? How could it be done? As federal agencies and others are trying to shift outdoor recreation revenue at no cost to the consumer to charging for access and services, we can expect to see many changes in the way we operate. Selling a product, even to an eager customer, is very different from giving it away. In an increasing-demand environment, additional funding or investment will be required for both the public and private sectors if we are to improve the quality and amount of opportunities in the years ahead."

The level to slow-paced growth of public funding for outdoor recreation continues from year to year, management and extract opportunities in the product’s mind-set where opportunities are priced, as opposed to free, if supply is to keep electric bills from increasing. To make this transition from free to priced recreational opportunities and services, a number of considerations will be increasingly important."

A note: For more information, please note that the author of what you just read was the Chairman of the American Recreation Coalition’s Recreation Roundtable at the time he was brought into the USFS. The American Recreation Coalition and its Recreation Roundtable TAKE FULL CREDIT for creating the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program. See: http://www.wildwilderness.org/docs/a/ miscellaneous.htm for the complete text. Source: Scott Silver Wild Wilderness 248 N Wilton Ave., Bend, OR 97701 phone: 541-385-2361 e-mail: ssilver@wildwilderness.org Internet: http://www.wildwilderness.org

USER FEES ON THE WHITE MOUNTAIN NATIONAL FOREST

(To begin with, they were sent to several local New Hampshire papers by a member of New England Public Forest Advocates, a group opposing recreational user fees on the White Mountain National Forest, in conjunction with similar groups nationally. The group has worked with members of Congress to pass legislation to prevent a resolution condemning the fee program."

The Rural Editors,
If you are angered or annoyed by the recent campaign to impose user fees on national forests you are not alone. If you are not concerned than you should be. Help us to stop the United States Forest Service’s Fees Demo such site: "Of every $1 in the federal budget, only 18¢ is put toward the entire Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness Recreation Trust Fund for Forest Service." A companion USFS flyer entitled: "Your Fee at Work" explains the significance of the fee in terms of a person with an annual income of $40,000 pays less than $0.5 per year to recreate on Public Forest lands, nationwide.

It must be noted that these fees refer to the current situation (AFTER congress legislation) and not if we have a "significant exclusionary impact" on the low income is misguidid, insufficient and totally unnecessary. To learn more about it visit the following web page or call (603)726-3538.

Cheri Buckley
AQUACULTURE LAWSUIT

(Press Release of US PIRG)

A lawsuit filed by US PIRG and four of its members announced on April 26 that they intend to sue three major owners and operators of Atlantic salmon farms in Maine for illegally discharging pollutants — including fish waste, a chemical used to control sea lice, and escaped captive-bred fish — which the US Environmental Protection Act permits.

The suit claims that farm-raised fish into Maine’s few remaining salmon streams has been identified as one of the factors leading the State government to propose that the wild Atlantic salmon be listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act.

In a formal notice letter sent to Atlantic Salmon of Maine, Conness Aquaculture, and Stolt Sea Farm, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group (U.S. PIRG) and First Maine residents allege that each of these companies has violated the federal Clean Water Act every day that they have operated their salmon farms.

An individual salmon farm is considered to be a point source, which means that it's pollution, which it sways in circles in floating net pens. Clusters of pens are typically attached to protected ocean sites leased from the State of Maine. According to the U.S. Department of Maine inventory, Atlantic salmon operates seven farms in Machias and Pleasant Bay, two farms in Casco Bay, Conness (six) and Stolt (three) operate a total of nine salmon farms in Cobscook Bay, just this side of the Canadian border. These bays sit at the mouths of several rivers in which wild salmon spend their juvenile phase with extinction (the Dennys, Machias, East Machias, Narraguagus and
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“A crucial feature of the Clean Water Act is that it requires companies to obtain discharge permits, which limit water pollution and require companies to publicly disclose what they put in the water. Citizens can then monitor a company’s environmental compliance. Since the salmon farms are operating without discharge permits, the public does not have full information about the environmental consequences of their operations,” said David Nicholas, Senior Attorney with the National Environmental Law Center, which sent the notice letter on behalf of U.S. PIRG and local residents.

For instance, Nicholas explained, the public knows little about the salmon farms’ use of the chemical cypermethrin, an active ingredient in many pesticides used on land. According to Sea Grant, a program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the salmon farms use a product containing cypermethrin to control sea louse infestations in their net pens. The product is considered by the federal Food and Drug Administration, however, to be a “non-disclosable Investigational New Animal Drug,” and the FDA has not yet formally approved it for general marine use. It is FDA policy not to even limit the existence of a non-disclosable Investigational New Animal Drug.

Also, according to the Maine Department of Marine Resources, the salmon growers refuse to reveal to the public the number of dead and dying salmon in their pens. When captured in the wild, salmon is quickly recognizable by distinctive features, including deformed fins. The National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have determined that escaped farm fish pose a threat to the native population through competition, interbreeding, and the potential spread of disease and parasites. Any escapes from the farms, including Atlantic salmon living in eight Maine rivers — including the five listed above — on the endangered species list.

Salmon farms also discharge fish feces and excess food, which can be digested and cause the flesh of farmed salmon to have a“natural” pink color for consumers.

Under the Clean Water Act, citizens must provide formal notice of their intent to sue sixty days before filing suit. According to NELC attorney Joshua Kratska, the citizens will ask the United States District Court in Bangor to order the farms to stop discharging nutrients at their discharge limits.

FIGHTING GENETIC ENGINEERING LEGISLATION REQUIRING labelling of Genetically Engineered Foods went down in defeat in both Maine and Vermont this year, even as news of their pervasiveness in foodstuffs (snuff you stuff) grows. A list of websites distributing information and news of anti-GMO campaigns is available at www.pages.org/links.htm

Maine Right to Know is coordinating the campaign legislation in that state. Contact them at HC 38 Box 205 East Gouldsboro, Maine 04607 or telephone them at 207-963-2012 or 207-963-7016 email maineright toknow@cadia.net. Vermonters should contact the Vermont Public Health Agency at 802-464-9292 or visit www.biodiv.org.

CONGRESS FIDDLING WHILE ACID RAINS A REPORT FROM the Ecological Society of America on the proceedings of a 1999 conference details the national scope of damage from acid rain. In announcing the findings, the Adirondack Council has called for swift action from Congress while noting that the Electric Utility Cloud Misting Funds in January of this year. The ESA report had called for cutbacks in emissions, particularly of nitrogen oxides, as well as increased monitoring and research.

Damage from acid rain is now reported in the mountains of California and parts of Maine and New Hampshire, as well as the Adirondacks, Catskills, Hudson Highlands, Taconic and eastern Long Island. Last fall, Vermont and Quebec researchers were reporting small improvements in acid deposition, too small to improve the situation in many waterbodies where fish can no longer live.

New York’s retiring Senator Moynihan and recently elected Charles Schumer have co-sponsored a bill addressing nitrogen emissions but the legislation seems to be lost in the maw of Congress. EPA and several states have meanwhile sued coal-fired generating plants in the Mid West, source of much of the Northeast’s problem. Local sources, including automobile traffic, are also contributing factors. (See Related Story on page 26, in ADIRONDACK PARK REPORT)

WOLVES FOR THE CATSKILLS UNITED STATES Congressional Rep Mike Simpson, R-Idaho, has proposed legislation that could pave the way in a manner of speaking, for eastern wolf restoration. While the citizens familiar with Simpson’s voting record suggest a cautious approach to Trojans bearing gifts, and suggest this is his way of thanking Eastern Congressmen for environmental legislation that has impacted Idaho, Simpson’s aides insist it is sincere legislation. The bill targets the restoration of the wolf to New York’s Catskills.

GLOBAL ACTION NETWORKS FORMING CROSS SECTOR ORGANIZATION and joint mobilization on actions is the goal of the Maine Global Action Network. The mission: “To organize and mobilize opposition to top-down, anti-democratic, corporate, financial, and military power and cooperate to do together what we cannot do separately.” McGAN seeks participation from across New England from labor, environmental and peace activists. For more info, write, McGAN, 170 Park St, ME, 04401.
INTERNATIONAL PAPER TAKES OVER CHAMPION INTERNATIONAL, PAYS $7.3 BILLION

Fate of Champion Lands in Northern New Hampshire and Eastern Maine Uncertain

by Jamie Sayen

On MAY 12 International Paper bought out Champion International with a $7.3 billion stock and cash purchase of Champion stock. IP won the bidding war for Champion with the Finnish paper giant UPM-Kymmene which had announced in February that it was "merging" with Champion. UPI bid $6.5 billion in stock for Champion, but in the spring its stock value dropped, thereby reducing the value of its offer. On April 24, IP offered $64 a share. In the ensuing bidding war, IP's winning bid was $75 a share. At that point the Finnish stock began to drop out, but Wall Street analysts speculate that it will continue to pursue a mid-sized paper company, the United States. Mead Corporation is the most likely candidate at this time. IP, the world's largest paper company, owns a paper mill in Jay, Maine and about 500,000 acres in Maine, as well as the Phillips Brook watershed in northern New Hampshire and Vermont. Over the past couple of years it has sold off 400,000 acres in northern Maine in the Aroostook and St. John watersheds. IP especially covets Champion's pulp production in Brazil, where costs (wages and environmental regulations) are lower. Within 18 months, IP plans to sell off $3 billion in assets as part of the consolidation of the Champion assets and to keep off the purchase of Champion. There is speculation it will sell off timberlands in Texas and Washington. At this time, the plans for Champion's northern forest assets are unclear.

In 1998 Champion sold all its holdings in New Hampshire, Vermont and 18,600 acres in New Hampshire. It retained 171,000 acres in northernmost New Hampshire, mostly in Pittsburg in the headwaters of the Connecticut River. It also owns a pulp and paper mill in Buckport, Maine and over 700,000 acres in eastern Maine. The fate of the Pittsburg lands had been uncertain even before the bidding war began. At the time the proposed merger with UPM- Kymmene was announced, Champion's office in West Stewartsannounced plans to charge access to a limited access ATV trail, along a coastal mobile and motor vehicle access to its lands in the northern tip of the state. (See Forum, Spring 2000, page 4) The reason for these efforts to generate supplemental income, Champion foresters freely admitted, was because they could no longer manage these lands profitably for timber alone. The local Champion foresters realized that their NH lands were likely to be sold by corporate headquarters unless they could generate more income from them pronto.

At the same time, Champion began to explore the possibility of applying for Forest Legacy money in NH for its 171,000 acres in Pittsburg for approximately $15 million, or $90 an acre. The campaign for an easement was the second part of a last-ditch effort by the Champion people to bail out the floundering NH operations.

Champion's foresters in northern New Hampshire believed that UPM- Kymmene would approve of the access fees and easement application. However, with IP now in control, all bets are off. It will probably be some time before IP decides what it plans for the Pittsburg lands. Thus, IP has not been interested in selling eases, and if it does decide to pursue Legacy funding in New Hampshire, it will have to submit an application. Champion had expressed interest in Legacy funding, but had not submitted a formal application. At the May 31 meeting of the NH Forest Legacy Board, we were told that Champion/JP is planning to hold an application for the Legacy easement.

What will IP do with the Pittsburg lands? These lands about IP holdings in western Maine which service IP's mill in Jay, Maine. IP may decide that these lands are a "strategic fit" with its holdings. On the other hand, Champion has so overcut the Connecticut Lakes lands that it could no longer turn a profit from timber management. Will IP decide to follow up on Champion's access fees and easement, or will it decide to sell off the northern New Hampshire lands as part of its consolidation and debt repayment plans? If IP decides to sell these lands, expect it to increase the overcutting as part of the debt repayment strategy.

HEADWATERS OF CONNECTICUT AND ANDROSCOGGIN RIVERS

The northern New Hampshire lands are not just run of the mill "plain vanilla" timberlands, to borrow an especially appalling phrase in vogue with industrial foresters. These lands are the headwaters of two of the great rivers of the entire region: the Connecticut and the Androscoggin. Most of the land is in the headwaters of the Connecticut. The four Connecticut Lakes are there. The NH Rivers Protection Project gave the Connecticut River headwaters the highest possible score for critical ecological significance. The region contains black spuce swamps, quaking bogs, softwood flats, and winter habitat for bald eagles. It is important habitat for pine martens, moose, and there have been a few sightings of wolves. They are critical for any strategy to protect the ecological integrity of northern New Hampshire.

ChAMPION PURSUIT OF FOREST LEGACY MONEY IN NH EXPOSES MISUSE OF EASEMENTS

State uses Legacy $$ to Prevent Acquisition by Public or 'Forever Wild' Easements

Clearcutting, Herbicide Spraying Would Continue

by Jamie Sayen

ALTHOUGH the status of the Champion lands in Pittsburg, Clarksville and West Stewarts, NH is now in doubt following the acquisition of Champion by International Paper in mid May, Champion's effort to secure Forest Legacy money for these lands in the months preceding the IP takeover have exposed a serious rift in NH timber politics and the forest conservation community. Apparently, preservation has become the enemy of conservation in certain circles.

Champion never formally applied to the NH Forest Legacy board to sell a conservation easement on its Connecticut Lakes lands, but it did submit a letter of interest. The response from the Society for the Protection of NH Forests, the NH Timberland Owners Association, and the Division of Forests and Lands was swift and enthusiastic. The Legacy Board convened a public meeting in Pittsburg, NH on April 5, 2000.

APRIL 5 MEETING OF NH FOREST LEGACY BOARD

Forest Legacy is a program funded by the US Forest Service, but largely administered by individual states that determine which projects in their state will be funded. It was established in 1991 by legislation introduced by Senator Patrick Leahy. Until recently, the state boards have enjoyed pretty much free rein, but as the size of Legacy Appropriations have increased to $25 million, and competition between states has grown (and, perhaps because the Forest Service has reason to believe that state legacy boards are not always abiding by the spirit of the program), the Forest Service intends to play a more active role in state legacy deliberations in the future.

The stated goal of Forest Legacy is "to identify and keep intact important forest acres that are threatened by conversion to non-forest uses" usually via purchase of easements. Legacy funds can be used for full fee acquisition, but rarely are. At the April 5 meeting I stated that since land must be threatened by development to qualify for Legacy money, most of the 171,000 acres of would be ineligible because they were under no threat of development. NH State Forester Phil Bryce responded that Legacy was designed to deal with threats of conversion posed by development and "Forever Wild" easements as well as full fee public acquisition for preservation. "We are worried that these are organizations that have a lot of money in "New York City" that want to preserve land from logging," Bryce told the audience of a conversation he had had with the Wyoming State Forester recently. The western states hate all federal conservation programs, including Legacy. Bryce assured the Wyoming forester that NH has successfully used Legacy money to prevent federal acquisition. At one point in the meeting, Bryce said, "We look at Legacy as an alternative to federal ownership." Bryce's interpretation of the Legacy Program is most troubling. I believe it reflects how Legacy is actually used, although this was not Senator Leahy's intent in passing Legacy in 1991. According to aides of the Senator with whom I have spoken over the years, the intent of Legacy was to complement acquisition, not thwart it. Legacy was also conceived of as a way to assist landowners, not to turn our landowners from decades of unsustainable harvesting.

Phil Bryce's impolitic admission that the forestry industry and their allies in the conservation community are misusing boisterousness.
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funds to subvert efforts to acquire land for the public was refreshingly candid. He is the first proponent of the Legacy Program to publicly acknowledge what supporters of full fee public acquisition have maintained for years: Legacy is being misused to benefit large, absentee landowners who engage in the worst forestry practices and to subvert full fee acquisition.

The response of the conservation community to Bryce’s comments about thwarting forever wild protections and federal acquisition has been predictable. Conservationists who have been shooed to support Legacy and to downplay ambitious full fee acquisition and wilderness protection were furious with Bryce. They realized that they have been used. The timber industry likewise was furious. Bryce may have spoken the truth, but it was impolitic. I think both camps are off-base. Although I disagree with Phil Bryce’s anti-preservationist view of the value of Forest Legacy, I salute him for his honesty. So long as the conservation community views preservation as its enemy, so long as it relies on Legacy and easements (and “green certifica
tion”) to do the job of full fee acquisition, no debate will keep the forests of the Northern Appalachians will continue to be degraded and scraggly conservation will continue to line the pockets of the timber liq
duators.

HERBICIDE SPRAYING,

FOREVER LOGGING

Proposals of the Champion easements are also seeking to incorporate language used by Vermont in the sale of the Conservation Fund of about 80,000 acres of former Champion lands to Essex Timber Company that mandates logging 50 percent of annual growth after the year 2040. This out
gerous amendment cooked up by the Vermont Land Trust and Conservation Fund to appease the timber industry, has zero ecological legitimacy, and will severely under-
mine the ecological recovery of these battered lands. That an organization such as the Society for the Protection of NH Forests would flirt with such eco
logically bent-backed policy speaks volumes! That the Northern Forest Alliance, headquartered a few blocks from the Vermont State House, per-
mits the Vermont Legislature to allow these morons to log without protest also speaks volumes!

It is also shocking that organizations that purport to support preservation of biological integrity and overall forest health. Throughout the state, easement holders are discovering that convention-
ally-directed easements, such as those generally used by the Society for the Protection of NH Forests, may be effective at preventing
development, but they are just about worthless at protecting forests. A 1300
acre tract of former Diamond International land that abuts the southwest cor
ner of the newly protected "Bunnell Tract" in Stratford and Columbus (see "The Nature Conservancy Acquires 18,600 Acre Bunnell Tract. Will Establish 10,000 Acre Reserve") offers a cautionary tale about easements. In 1992 a standard conservation easement was placed on these lands and then they were sold to a notorious Coos County contractor who promptly liquidated the timber value of the tract. (I live about a mile south of this tract.) Either the easement language was not strict in monitoring the terms of the easement, or the easement language secured no protection from liquidation logging. Either way, the liquidator got a fat subsidy, and the landscape got chob
ered. (See "The Trouble with Easements")

would support easements that require the landowner to restore much of the ecological integrity of the pre-settle
ment forest, then these controversial easements might have some conserva
tion value. Researchers have deter
mined that the pre-settlement forest of this region was dominated by old trees and that openings from natural distur
bance were almost (but not) very small (less than one-half acre in size). As much as 60 percent of the trees of the pre-settlement forest canopy were older than 150 years, and 27 percent were older than 300 years. Should not the Alliance and SPFNF require easements that guarantee that the landowner restore at least two-thirds of those age cohorts? But the landowner will never agree to those terms; they’ll reply. Precisely, Landowners such as Champion aren’t interested in socially responsible behavior in return for public funds; they want a subsidy.

FUNDING

Where would $15 million come from for this deal? New Hampshire’s share of the Legacy pot is unlikely to exceed $1-2 million a year for all projects. New Hampshire has done quite well with Legacy in recent years. In fact, John vanough, the natural resource advisor to NH Senator Judi Gregg told the April 5 meeting that “New Hampshire has gotten more than its fair share” of Legacy money in recent

projects such as the Champion easements. Nonetheless, proponents of this deal are also eyeing Federal Land and Water Conservation Funds that ought to go to full fee acquisition. Perhaps they are also looking to hijack some of the $3 million of the fledging New Hampshire Land and Community Heritage Program that passed the NH Legislature in May.

Although the proponents of the Champion easement covet federal funds, they are not to keen on the federa
government. Throughout the April 5 meeting, several statements hostile to federal acquisition were made by representatives of the Forest Legacy Committee, a clear effort to pander to perceived anti-federal atti
dudes of local citizens. The local citi
dens did not express anti-federal senti
ments. They were too worried about possible curtailment of snowmobiling activities under the easement.

In response to the anti-Fed state
ments, I suggested that Legacy money comes from all federal taxpayers and accordingly they are all entitled to input on any proposed Legacy project. I suggested that it would be unlikely that most citizens of the US would be enthusiastic about using scarce conserva
tion funds to subsidize continued clearcutting, herbicide spraying, ATV trail development, an additional 50 new hunting camps, or the unattain
able logging practices of Champion.

International Paper clearing in western Maine. Easements as currently devised are a poor defense against practices like these. Photo © Conrad Heuschen.

LIQUIDATION CLEARCUTS, ATV NETWORKS

In response to a question about herbi
cide spraying, Paul Doscher of the Society for the Protection of NH Forests replied that so long as the spraying was part of a “sustainable management” plan, spraying would be permitted by the easement. He also stated that clearcuts conducted every 150 years were permitted by the easement as long as they were not perceptible at the case hand. Champion con
ducts its clearcuts every 35-40 years. It should also be noted that Mr. Doscher did not object to Commissioner Bryce’s statements about using Legacy to thwart federal acquisition and Forever Wild easements. Neither Bryce nor Doscher objected to Champion’s proposal to develop an ATV trail network. Doscher also stat
ed that there were now 50 more such camps on the Champion lands and that the easement might permit the development of 50 more such camps. So much for stopping development.

Easements have been the favored “conservation” tool in New Hampshire for a couple of decades now, and we are beginning to learn how effective they are at protecting biological Summer Solstice 2000

FOREST LEGACY PROGRAM BLOCKS FOREST PRESERVATION (from previous page)

The 1997 USFS Forest Inventory for NH reveals that all landowner types, the forested lands had their volume per acre, the lowest percentage of sawtimber, the highest percentage of seedlings and saplings, and the poorest forest of the entire state. The Forest Inventory found that statewide, NH cut about 2 percent of growth from 1982-1997. However, in Coos County, which is dominated by paper company, there has been a 15 percent of growth, and it is unsurpassed to suspect that on Champion's lands they have cut even more than the County average—closer to twice the rate of growth.

Champion's management of these lands over the years has been ugly. In 1995 one of their clearcuts sent a 70-mile plume of silt down the river. In 1995 on one of their annual herbicide spraying operations, the sprey destroyed the claim to belonging in International Paper. Their clearcut regularly exceed 100 and even 200 acres.

Should the public bail out a company that has mismanaged its lands?

ARE THE CHAMPION LANDS ESSENTIAL TO LOCAL ECONOMY?

On the surface, the answer is yes, of course. But, as one examines the current situation, the answer becomes less clear. Champion has so badly mismanaged these lands that there are few trees over 75 years of age, and most of those are in beautiful woods along streams and ponds. To restore a healthy, functioning forest ecosystem will require substantial cost, of 50-100 years of minimal cutting, or no cutting, thanks to Champion's corporate decision to lock up the future value of its lands by liquidating these lands over the past two decades. In other words, whether you choose to manage these lands according to the principles of sustainability developed by the group that produced "Good Forests for the Granite State in 1997", or if you prefer to manage them as wilderness, there will be no serious logging for the better part of the next century. Any commercial logging on these lands over the next few decades will seriously degrade the integrity of these already degraded lands.

Because Champion has liquidated the timber value from these lands for decades to come, claims by politicians or conservation groups that they are saving the economy of the region by preserving the working forests are false, or at best, deluded. Only an irresponsible politician or a commercial loggers operating on these lands anytime soon. I cannot imagine that the veritable forest industry for the forests of NH, such as the region's economy is going to have "cheer" without timber from the sample of 1,000 acres in the Connecticut Lakes region for some time to come regardless of whether it is ever wild or working forest.

Actually, this does not represent as severe a blow to the local jobs situation as it might at first think. Although Champion does not disclose how many logging jobs are sustained by these lands, some simple arithmetic suggests that one logger is sustained by about 4,000-5,000 acres a year, and that today's industrial logging utilizes the largest machines (and hence, require fewer loggers), the 5,000 acre figure seems quite reasonable. At this rate, Champion has been employing about 35 loggers on these lands annually, if that. Since there are 40 logged Canadian loggers imported to New Hampshire this year, it is not unreasonable to assume that many of them are employed by contractors cutting Champion lands. So, we may be talking about 15-20 logging jobs by US loggers, and half of them on the Champion lands, if that.

Just not this year. Champion reports 80 percent of its sawtimber sold to Quebec. That's a lot of value-added jobs riding out on one every truckload of raw wood. Many of the drivers of those trucks are also Canadian citizens. Interestingly, critics of raw log

Problem with Easements

CONSERVATION EASEMENTS are a form of partial land acquisition, or less than fee acquisition. Although they can be fashioned in many ways, the standard format is for the public or a private conservation organization to acquire maintenance and public access rights to a tract of land, while the private landowner retains all other rights. Applied to the Northern Forest region, this often means that a landowner with a tract of land with development potential would sell the right to develop. Few of the easements contain language seriously restricting timber harvesting practices, so a conservation easement usually permits clearcutting, herbicide spraying, road building, sometimes even an air strip and other commercial activities.

The Northern Forest Lands Study (NFLS) of 1990 acknowledged that easements are of limited value in ensuring biodiversity. It noted the costs range between 40 and 90 percent of full fee. It also stated that development rights for land near a real estate maker that is very active would cost a greater percentage of full fee than lands remote from an active real estate maker.

Translation: Easements on lands relatively accessible to interstate highways and resort areas were likely to cost between 75 and 90 percent of full fee, whereas remote lands from roads and settlement, with scant development potential, would cost closer to 40 percent of full fee. If you are going to pay 75-90 percent of full fee, why not pay the remainder and acquire the land outright so that the public can decide appropriate protection and management strategies? The notion of paying three-quarters or more of the market value of land that is thin clearcut and sprayed with herbicides is repugnant to all but the landowner and the most didactic true believer in easements.

The NFLS suggested that the average price of an acre of conservation easement ranged from $2,000 to $12,000. In some cases, however, where it had calculated that the average price per acre of full fee acquisition would be $175 to $350 an acre, how can it be $350 to $315. Over the years, many deals for easements have been stuck in the region and, few, if any cost as little as $120 an acre, except where the potential for development was practically nonexistent.

These problems with easements are troubling enough, but the real problem is that a legitimate conservation tool in specific circumstances has been embraced as the cure-all to the region's conservation problems. The Governors' Task Force report (that accompanied the NFLS final report) stated "In all cases, consideration should be given to the benefits of conservation easements over fee purchases where appropriate." (GTF, p.4) The Northern Forest Lands Council (NFLC) "Mission Statement" stated a preference of easements over full fee acquisition, without offering any analysis to justify this bias.

Neither the NFLS nor the NFLC provided useful information so that an informed public could determine where easements were "appropriate." Easements are nearly useless where development is not a threat, but industrial-scale forestry is. They are of value in a region such as the Adirondack Park in which 48 percent of its land base is already protected as "forever wild." There, an easement may help to limit wilderness areas or to buffer a wilderness area from other threats. But, even in the Adirondacks, easements are not substitute for full fee acquisition of lands which are ecologically essential or small gaps in an otherwise relatively well-protected landscape; they cannot serve as a substitute for core reserve areas.

In northern New England, where, excepting the White Mountain National Forest and Baxter State Park, there is scant public land, easements are an unacceptable substitute for full fee acquisition. They can play a role in buffering core reserve areas, but you need to protect the core areas first.

In a coherent strategy to protect biodiversity and prevent further mismanagement of timberlands in northern New England, easements would play a supporting role only. Primary focus would be upon Existing Use Zoning to deal with the threat of development; meaningful forest practices regulations to limit unsustainable practices; designating large tracts of land to protect threatened species, natural communities, and ecosystem integrity.

Resident are hard to monitor and are proving to be vulnerable to land suits when ownership changes hands. But the main objection is that they are an inadequate tool for biodiversity conservation and they are an expensive way to thwart development.

Related Stories on Pages 10-11
The Nature Conservancy

Acquires 18,600 Acre Bunnell Tract; Will Establish 10,000 Acre Reserve

HTOA Attempts to Block Legacy Funding for Reserves

By Jamie Sayen

O N MAY 17 The Nature Conservancy of New Hampshire said it will acquire the 18,600-acre "Bunnell Tract" in Strafford and Columbia, NH from The Conservation Fund which had acquired the land from Champion International in 1996. TNC will pay $3.8 million, about $204 an acre.

This is the largest private conservation purchase in New Hampshire history. The tract includes 6,000 acres of evergreen forest and 12,000 acres of uplands, in addition to 500 acres of open water.

The Bunnell Tract extends from just east of the Connecticut River in the northwest corner of Strafford to nearly the western tip of the Nash Stream State Forest. A quarter of the tract is high elevation spruce-fir forest, a rare habitat type in New Hampshire. The rest provides habitat for the bobcat, the boreal chickadee, spruce grouse, blackpoll warbler, white-winged crossbill, yellow-bellied flycatcher and Bicknell's thrush. There is a reliable report of a lynx sighting in the area a couple of years ago. The lower elevation forests are composed of mixed hardwoods, which have been previously managed by Champion.

The Bunnell Tract provides critical connections between the Nash Stream and the White Mountain National Forest and the Northeast Kingdom of Vermont. The value of this tract in connecting protected lands in northern Vermont and New Hampshire cannot be overestimated.

The Nature Conservancy plans to conduct ecological assessments of the land this summer after which it will determine the boundaries of a 10,000-acre reserve. The higher elevation lands will be included in the reserve. It will be important for TNC to include as much of the lower elevation lands in the reserve as possible because of their role in producing water for the Nash Stream. The higher elevation lands (which are also most coveted by timber interests) are generally more biologically rich than those in the lower elevations and much more widely represented in existing conservation lands. These lands are critical for wildlife migration corridors, and for the productivity of the landscape. TNC will probably protect some lower elevation lands that have not been heavily logged (if such exist) as a control study because they will also protect some of the overcut lands so as to foster natural ecological restoration.

The ecological inventory this summer should assess both plant and wildlife ecology. Before designating its reserve boundaries, TNC must locate critical wildlife habitat and migration corridors in the lower elevation stands.

The remaining 8,600 acres will be sold to an as yet unidentified timber investor who, according to the press release from TNC, "is committed to sustainable and compatible forest management, including allowing beaver to return to a productive state." These managed lands will provide a buffer for the protected lands.

If the timber investor is genuinely committed to sustainable forestry, (s)he will have management options in the 50-100 years because of the cur-

rent condition of the land. A friend of mine recently was in the Simms Brook area, and he noted that the logging roads have become streams due to Champion's mismanagement. Currently there are few trees older than 75 years of age, except in beauty strips. To reverse the ecological integrity of the tract, the new landowner will have to permit the recovery of an age-class distribution that more closely resembles the present forest. The post-settlement forest canopy was dominated by old trees; 60 percent were greater than 120 years and more than a quarter of the canopy was greater than 300 years.

The Nature Conservancy has not yet completed its fundraising for the Bunnell Tract. Thus far, it has raised $1.25 million, including a $1 million leadership pledge from the Sweet Water Trust, one of the few handfuls of land acquisition that is committed to for ever wild protection of biological diversity. Emily Bate son of Sweet Water Trust explained her organization's interest in the Bunnell Tract: "The Bunnell Preserve represents a key jigsaw puzzle piece of biodiversity. The last 15 years of conservation science have conclusively documented that our public lands are simply not large enough or connected enough to protect our animals, plants species, or overall ecological health for the long
term. The Conservancy is providing true leadership to benefit the many generations of all species that follow."

TNC still must raise $3.75 million to complete the purchase and fund immediate and long-term stewardship costs. It hopes the NH Legacy Board (the one that has already been appropriated by the US Congress for the Nash Stream) will provide additional support to the efforts of NH Senator Judd Gregg. This would be a great use of Legacy funds. In addition, TNC will realize an unspecified sum from the sale of the 8,600 acre tract to the timber investor.

At the May 31 meeting of the NH Forest Legacy Board, the NH Chapter of The Nature Conservancy resubmitted the application for funding that The Conservation Fund had originally submitted earlier.

The only change in the application was that TNC is now listed as "agent" for The Conservation Fund, which continues to own the land until the closing occurs in mid-June. The Legacy Board had earlier approved the application, but on May 31, it backed off somewhat.

When State Forest Director Phil Bryce asked: "Do we accept this application?" Paul Doshier of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests replied yes. He reminded the Board that it had already accepted the application from Conservation Fund. A representative of the US Forest Service, the agency that provides funding for Legacy and holds the easement, said: "You already have a grant for this land, so there's no problem with the Forest Service." Peter Helm of the NH Office of State Planning, the agency that administers state easements said: "Yes, the application was already accepted."

But, Eric Kingley, executive Director of the NH Timberland Owners' Association objected. "I think it is an excellent project," he said. "It ought to happen. But I have concerns about Legacy money being used." He supports Legacy funding for the 8,000 acres of managed forest, but he opposes using Legacy money for lands to be designated "forever wild." It would set a bad precedent, he believes. Also, the timber indus

tively views Legacy money as earmarked for it alone.

Paul Doshier responded that there is a certain amount of money left under the original contract, and the highest development value is in the higher elevation portion of the Bunnell Tract, where logging will con

inue to be permitted. The least development value is in the higher elevation portion that is to be designat

ed as forever wild. Therefore, Doshier pointed out, for a small additional amount of money we are buying public access and ecological reserve protection. The representative of the Forest Service added: "It's money of the people of the United States."

Phil Bryce worried, "we're setting a precedent by paying for 60 percent reserves. After the meeting, I reminded him that that precedent was set a dozen years ago when the state of New Hampshire accepted $3.925 million from the US Forest Service for an easement on the Nash Stream State Forest. Half of the Nash Stream is off-limits to logging (due to high elevation and steep slopes). If the Legacy Board refuses to approve the entire application and award all the money that has already been appropriated for the project, New Hampshire ought to return the $4 mil

lion it received for the Forever Wild portions of the Nash Stream to the Forest Service.

At the end of the May 31 meeting, the Legacy Board postponed making a final decision pending a public hearing to be held in Strafford (tentatively scheduled for June 19). Summer Solstice 2000
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The Northern Forest Forum
Help Save the Allagash

by Jim St. Pierre

The Allagash is one of Maine’s most important wilderness areas. For more than a century and a half, the vast wilderness lakes of the Allagash watershed in northern Maine have attracted wilderness lovers from across America and beyond. To protect the wilderness experience there, the Allagash Wilderness Waterway (AWW) was created as a partnership between our national government and the State of Maine. "The interest of all hands along the world in the purchase of federal and state funds for the AWW in the 1960s. In 1970, the AWW was incorporated into the national Wild & Scenic River System.

However, two distinct and defining features of the Allagash Wilderness Waterway are its wilderness characteristics and its Planner. For instance, there have been problems with new access points where increasing numbers of motor vehicles come into the conscious waterway.

Now the Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands (BPL) wants to develop an 80-foot boat launch in the heart of the Allagash which threatens the wilderness character of the waterway. The new development will include a parking lot just outside the AWW Reserve Zone, a loop road within the Restricted Zone to within 125 feet of the shore, and a six-foot-wide gravel path from the road to the water.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Everyone has a stake in protecting the Allagash. Don’t miss this opportunity to speak for wilderness in the North Woods!

1. It is most important to send written comments to the Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands (BPL) on June 28 through July 7, 2000. (Use a fax machine. Use Regulation Commission (LURC) at the address below before July 7, 2000. You can use the information in the key points listed here, but it is best to put comments into your own words.)

2. If at all possible, attend one of the public hearings being held: BANGOR — Wednesday, June 26, 6 PM, Bangor Motor Inn & Conference Center, Haggin Road PREQUE Isle — Thursday, June 27, 6 PM, Northeast Hotel, Main Street (Route 1) AUGUSTA — Monday, June 19, 7-11 PM, University of Maine at Augusta; Library; through the UM interactive TV system citizens can watch participation in the meeting going to UM Machias, Torrey Hall, BANGOR — Tuesday, June 25, 6-10 PM, Bangor Motor Inn & Conference Center, Haggin Road

WHAT YOU CAN DO

1. It is important to send written comments to the Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands (BPL) at the address below before July 7, 2000. Use your own words. The Call BPL, for that date.

2. If at all possible, attend one of the public hearings:

AMERICAN FOREST & WILDLANDS

1. You can get more information about the proposed launch from LURC, 22 State House Station, Augusta, Maine 04333, tel (800) 452-8711.

KEY POINTS

7. The proposed boat launch near John’s Bridge (officially called Churchill Lake Access Site) is not consistent with the national goals of a comprehensive plant and zoning rules. The site is noted as an Unusual Area Protection Area and the most protective of all LURC zones. Despite an unresolved conflict in a F-PA zone contradicts the purpose of the zoning.

5. The proposed boat launch is not needed. Other public boat launches are available nearby within the Allagash Wilderness Waterway for those who are interested in boating and water-related activities.

4. During the writing of the 1999 Allagash Wilderness Waterway management plan, hundreds of people urged that John’s Bridge area remain legally closed to access, as it has been for more than a dozen years. This was reaffirmed by a recent Maine Sportman’s poll which showed that nearly 75% of respondents opposed more access points in the AWW. BPL staff opposed the boat launch. Despite this the Commissioner of the Department of Conservation oversaw his own staff and the public boat launch opened a new boat launch near John’s Bridge.

3. The facilities at the proposed launch with the boat ramp and that what was contemplated in the new AWW Management Plan. The public report of the Allagash Wilderness Waterway Advisory Council were not consulted by the BPL staff on the access developments contemplated in the Management Plan. The new boat launched near John’s Bridge would encourage increased day use and greater conflicts with those using the Allagash for the long-trip wilderness experience.

2. How will BPL provide adequate enforcement at the very boat launch parking area does not exceed 24 feet of the shore and that may be in the parking on the launch. Native American sites at the site could be disturbed by the development of the boat launch.

1. This is just about a single boat launch. This boat launch is symbolic of the unrelenting degradation of the wilderness character of the Allagash. It is time to draw the line. It is time to stand up for wilderness. "Remember John’s Bridge, the Allagash should become the rallying cry of advocates for protecting and restoring Maine’s wilderness areas.

Jim St. Pierre is Maine Director of RESTORE: The North Woods, 9 Union Street, Hallowell, Maine 04347, 207-626-5635
Jim St. Pierre is Maine Director of RESTORE: The North Woods, 9 Union Street, Hallowell, Maine 04347, 207-626-7944 (fax)
JimStPierre@restore.org — www.restore.org

Save Wilderness on Maine Public Lands

by Jim St. Pierre

More than two years the Maine Bureau of Parks & Lands (BPL) has been revising the State’s Resource Policy (RIP) document. The RIP guides management of all state parks and state public lands and state parks in Maine (except Baxter State Park).

This is a matter of great public interest. However, it does not include the chance to designate wilderness areas and protect wilderness areas. Citizens need to tell BPL they want wilderness areas protected on the state public lands in Maine.

A large number of people are expected to attend the public hearings and speak against wilderness. It is crucial to have many people there to speak for wilderness.

WHAT YOU CAN DO
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The US House of Representatives just passed a historic $45 billion land act that would fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and other important conservation programs. While far from perfect, the House’s actions show a unique bipartisan commitment to providing future funds to assist local, state and federal governments in protecting wild areas, wildlife habitat and open space.

CARA managed to unite Representatives Don Young (R-AK) and George Miller (D-CA) who have been working on this proposal to each other on the House Resources Committee than they have on their cooperation. Given Representative Young’s extreme anti-environment and anti-conservation voting record, it may seem odd that he supports a conservation initiative at this time. In return for his support though Mr. Young brought his home state $87 million for “Impact Assistance and Coastal Conservation”, which some environmental groups say could be used for anti-environmental purposes like building roads. This, along with a Republican anti-environment image at election time, may have convinced Mr. Young and other GOP leaders to take a different position than they are used to taking.

Despite this, an issue, that the environmental community improved in the House and is looking to continue to address in the Senate, CARA does a lot of good. In a passionate speech to the House, Rep. Sanders (I-VT) said, “Let me be clear, this bill is by no means perfect [however], we must not allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. For the first time in 25 years, we have the opportunity to provide a permanent and reliable source of funding to protect our environment. This legislation is indeed one of the few bright spots of the 106th Congress, and we must do everything possible to ensure that a final version of this bill is passed and signed into law this year.”

Over the next fifteen years the forest would receive a total of $4.2 billion to be used for conservation purposes. For example, Maine would have access to $4.7 million a year from LWCF to help purchase some of the millions of acres of industrial forest land being put up for sale. New Hampshire would have an additional $5.4 million a year to help fund wildlife and habitat and non-game programs. Vermont would receive $2.3 million for conservation easements and funding for landowner incentives to aid in the recovery of endangered and threatened species.

Without a serious level of financial assistance from the federal government, the Northern Forest will continue to suffer an uncertain future. CARA provides the assistance needed to buy lands surrounding Moosehead Lake, the Nulhegan River and the Adirondacks. Please contact your Senators and ask them to co-sponsor S.2123 (CARA), the greener S.2181, or both. Ask them to support the removal of all current and future anti-environment wording. Senator Jeffords (VT), Stevens (VT), Specter and Collins (ME) especially need to hear from you.

**THE HELENE D. SPECHER & EDGAR E. CLARKE FOUNDATION** is accepting grant applications from grassroots groups and individuals working for the environment, animal welfare, peace and social justice. Grant sizes range from $100-$5000. Grants are generally limited to projects in Vermont. The Foundation does not fund environmental projects that encourage high impact recreational use, land use, or logging. Groups or individuals who can be funded by larger, more traditional foundations are encouraged to apply. For more information contact The Helene D. Specher & Edgar E. Clarke Foundation, 237 Thaddeus Stevens Rd., Peacham, VT 05862, (802) 892-3130, e-mail: scfdn.org, web site: www.scfdn.org.

**Summer Solstice 2000**

"LET US RESOLVE TO MAKE A TRULY LIVING MONUMENT TO THE SENATOR’S TIRELESS EFFORTS—LET US PROTECT THE EASTERN WILDERNESS."

The Northern Forest Forum

Senator Henry M. ("Scoop") Jackson, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, added another tribute. "No man has worked longer or harder for the cause of eastern wilderness than my esteemed colleague from Vermont (Mr. Aiken). It can truly be said that he is the father of eastern wilderness...Let us resolve to make a truly living monument to the Senator's tireless efforts—let us protect the eastern wilderness."

In May of 1974, the Senate heartily endorsed the wilderness bill introduced by Senator Aiken and 21 co-sponsors. When the bill took effect on January 3, 1975, it established 15 new wilderness areas totaling more than 200,000 acres of eastern national forest land, including the Bristol Cliffs and Lye Brook Wildernesses in Vermont. Ten years later, the Vermont Wilderness Act of 1984 created a National Recreation Area and four more national forest wildernesses, including one in southern Vermont named after George D. Aiken. Although many people scoffed at the notion of establishing wilderness on the once-disturbed mountains of the east, Senator Aiken recognized the priceless ecological and social value of these recovering wild forests and convinced the Senate to formally protect them for current and future generations of Americans. For this we are in his debt.

Senator Hubert Humphrey acknowledged George Aiken’s vision and leadership on the concept of reserving eastern forests when supporting passage of Aiken’s bill. "The bill we now have before us represents an effort over two Congresses, on the part of Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont, to assure that examples of wilderness will endure in National Forests in every region of our nation. Beyond this, what the bill does is recognize that while man may have changed our area, man has the capacity to work with nature to erase the traces of man’s presence."

"I want to compliment my colleague from Vermont, Senator Aiken, for the constructive and dedicated way he has sought to improve the wilderness concept. This bill’s emphasis is a tribute to his leadership," concluded Senator Humphrey. The recovering wild forests now protected as wilderness in Vermont will remain a living testament to Senator Aiken’s vision and values. On behalf of present and future generations, thank you Senator George D. Aiken for this rare and precious gift.

Jim Northrop is Executive Director of Forest Watch, a 2,000-member conservation group.
MAINE'S VOTE ON CROP PEST MANAGEMENT
What Will It Decide?
By Pamela Prodan

This fall a new forestry referendum will appear on the ballot in Maine. Probably nobody one would deny that the upcoming referendum is a consequence of the inability of the Maine Legislature to enact meaningful forestry reform legislation. It has been said by legal scholars that the function of the citizens' initiative is to permit enactment of laws which for political reasons the legislature cannot. They would argue that the initiative process is useful on those few occasions when the legislative process does not function properly.

This initiative uses a three-proposed-language formula consisting of voting, requiring, testing levels, requiring that "total cutting activities and cutting activities for each species group" be kept at sustainably manageable levels for any rolling 10-year average." This section of the legislative approval process would not be granted only if there is a cultural justification, one reasonable alternative and one under the jurisdiction of the cutting activities from the clearcutting activities. The third establishes a public process to implement the referendum language.

One important thing to understand about this referendum contains very little specific language about how the law will actually work. Instead, the law directs a Maine Council on Sustainable Forest Management appointed by the governor to come up with a set of science-based regulations to make the new law work. Because the regulations do not yet exist, it would be pure speculation to project what economic implications the referendum would have. As the referendum passes, the time frame for rules to be established is short — only six months after election day.

Since we actively manage our woodland and have enrolled it in the Treegrow program, we wanted to know if the referendum would affect us. We thought the rules that would be established would be applicable to us.

Reasonable vs. Unreasonable
If the referendum does pass, whether the law will be reasonable or not will depend on the final regulations. Unlike the opponents, I do not anticipate that the referendum as directed at the total cutting level on any one individual landowner's land. It would be extremely burdensome, from the standpoint of small landowners and from the standpoint of the Maine Forest Service, to have to determine for each small landowner the amount of growth and allowable cut at the ownership or stand level. Regulations requiring this kind of bureaucratic burden would not be reasonable. I think there is more a sensible construction of the language. Since the language contains no directive to individual landowners, the cutting limits referred to in the referendum refer to the sum total of cutting on all land under the Treegrow Law statewide.

This interpretation creates a lot of flexibility for the Council in implementing the law. It would allow the Council to craft regulations that address specific problem areas. In constraining specific terms, courts, including the Maine Supreme Court, have ruled that if one of several possible interpretations of a law produces an unreasonable result, that is a reason for rejecting that interpretation in favor of another which would produce a reasonable result. The interpretation that the referendum sets an overall goal, leaving how to get there to the rulemaking process, makes more sense.

Given that the regulations have not yet been written, I think opponents unreasonable interpretation of the referendum to contain a directive for each individual landowner to limit cutting levels for each tree species group. As with total cutting levels, the problem that has been documented regarding the species mix in the forest the overall statewide decline in the stocking of certain species. Red maple and balsam fir are an example in the northern forest today than they were in the present state of colonial times. The frequency of their occurrence today is a direct consequence of the intervention of man in the forest. Should we be "tricked" with the dominance of these less preferable species? I don't believe that such an outcome is required by the referendum's language, which states the overall goal that "...cutting activities for each species group may not exceed sustainable cutting levels..."

The opponents' contention that woodlot owners directed by the referendum to freeze existing proportions of all tree species is an unreasonable requirement that would be extremely burdensome and unenforceable. One of the most common principles of state's constituted under courts is that a statute or rule is construed so as to avoid an unconstitutional, absurd or unenforceable result. If the referendum does pass, an effort must be made to ensure that the regulatory system is workable, understandable and not burdensome to administer. It's highly unlikely the Maine Forest Service, as the key law enforcement agency administering the law, will push for any absurd and burdensome interpretation of the law. As a woodland owner myself, I believe landowners are justified in adjusting the species composition of their woodlots in order to benefit wildlife and improve the existing mix of the species that has resulted from poor forestry practices of the past like high-grading and clearcutting. The important thing is that such poor practices not continue.

The referendum also requires that the law be based on current scientific research. Perhaps the science will demonstrate that overall cutting levels in the state would be sustainable if cutting levels were based on minimum stocking levels and forestry practices included those that ensure adequate regeneration of shade intolerant species such as birch. This is certainly a more realistic way of achieving sustainable cutting levels than harvesting a small percentage of every species of wood every year and it is also a more sensible interpretation of what the referendum requires. Maintaining minimum stocking levels would also encourage landowners to thin trees of long-lived species that are now being over-harvested. Stocking levels would vary according to the composition of the forest, i.e., hardwood, softwood or mixed wood. In any case, the rules would have to respond to the cycles of change and acknowledge that past practices should not determine the future forest.

Administering the Law
One possible way to administer the new law for small woodlot owners would be to work within the existing framework of regulations. Small woodlot owners already must file a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form would be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service. The form could be expanded to include a Notification of Intent to Harvest Forest Service.

These techniques that could become more widespread include crop tree release, where a forester determines which trees to select for crop trees that will meet the landowner's objectives and which trees to mark for cutting to release those crop trees. Only trees in direct competition with the crop trees are allowed. The forester would have to consider regulatory tools such as minimum stocking levels, or how many trees would have to be released to exceed diameter limits for specific species that are being over-harvested; and incorporate environmental values sensitive ecological features such as wildlife habitat and riparian areas. In addition, the Council would have to consider something about the introduction of non-native species and genetically engineered trees, which could threaten sustainable harvest levels of native species.
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Summer Solstice 2000
Vermont Perspective
Caveat Emptor

Vermont, of course, passed into law a permitting process for clearcuts. It was passed into law following the recommendations of the Forest Resource Advisory Council, now disbanded, but periodically reawakened to consider forest policy changes. What has been the result of this law and what lessons may Mainers, considering their referendum, draw from it?

I bear several forms of praise and criticism of the "heavy cutting law." One result was that it was politically fatal to several legislators who supported it in the face of rather spirited protest. If one looks closely at the protests, you can begin to appreciate that they were a mixed bag of skepticism of government, people who believe there is an inherent right to treat land as the owner wishes, and, most tellingly, many of the bosses who are locally powerful in the distribution of pulp tickets and other means of controlling the market for wood.

The hope then, was that there would be an open, honest, non-political rulemaking. This hope was misplaced.

Small scale loggers who laugh at the law see several problems with it: one, that cutting practices have changed little, and two, that its passage "alienated everybody." Some loggers are also extremely skeptical of the forestry profession and question anything that may require their services. But small independent themselves have been little impacted, one way or another. They continue to see landowner decisions as the key when bad log jobs occur: landowners get greedy and want revenue maximized. Loggers often refer to a frustrating situation: they will cut properly, for growth, only to be followed by an operator who comes in and takes the cream.

Large scale operators with big equipment also offer economies of scale to landowners, which may really mean that their equipment is so big and, debatable so great, they must cut wood, even at a loss, to create cash flow. This of course means they also cut where weather and soil conditions may not be appropriate—increasingly true in our milder winters. It is true that small scale loggers tend to be the ones concerned about the availability of raw timber, but they do not seem Vermont's law as having done much to protect it.

Administratively, the Department of Forests and Parks resisted the cutting law. Their report on its administration notes its cost for which no new funds have been allocated. Individuals within the Department have, over time, expressed dissatisfaction with having to respond to public complaints about cutting, and mystification with why the legislature and members of the public ever supported restricting clearcuts. The inventory numbers for Vermont look good at the coarse scale, although Department officials also express concern about timber quality and species shifts (i.e., red maple overtaking sugar maple).

I think this dissatisfaction is the rub problem with the heavy cutting bill, which relied on a politically accommodative, rather than scientifically based, analysis of what problems are caused by clearcutting and which of these can be constitutionally readdressed by regulation. This is where any effort in Maine will run into problems, too: the idea that political appointees who are assigned to assure the buffering of their particular interest's toast can emerge with guidelines to improve practices.

I offered this criticism to the rules committee and was asked to define what I mean by science. My answer (whatever it was) was met by the rather snorting (I thought) comment that abstract academics would be devising rules. No, I replied, there are academics with dirt under their nails. I will defend my hope: that we could come up with a way to assess long term impacts of clearcutting and devise rules to limit these. This, in turn, opens me to the most telling criticism of any cutting bill: why permit a practice like clearcutting at all?

This, in fact, is the closing of the logical loop that led to the political compromise of Vermont's bill: rather than a banning of clearcuts of a certain size (and the Commissioner of Forests and Parks expressed his belief this was the easiest thing to do) FRAC decided political compromise was best. The hope then, was that there would be an open, honest, non-political rulemaking. This hope was misplaced. Some good things may have emerged from this bill: some believe it has kept out fly-by-night operators or speculators from Maine. — Andrew Whitaker

The author is an attorney in Wilson, Maine.
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Alternatives characterized the matter as one of unclear communication from FSC on which chemicals are prescribed and considered as chlorinated.

OTHER CRITIC
Restoro's conclusion is that Irving's ability to thwart regional standards calls into question the credibility of the entire FSC process.

An article by Denise DeMoura in the March 2000 Atlantic Forestry magazine also quotes other participants in the process who note the shortcomings of FSC certification while holding hope for incremental gains from the process. Marvin von Mirbach, for instance, hopes that standards are stringent enough to re- 

Some critics on both sides of the border see Irving's labor practices as hopelessly clouded. Jim Freeman in a Forest Ecology Network article (Winter 2000) outlines various ways that Irving is said to squeeze loggers and contractors, including under-utilizing both Freeman and Austin in her piece relate that contractors routinely overload their trucks past legal limits to make ends meet. Overall, Freeman ties Irving's practices back to its market dominance, or oligopoly.

The religious community at Novad Nada in North Kentville, New Brunswick recently gained a long battle against what it termed Irving's dis- 

We also encourage support of employment-intensive logging practices. In contrast to Irving's machinery-intensive logging practices, the environmental community has developed a viable alternative that includes employment-intensive practices and fewer mechanized natural forests and fewer clearcuts, and no pesticide-herbicide spraying which contaminates our earth, air, and water.

[For full text — www.spiritualintent- 

FSC PROMOTES CONSENSUS
Public relations data indicated in January from the FSC/US website (www.fsc.org/consensus) states that certification is a solution to the polarized discussion of forest practices. "On the one hand, environmental activists

Vermont Clearcut photographed in May 2000. Photo by Gustavo Verdeer
SUPREME COURT THROWS OUT STATE OIL TANKER REGULATIONS

by Ron Huber

(SEARSPORT) — In a move that could affect the safety of Maine's seafood industry and coastal wildlife, the United States Supreme Court has thrown out many of Washington State's oil tanker safety regulations, holding that international treaties and federal laws supersede state's right to make oil tankers meet state safety standards.

The March 6, 2000 decision by the high Court found unconstitutional most of that state's oil tanker safety laws, finding that they would be superseded by federal law, or would continue in effect when an oil tanker was outside state waters, violating the Commerce Clause of the US constitution.

The decision has required the Maine Department of Environmental Protection to review and revise Maine's own tanker rules, which include elements that were struck down in the Washington State vs Interstate tanker regulations case.

Calling oil tanker safety regulation "an area where the federal interest has been manifest since the beginning of our Republic," Justice Kennedy wrote that the court has "determined that Washington's regulations regarding general navigation watch procedures, English language skills, training and casualty reporting are preempted." [by federal law]

The Coastal Waters Project is very disappointed by this decision. Maine's marine resources are far too precious to leave to the whims of international treaties, and a largely indifferent federal government. We are going to be studying the Court's ruling very carefully, and determining which of several options to pursue.

Excerpts from the US Supreme Court decision (Justice Kennedy wrote the unanimous opinion):

NOTE: words in [ ] are added by the writer for clarity.

"TODAY WE MUST determine whether these more recent laws can stand despite the comprehensive federal regulatory scheme governing oil tankers. Relying on the same federal statute that controlled the analysis in this case, we hold that some of the State's regulations are pre-empted, as to the balance of the regulations, we remand the case so that validity may be assessed in light of the considerable federal interest at stake and in conformity with the principles we now discuss.

The State... has enacted legislation whose pre-emptive reach is manifest since the beginning of our Republic and is now well established.

"The evident purpose of the saving clauses is to preserve state laws which are not inconsistent with substantive regulation... to conduct, establish liability rules and financial requirements relating to oil spills... "

"...The issue is not adequate regulation but political responsibility; and it is, in large measure, for Congress and the Coast Guard to confront whether their regulatory scheme, which demands a high degree of uniformity, is adequate. States, as well as environmental groups and local port authorities, will participate in the process. See 46 U.S.C. § 3703(a) (requiring the Coast Guard to consider the views of "officials of State and local governments," "representative of port and harbor authorities," and "representatives of environmental groups" in arriving at national standards).

"The judgment of the Court of Appeals is reversed, and remand for further proceedings consistent with this opinion is ordered.

It is so ordered.

For MORE INFORMATION: Copy of the Supreme Court decision:

Any financial help you can provide, from $5 to whatever you can afford, is greatly appreciated. Please make your check payable to Quiddy Spill Prevention Group. Donations are tax-deductible. For more information: Contact Steve Crawford at 130 Water Street, Eastport, Maine 04631

MORE COASTAL WATERS WATCH>
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PENOBSCOT BAY COAST SMARTING UNDER “DUMB GROWTH”

VICTORY! CITIZEN OPPOSITION & STATE REGULATION BLOCK PCO’s COASTAL “SUPER WAL-MART” PLAN.

ROCKLAND — Downtown merchants and windjammer captains are breathing a sigh of relief as the Wal-Mart corporation abandons its plans to build a megastore on a heavily forested ridge overlooking Penobscot Bay along this city’s scenic US Route 1 corridor. That plan, which covers more than 21 acres of Rockland’s remaining coastal forests with a 186,000 square-foot retail monolith surrounded by 914 parking spaces.

The entire Rockland downtown business community signed a petition calling on the Rockland City Council to reject the Walmart company’s request for a zoning exception to carry out their super-structure construction project. The megacomplex would have included a full supermarket, beauty salon, barber shop, gas station, hardware store, pet shop, department store and restaurant under one roof.

The residents of the Pen Bay Acres hamlet, bordering the proposed site for the giant retail outlet, were also united in opposition to the plan as harnessing their quantity of life and depressing the real estate value of their homes. Community opposition, ranging from the schooner fleet to downtown businesses played key roles in marshalling general community opposition to the plan.

“Rockland City Mayor Jim Raye and other supporters of the corporate sprawl plan, including the editor of the absentee-owned Rockland Courier Press newspaper, did everything they could to force the development project through against the community efforts,” Raye and Courier reporter/columnist Steve Betts belligerently asserted. “All the while a huge forest from the company would off-set traffic jams, declines in downtown business revenues, and the development would be an eyesore visible miles offshore, angering Raye’s backyard neighbors.”

But, in the end, the Walmart supporters’ claims couldn’t pass the straight-faced community assertion.

He noted that Maine Department of Transportation and other agencies took the concerns of area residents seriously. A critical event occurred when the Penobscot Bay Medical Center wrote the town with details about the development proposal. The doctor’s group could cause gridlock on Route One, hindering ambulances from reaching the hospital in emergency situations.

The DOT told the developer that it would have to prevent such gridlock from happening. Apparently the company was unwilling to pay the additional costs that this would have required. Then they didn’t reconsider the idea of building on Route One, in my opinion,” Rockland resident Jason Jackie said, “this company, which is called Wal-mart is a good sign. Areas are combating sprawl all along Penobscot Bay’s Route One corridor. This was an important win. Maybe there will be more of them.”

PLASTIC INFUSION MUZZLES MINEIRA SIERRA CLUB, AS Bambi SPARS WITH SWAPZILLA.

MBNA Corporation continues a relentless attack on land and wildlife of the western Penobscot Bay coast, expanding its sprawl operations across the Megunticook Coastal Range, and joining with Marriot Corporation and other megadevelopment blockhead (laundered gentrification) of the Rockland, the bay’s historic commercial fishing port, and its surrounding village community.

Grassroots advocates armed with fresh Maine Dept of Transportation (MDOT) reports showing a sharp rise in wildlife traffic casualties on US Route One along the Penobscot Shore, and armed as well with the citizen enforcement provisions of a handful of federal and Maine state environmental, fishery and conservation laws and regulations, have begun to stem the sprawl wave.

The credit card peddlers’ advance on Dunegrass Golf Club and the town has been blunted, with the state’s top environmental appeals board ordering the company to cease further development of Duncktrap Mountain, the easternmost peak of the Megunticook Range. The Board of Environmental Protection had further responded to the tsunami of criticism levied against the Maine Department to build on Environmental Protection’s near-refractive rubberstamping of coastal sprawl permits, by ordering that agency to re-examine how it decides whether any particular development proposal would be an excessive cumulative impact to the natural environment, and on how the department decides to honor requests for public hearings.

ROCKLAND RESIDENT JACKIE JACKIE SAID, “THIS COMMUNITY VICTORY OVER WAL-MART IS A GOOD SIGN. AREA RESIDENTS ARE COMBATTING CORPORATE SPRAWL, ALL ALONG PENOBSCOT BAY’S ROUTE ONE CORRIDOR.”

The Maine DEP has the unenviable record during the King Administration of denying every citizen request for a public hearing on a development project and of approving every large scale development project that has crossed its decision-making plate. Embittered environmentalists have been forced to take to the streets and appeal by appeal if any protection of a quickly diminishing wild maine coast is to be gained.

KILLING ZONE

The appeal, prepared at the request of NARP’s Coastal Waters Project, shows a 400% rise in deer-vehicle accidents along Route One in Rockland, Maine, since the credit giant invaded the Ducktrap Mountain Deeryard and commercial development on this hill overlooking the harbor’s entrance.

At a series of appeals hearings brought by NARP’s Coastal Waters Project, bay defenders used this and other data on the harm MBNA’s development is having on the area’s wildlife to convince the Maine Board of Environmental Protection to The Ducktrap Deer yard (officially DWA #4250) in an incensed dense forest cut with streams and springs, on Ducktrap Mountain overlooking Penobscot Bay, and is considered to be the USA’s easternmost coastal deeryard.

As it turned out, MBNA’s 40 cabin sprawl event was not given the boot. However, the request by the Maine Board of Environmental Protection to forever cease from building on the rugged Ducktrap Mountain the northernmost peak of the Megunticook Range that overlooks West Penobscot Bay, was granted. The mountain is officially labeled by Maine Dept of Inland Fish and Wildlife as Deer Wintering Area 020429.

The permanent no-sprawl condition became final at a BLP meeting on April 5th. Bay defenders are jubilant that an important precedent has now been set by the state of Maine asserting the authority to order landowners to create conservation easements to protect important natural resources that are otherwise not protected by states Natural Resources Protection Act.

For the first time in Maine history, MBNA Corporation has been ORDERED to put land into a conservation easement to permanently protect it from the owner’s sprawl proclivities. The Maine Board of Environmental Protection is breaking new ground.

In the accelerated coastal sprawl afflicting the Penobscot Bay coast, this is a much needed step. We anticipate more protection orders as this is one of the first to come from the Board of Environmental Protection.

Critics of the controversial development on the thickly forested mountain side overlooking Penobscot Bay had told the Board that MBNA had earlier promised to “permanently protect” the heart of the deeryard, a densely forested area halfway up the mountainside, but then reneged on their promise by proceeding with their entire project development in the very area.

Critics had told the Board that the area was critical to the survival of the western Penobscot Bay region’s deer herd, who overwinter in the dense woodland on the mountain side.

Area residents described to the Board how hundreds of deer had fled the mountain during the harsher months of the last winter once MBNA commenced bulldozing and logging operations in the deeryard. They noted that the Waldo County sheriff’s department has received reports of a number of deer killed on Route One below the mountain. The deeryard has been dramatically eroded by the December, when MBNA commenced land clearing operations there.

MBNA spokespeople wrote: “The applicant shall, by March 30, 2000, submit to the Department for review, acceptance, and recording a conservation easement with IF&W, or another government or non-government entity, permanently protecting the added area for the protection of...”

The Board of Environmental Protection order came as a complete surprise to developer MBNA, whose attorney stated that the company was already negotiating with a New Hampshire law firm of Pierce, Atwood, protested that the company was already negotiating with a New Hampshire law firm of Pierce, Atwood, and was already negotiating with a New Hampshire law firm of Pierce, Atwood, who stated that the company was already negotiating with a New Hampshire law firm of Pierce, Atwood, and was already negotiating with a New Hampshire law firm of Pierce, Atwood, who stated that the company was already negotiating with a New Hampshire law firm of Pierce, Atwood, who stated that the company was already negotiating with a New Hampshire law firm of Pierce, Atwood, who stated that the company was already negotiating with a New Hampshire law firm of Pierce, Atwood, who stated that the company was already negotiating with a New Hampshire law firm of Pierce, Atwood, who stated that...
claim that "there is no record of any known rare or unusual features on the property".

EARTH DAY MASSACRE
Maine's top environmental official approves "stroo-turffing" of lower Camden Hills deadroy.

Bay watchers were shocked however, when the Maine DEP's permit stamp abruptly asked a question by the MBNA Corporation to clear and blast a wooded area right on the border of the southwestern area, only hours before "Earth Day 2000".

"This is a really grotesque Earth Day gift to the Penobscot Bay region," said Ron Huber, co-director of Penobscot Bay Watch. "At the same time that Kirkpatrick is talking of the need to defend Maine's environment, she is delivering up the Bay area's natural resources, and the local business that introduce visitors to them, to a voracious land developer."

Opponents note this latest proposal flies in the face of recent recommendations by Maine's top environmental panel that the DEP hold public hearings and consider broader off-site impacts before approving any further development on land owned by MBNA International Corp on Ducktrap Mountain.

"MBNA's assault is covering up the company's real plans," said Ron Huber, leader of Penobscot Bay Watch [www.penbaywatch.org]. "Everything points to MBNA really proposing to build a private indoor stadium in the deer forest, in two steps. One blast the mountainside flat, install a million dollar drainage system and cover it with astro turf. Step 2: Next year, "amend the plan to include walls and a ceiling. Can't have company execs exposed to blackflies and Lyme disease, for gosh sakes."

In another ominous sign of things to come, the MBNA corporation evicted eighteen families from their homes on the Rockland Harbor adjacent to the Fisher Snow fluid flow facility in Rockland, Maine, and will demolish their homes.

The company proposes building a gigantic corporate complex on Rockland's waterfront.

Rockland's South End neighborhood is about to find out what corporate sprawl is all about: less housing for working families, and a massive increase in property taxes that will force hundreds of town homes to sell their homes and leave Rockland. MBNA and other real estate

"The awful irony is that the same day that the eviction was ordered, MBNA and Maine Governor Angus King held a press conference in Augusta announcing that MBNA is giving more than a million dollars to a wealthy landowner near Acadia National Park, to purchase the million-acre island property and take it off the Frenchboro tax rolls." "It's truly bizarre," one community activist noted, "MBNA will give a million to a millionaire, but not a nickel to the men, women and children the company is about to make homeless in Rockland."

"Some states have "Smart Growth" programs to control sprawl on their coasts. But Maine seems committed to "Dumb Growth" along our shores," said Huber. He said of MBNA, "You can't imagine a less water-dependent business than telemarketing."

Route One brings more than a million tourists through downtown Rockland every year. As a result, the town has thrived as a small business-dominated, fishing and tourism economy, with one of the lowest unemployment rates in the state.

Efforts by MBNA, Wal-Mart, Marriott Corporation and other giant absentee corporations to force giant mass employment facilities on Rockland and its neighbors along the picturesque Penobscot Bay coast could forever change the character of the Penobscot Bay coast. We don't want another Portland here on Penobscot Bay," said one local.

The Coastal Waters Project is a citizens' association dedicated to protecting and restoring Maine's coastal and marine environments. Learn more about their efforts by calling or writing to Coastal Water Project, 418 Main Street, Rockland ME 04841 telephone 707-594-5712.
STARVATION IN THE GULF OF MAINE

by Ron Huber

NOVA SCOTIAN writer Debbie MacKenzie has proposed a new theory to account for the persistent decline in offshore fishin and marine mammals - STARVATION.

In her landmark 1998 essay, "How to Rebuild the Fish Stocks? A New Strategy", (co-authored by Douglas Brennan MacKenzie) compared the marine ecosystem system to a vegetable garden, and noted that neither ought to be expected to constantly produce food unless the "harvester" returns organic material to the system. Well understood in terrestrial agriculture, but she found a far different point of view among the fishing and marine science communities: "The oceans are so large that their ability to "produce" seemed to us to be without limit," she wrote. Noting that fishery managers and others "assumed that some magical force of nature had always worked to, and would continue to, replenish the "stocks" that we removed", MacKenzie examined this "magical" marine cornucopia assumption.

Contemporary marine biology holds that the tonnages of marine life are limited by the amount of "fixed nitrogen" available to planktonic marine algae or phytoplankton. Occupying a fundamental place in the offshore marine food web, phytoplankton are consumed by zooplankton, in their turn preyed upon by marine animals from baleen whales to herring, whale sharks to cormorants, barnacles, and deep ocean corals. With fixed nitrogen essential for the formation of proteins, its relative availability in the system exerts a controlling effect on the amount of biomass present in the sea. "This is how the sea plants and sea animals depend on one another," MacKenzie writes, "they take turns using the protein building blocks."

While acknowledging that blue-green algae, unlike the other diatoms and phytoflagellates, can actually "make" new fixed nitrogen, she differs with those in the marine scientific community who hold that fixed nitrogen production by blue green algae is likely sufficient on its own to power the offshore foodweb.

In addition, MacKenzie challenges those holding that seawage, air pollution and other industrial discharges supply sufficient nitrates to feed the offshore planktonic center of the marine foodweb. Current models of marine nutrient cycling accept that the "fixed nitrogen/protein removed from the sea by fishing is in fact replaced by our known-to-be large nutrient inputs. The problem with what humanity is currently giving back, it's inappropriately mixed and is limited area of dispersal."

This "input" is in the form of (a) nutrient drips in terrestrial runoff - frequently in an inappropriate FORM (too tiny) and inappropriately LOCATED (coastal waters only with no sufficient offshore distribution). It is also frequently too concentrated and actually sickening coastal waters. (b) arial deposition of nitrates - soot from the burning of fossil fuels contains fixed nitrogen - a certain amount ends up in the oceans, though again the FORM & LOCATION are inappropriate. Only the relatively minor amount that drops over the fishing banks has any chance of contributing to nourishing fish; the vast amount that falls into the mid-Atlantic, outside the continental and coastal shelf currents, basically dozes the food web. For very good reasons, marine lifeforms and nutrients were and are separated in very separate areas. We depleted very specific areas (fishing banks) of solid edibles (fish) and are trying to pay back with random, atmospheric sewage and sooty Points of Debate) for further discussion of this point).

MacKenzie studied both the scientific literature and fishery harvest reports of the past few centuries. Her newest report, "WAKE UP AND FEED THE FISH: How the Causes of the Collapsing Fisheries" notes declining weight-at-age patterns, declining abundance, the relative continued success of micro-plankton feeders, and steeper declines in offshore fish stocks as compared to inshore fishes, and advances the hypothesis that the extraordinary removals of biomass from the offshore marine ecosystem by commercial fisheries has significantly and chronically reduced the abundance and variety of life in that ecosystem. A notable victim of this forced Starvation, MacKenzie notes, is the Atlantic coast's Northern Right Whale. The few arriving in Bay of Fundy waters are emaciated, according to the DFO.

Meanwhile, a researcher at the New England Aquarium-sponsored WhaleNet gloomily noted the lack of right whale calving success for this year: "This is the way the world ends / Not with a bang but a whimper..." There was no 9th inning rally, last gasp to raise our spirits about the season. The EWS team scored its final right whale sighting on 02/01. There wasn't a confirmed sighting by any of the survey teams after 02/08 and nothing to add to the calf count for 2000 — which stands at ONE.

Citing "conclusive evidence that plankton levels in the ocean are now levels depleted from their historic levels," MacKenzie postulates that this is the most efficient way to restore levels of fixed nitrogen to the offshore environment. MacKenzie studied reversing the removal process and actually fertilizing organic material generated on land (selected food and crop wastes) offshore.

"We must realize that the ocean has never been able to naturally replenish itself at a rate to match the rate that we have removed fish," she notes. "Primary production is MUCH too slow. We now need to add organic material itself, not more quantities than we remove it...that is, we must FEED THE FISH!"

Is MacKenzie correct? One tantalizing suggestion that she is may be seen in Maine's and Nova Scotia's lobster trap fishery. The lobster has fared well, despite warnings of overfishing from all sides. The notable difference from other marine fisheries, however, is that the lobster industry continuously feeds the wild lobsters from juvenile to adulthood. Every month, millions of pounds of herring are being

GULF OF MAINELNTERNATIONAL OCEAN WILDERNESS

REWILDING OUR MARINE BORDERS NOW POSSIBLE, SAYS PRESIDENT'S MARINE PROTECTED AREAS ANNOUNCEMENT

By Ron Huber

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S May 26th announcement to the establishment of Marine Protected Areas off our nation's coasts is a MAJOR policy decision, one that augurs the rewilding of major portions of our nation's protected area.

The US Department of Commerce has long claimed sole federal jurisdiction over all "living marine resources" with the US Forest Service under the Dept of Agriculture, however, NOAA is bound by its host affiliation to be a COMMUNITY managed agency.

Commerce, thus NOAAs, point of view is that the living things of the sea are to be extracted and used in some way - captured, killed, sold and eaten (or, in the case of invertebrates like the lobster, blue mussel, quahog or softshell clam, retained alive). Under Commerce's regime, all of the sea in US jurisdiction, even the "National Marine Sanctuaries" are fully open to the same levels of commercial and recreational fish removals as the Corn and sea for outside the "sanctuary". Increasingly, powerful multinat- tional aquaculture interests are gaining lease control over ever larger acreages of New England's coastal waters and now offshore, at fees that might make a rancher running cattle on public range envious.

Management of public marine wildlands as wilderness is simply not to be found under the Department of Commerce, with its ingrown "consumption as highest best use" outlook.

Wilderness has long been the purview instead of the Department of the Interior. NOAA and Commerce, however, have determined and effectively, fought every effort by Interior to create Parks and Wilderness area with in the US's territorial ocean. Until the President's proclamation, Interior had been restricted to that which is above the high tide line (above mean potential) Even in the Bird Rocks National Monument offshore California.

Now that has changed... By his announcement, Clinton has expressly broken Commerce's grip on Atlantic. His declaration gives Interior (and other agencies) the authority to now dive in and designate undersize protected areas. Fully protected undersea areas, if the agency has a program to do so.

NOAA must now show the crown of Atlantic with Interior. This duet however, must, like King John, sign a Magna Carta of sorts, giving all the other federal agencies from NASA to DoD, the authority to propose and have designated Marine Protected Areas.

Specificially the Presidential Proclamation says: Each Federal agency whose authorities provide for the establish- ment or management of MPAs shall take appropriate actions to enhance or expand their authority and establish or recommend, as appropriate, new MPAs.

The Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior, in consultation with the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Science Foundation, and other pertinent Federal agencies shall develop a national system of MPAs.

Note the proclamation's descr iption of WHERE these MPAs can be designated was the "(b) Marine environment" means those areas of coastal and ocean waters, the Great Lakes and their connecting waters, and submerged lands thereunder, over which the United States exercises jurisdiction, consistent with international law."

This clearly includes America's Exclusive Economic Zone out to 200 miles offshore. "Marine environment" is a place where "the United States exercises jurisdiction, consistent with interna- tional law." Can it be done in the want of the efforts of the Clinton Administration? Time will tell.
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MARINE PROTECTED AREAS: A HUMAN-CENTRIC CONCEPT
by David Orrin

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES and Oceans (DFO), under the new 1996 Oceans Act needs to apply deep ecology to an actual environmental issue. The literature that has dealt with MPAs seems to appeal to human economic self-interest, such as how fishers can benefit. Yet fishers seem to feel that they have some proprietary local role, from which the public is excluded. It seems a stupid strategy to try and mollify fishers while trying to establish MPAs. In order to create fully protected, extensive ocean sanctuaries which are not undercut by fishing or fossil fuel interests there must be a new social base, including more than just fisher people. Conservation must raise an all-species perspective and oppose anthropocentrism.

The primary issue in any MPA discussion should be philosophical, trying to change how humans look at the oceans and their life forms.

Choices in life are driven by philosophy, although few of us think about our actions and philosophies are related. Those who support deep ecology believe that there has to be a fundamental change in consciousness of how humans relate to the natural world. This requires a change from an anthropocentric to an ecocentric perspective—seeing humans as a species within a superordinate status. All other species have a right to exist, irrespective of their usefulness to the human species. Humans cannot presume dominance over all resident species of life and see nature as a resource for our utilization. We have to extend the ethical circle outwards, towards the oceans and the Earth. All life is one.

The true conservationist, or Earth-citizen, must be prepared to oppose his/her own self-interest for the benefit of other creatures and their habitats. The justification for MPAs should not be one of self-interest. Protection of marine areas should not be based on which (human) shareholders about the loveliest in opposition. A fundamental question about MPAs is whether to appeal to economic interests or to rise above this, by promoting overall ecological and social interests.

A Marine Protected Area must mean full ecological protection from human exploitative interests, otherwise the term itself becomes debased. Degrees of restriction of the human use of an oceans area could be encompassed, using another term such as Marine Regulated Area, rather than using, and debasing, the term "protected area."

According to the Oceans Act, MPAs rest on an assertion of ownership over the internal waters, the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone. In a press release December 19, 1996, the federal fishing minister said the passage of the Oceans Act reaffirms Canada's sovereign ocean rights... "Supporters of deep ecology believe no one can own the Earth, whether from a state, individual or collective point of view. "

Awwarded ownership is ultimately a convenient social fiction deriving from a human society bent on enforcing a claim of control over other creatures and the Earth itself.

The Oceans Act is not based on deep ecology. According to this Act, Canada's Ocean Management Strategy (of which MPAs are a part) is to be based on support for the principles of sustainable development. This concept, which sanctifies continuous economic growth and consumerism, should not be accepted. We need to drastically scale back economic growth and consumerism not expand it. Mathis Wackernagel and William Rees, in their 1996 book Our Ecological Footprint, through presenting quite a human-centered perspective, point out that to live sustainably, we must ensure "that we use the essential products and processes of nature no more quickly than they can be renewed, and that we discharge wastes no more quickly than they can be absorbed." Moreover, they point out that if everyone on Earth had the average Canadian or American lifestyle, then three planets would be needed for a sustainable lifestyle for the world's population. The Oceans Act uses the word "resource" to cover non-human creatures living in the oceans. The automatic assumption that nature is a resource for corporate and human use is an indication of our total alienation from the natural world. It implies a human-centered, utilitarian world view and that humans are somehow the pinnacle of evolution.

The word "stakeholder" means anyone interested in MPAs, lumping together those who want to exploit the oceans with people who have ecological and social interests. It makes no distinction between, say, inshore fishers who have a long term personal commitment to living off the oceans, and oil and gas companies who pick up and move whenever richer fields are found. The concept seems to imply that out of the various competing interests, a lowest common denominator, general good will emerge. Ultimately, we are all stakeholders in a planet well-being sense, yet non-human stakeholders are not considered. In terms of MPAs, who has more at stake than the seals, the fish and the algae?

The Oceans Act says that its legislation upheld existing treaty rights of aboriginal peoples as outlined in the Constitution Act of 1982, under section 35. Translated, this means that a MPA can be subject to exploitation by aboriginal peoples. This puts ecology subordinate to human society.

The DFO seems to have replaced Parks Canada as the leading federal agency in marine protection, yet it has been intimately concerned with promoting corporate exploitative interests in fisheries policies. Put another way, the DFO does not question the assumption that marine ecology should serve the industrial capitalist economy. For Parks Canada, maintenance of ecological integrity was considered the first priority in park zoning and visitor use.

The nature of our capitalist society influences how we think about MPAs. I support protecting marine areas, but free of human exploitation. MPAs need to become a reflection of ecocentric thinking. The question is: Will MPAs be the beginning of a new ecological way of preservation or a subterfuge for the continued industrial exploitation of the oceans using greenwashing?

A step in choosing marine areas to protect is to assess all the stakeholders. Humans are one group—those with a direct economic interest being only a sub-group. After all, the term protected area implies protection from humans. The other stakeholders, who usually remain voiceless at meetings, are the marine animals, plants and other organisms. Their interests have to be given more weight than human concerns. MPAs cannot be just minor set-asides. We cannot have dead zones between them.

MPAs are not about creating wildlife reserves, because the nature of our society influences life inside these areas. Wider phenomena, like global warming, do not stop at MPA boundaries. Therefore a new global, marine vision is necessary. Why don't we set aside oceans giving them protected status and then have workshops and meetings about which small areas should be opened up for human exploitation, of course, done sustainably?

David Orrin, is coordinator of the Green Web environmental research group. He lives on an old hill farm in Nova Scotia, Canada, and engages in developing the left biocentric tendency in deep ecology.

The article above was published in the December 1999/January 2000 issue of the Earth First Journal (Vol.28, No.2). Please feel free to reproduce it, with due acknowledgment.

To obtain any of the Green Web publications, write to us at: Green Web, R.R. 1, Sabletown, Nova Scotia, Canada, B0K 1P0.

E-mail us at: greenweb@fox.net.s.ca http://fox.net.s.ca/greenweb/MPA.html

SALMON FRY RELEASED INTO SHEEPSCOT RIVER.
CAPTIVE WILD SALMON ALSO FREED.

In May, volunteers organized by the Sheepscot Valley Conservation Association released around 200,000 Atlantic salmon fry in the Sheepscot River. Warden, so young that they still have their yolk-sacs, the inch long or less young salmon were released in selected locations in the Sheepscot river and three tributaries -- the West Branch, Trout Brook and Choate. Those fry that survive through three years of parr-dom and smolt-hood will enter the Gulf of Maine, not to be seen again for two to four years. On MPAs the spanning imperative brings them back to the Sheepscot.

Earlier (January) 49 adult salmon were released from their lengthy incarceration as She蔡on's "salmon breedstock" back into the Sheepscot River. Welcome home!

Summer Solstice 2000

Aquatilfure fish pens, Blue Hill Bay, Maine. For stories related to aquaculture, see page 5.

Environmental activists across the globe are concerned about the impact of salmon aquaculture on natural ecosystems. In recent years, salmon aquaculture operations have become extinct. Impacts include genetic contamination, fecal wastes and other contaminants. Salmon are fed fish generated from ocean fisheries subject to over-harvest. Large, multi-national corporations operate pens in Canada, the U.S., Scandinavia and Chile. While public officials hold aquaculture up as an economic development tool, local residents see the taking of the public marine commons and a diversion of food sources from starved ocean ecosystems.
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A critique of Maine Logging Industry and the Bonded Labor Program: An Economic Analysis

Prepared for MDOR hearing, May 2nd in Presque Isle

By Mitch Landry

The PAC and the IRG panel conducted a study on the bonded labor program for the timber industry, and the discussion on logging labor in Maine. Although this is not a complete or detailed research, it does have some flaws. Some of the details (for example, figures on logger wages) have limited value because they were derived from studies and reports of a complex workforce. Some conclusions in the study are editorial opinions rather than statements of fact. In some cases, there are alternative opinions or editorial facts. In general, the study does not take into consideration the influence of political/economic power in the wood industry. It has been used to cut costs for landowners and mills at the expense of workers (who are often not unionized). In January, it was found that loggers' wages were unacceptably low at 1999 levels, but in 2000, inflation-adjusted wages had gone down 32%.

Despite the surplus of workers displaced by mechanization, employers are demanding lower wages. This is not a healthy trend as a whole in Maine. Maine paper companies are increasing their hourly wage by 30% per hour over the past year. The labor shortage has led to higher wages for workers. The rise in wages will not attract more workers, as skidder wages are currently low, given the level of hazard, hard work, hours from home, and necessary skills, and they are not competitive with wages for similar work in other states. The study did not determine what a reasonable wage should be for loggers.

While the bond program is not the primary cause of low wages, it is a contributing factor. The key benefit of the bond program is that loggers can offer a lower rate, take-it-or-leave-it wage. If domo is lowered, it is less than 25% of Canadian workers who will take this leverage represents an adverse impact on domestic labor. The bond program is a form of government price fixing that virtually eliminates competition. Unfortunately, the government has set minimum wages too low to remedy the problem.

Indeed, logger wages are well below what they would be in a true free market. Government should take a comprehensive approach that benefits loggers, their communities, and the forests as well as owners of land and mills. Potential loggers will not enter the logging workforce if they see low wages, diminishing timber supply, and increased competition, for better conditions. The current situation is an opportunity to take proactive steps to deal with a number of problems regarding labor in the wood industry.

While I will use some general conclusions from the study, some specific statements are more questionable. Here is a brief interview (pg. 228) that stated reliance on Mr. Brown for policy making is "worsening" due to small sample sizes and differing interpretations of their meaning. For example, I agree with all the statements, and I would not have recommended sample sizes for American loggers in percentage terms are even lower (pg. 149). Loggers have cut labor costs by mechanizing, subcontracting, and putting less emphasis on the whole process. This makes contractors more valuable — they must make payments, they must cut wood.

While profitability of landowners was up 1996 since the increase in productivity per worker went up 74% or real wages have fallen a decent 32% (pg. 138). "The trend in the wood harvesting industry in Maine is far more marked than the national trend" (my emphasis).

In subcontracting has created a class of workers who are not subject to protection such as WC, OSHA, PICA, or some compensation. This is a major social issue since few have major social impacts from these changes towards reduced wages and reduced power. The overwhelming majority of loggers and contractors, both downstate and upstate, "are in a sense driven to get into the logging business." The intergenerational chain which has produced loggers in the woods for perhaps hundreds of years may be strewn at the point of breaking." (pg. 190) (my emphasis)

The study cites complaints that it is increasingly hard to find skilled loggers — the average age of loggers is rising. The labor shortage is used to justify importation of workers is artificial. Despite a surplus of workers (dispelled by mechanics, mainly), most who want to hire workers argue that there is a shortage of skilled labor (pg. 138). The study does not do a good job of explaining this obvious paradox. The study should have potential contractors and parties did not see the study as harmless or neutral. Some contractors and loggers indicated the study is not taken seriously. It is not considered as important to loggers. The study concluded that there is only a shortage at the employer asking price. If Maine wages will not attract that level (which is non-negotiable) there are Canadian workers who will (pg. 193). This has already been demonstrated. Employers do not have to raise wages, so they do.

When employers were asked if they would raise wages 10% if it would end the labor shortage, most said they were unsure (pg. 207). The study's argument that raising wages will not attract more workers is flawed. The study argues: "Nor is there any indication that Maine workers require premium wages to work in the woods under remote conditions in jobs with relatively high accident rates" (pg. 77).

The study argues that the laborer pool is "inelastic" and will not respond to higher wages. (pg. 214). This argument is an example of the fallacy of being generous. The study concludes that the average logger has low elasticity does not mean that all loggers have low elasticity. The study neglects that some loggers have responded to lower wages by leaving. Some loggers have moved to other jobs (in other states/houses). Little competition between employers. The study refers to "the landowners' ability to transfer profits from loggers into lower wage workers (pg. 199). The study concludes that landowners have used their political/economic power to cut labor costs and thereby increasing overall medians of wealth. The study listed long-term changes in loggers' labor, laboring ability (pg. 154): Ending of compa- ny crews, Making unionization more difficult. Long-term effects on wages, benefits, and WC. Putting these responses into context.

The study concludes how contractors have little power to negotiate with landowners. Some (91%) are more than 90% of their wages (pg. 146) — mostly the same or lower. More contractors say profitability is a going down. Loggers say how many times can a loggers' squeeze from landowners and mills (pg. 146) — making the contract down to labor. Many landowners are going to CLS, where power of contractors to influence prices is lower.

because wages for construction, heavy equipment operators, and similar occupa- tions are in the area. Indeed, the study states that these other jobs have been in "low" in other states (pg. 77). The study does not entertain the possibility that there would be a "great depression" on these other jobs. Perhaps the wages for displaced loggers would consider finding work.

The majority of contractors said they are advantages to hiring bonds (pg. 199), but stated that wages are for explaining what the benefits are. The study rejected health care, exchange rates, and compensation as significant benefits (pg. 199). The knowledge that "the exchange-rate differential and the Canadian healthcare system are likely advantages for Canadian workers." We are not surprised that there is merit in view of these as matters of fairness, nor is it evident to us that their existence has had to more of a marginal effect on logging labor markets in northern Maine... (pg. 199) Yet the study gave very little information to back up this up. The major ben- efits of the program is bonds will work for Maine workers... Canadian workers will not. This is not theori- cal.

Most loggers are aware that the bond program is not the major cause of low wages. Factors contributing factors include labor shortage, timber per- ceed ownership, export of raw sawlogs, and low value added, and low wages fall off a cat as it leaves town. The study concludes that the bond program did have an adverse impact in the past and has a limited adverse impact now. Concerning the 1930s and 1970s, "Very likely the dominance of work" (p. 199). Canadian workers and workers during this period con- tributed to lack of opportunity and competition for work in this towns. (pg. 173)

The study admits that there is an adversarial wage structure. The study quotes John Valley, pg. 185, but dismisses it as "insignificant" compared to the entire economy of Aroostook County or the state. This is argument by dilu- tion — bigger impacts in small areas get drowned by smaller impacts in big- ger region. The study is not clear as to the implications of the finding that there is an adverse impact to American workers in the larger region.

The study argues that some foreman's wage was "shrewder" than OSW workers should "careful of what they wish for..." Because they might get it. (pg. 175)

The study emphasizes a number of times that loss of Canadian jobs was "likely" (p. 199). Because simplistic solutions might not work, the study recommends an attempt to solve problems or come up with real solutions. But they must be initiated by logging employers. Loggers have been facing a "real squeeze" on wages. Loggers have been facing a "real squeeze" on wages in Maine would make wages too many cycles for a contract.

Rates for feller-buncher operators in western states in 1998, for example, were more than 74% higher than Maine ($28.65 CA, $20.32 ID, $25.70 OR, $10.67 WA). The study does not examine how a change in wages might impact the cost of making lumber or paper, or the competitiveness of these industries. The study admits that loggers wages are higher in other states (Virginia, Oregon, Florida) than Maine (pg. 77), but dismisses this as an issue.

The study concludes that loggers wages are higher in other states (Virginia, Oregon, Florida) than Maine (pg. 77). The study concludes that loggers wages are higher in other states (Virginia, Oregon, Florida) than Maine (pg. 77). The study concludes that loggers wages are higher in other states (Virginia, Oregon, Florida) than Maine (pg. 77). The study concludes that loggers wages are higher in other states (Virginia, Oregon, Florida) than Maine (pg. 77).
What Country is This?
DOL Tells Allagash Loggers Why They Can't Make a Living
Large Landowners Skip Meeting

May 2nd, Presque Isle — The Maine Dept. of Labor chose the remote town of Presque Isle, on Tuesday May 2nd, to hold what they referred to as a forum to discuss the $100,000 study they commissioned Pan Atlantic Consulting from Portland and the Island Group to do on the viability of the now infamous Bonafide Bond Program. It was like one of those "what's wrong with this picture" scenes — what's happening here?

Looking around the tiny crowd, one saw a couple dozen loggers, a handful of union representatives, a dozen or so environmentalists from Naive Forest Network, the two communications directors, one state representative and staff from the County field offices of Collins, Snow, and Baldacci. At the front of the room was a square of tables (putting some backs to the "audience"), designated for the "Logging Subcommittee," a hand-picked group that Alan Hinesey, the director of Labor Statistics, counseled. Here, among the three loggers from the Allagash, the Contractors' Representative, three men from US Dept. of Labor and three from the Maine DOL, saw a collection of unused place cards stacked up and long stretches of empty space. Facing the audience were the authors of the Pan Atlantic Study and Mitch Lansky, forestry expert and environmentalist, who were invited to share his critique of the study.

Who was missing? Landowners. Contractors. The DOL making profits and depleting the resource. The ones who have nothing to lose.

Things were off to an ominous start when Ray Lopez from the US DOL admitted that he didn't know why they were unable to obtain the presence of Canadians who belong to the Paper and Chemical Employees (PACE) union (the only local organizing in the Maine woods) and a figure that was key in determining whether or not the union had the right to establish wages below prevailing rates, as the union claimed.

Hinesey read a letter from the US DOL that contradicted an earlier letter that said that if the union sets a wage below prevailing wage, and it has a majority of Canadians in the union, that wage cannot be paid to American workers — the higher prevailing wage must be paid to them. The new letter not only changed the US DOL's position 180 degrees on this, but also stated that whatever the union determines to be the wage scale will be the prevailing rate for all woodworkers, no matter how low.

Then PACE representative Lucien Deschene stood up and admitted three counts of gross consequence: one, it was he who had withheld the numbers from the DOL because he felt they would misinterpret them. What he seemed reluctant to spell out was that nationally, the union has a very low number of Canadians, but locally it is 80%, a figure that would invalidate the low wage scale that the union supports.

Two, he admitted that for the past 15 years he believed that the union had agreed to a higher wage scale and he now realizes it has been below the prevailing rate that has been established, a fact the Allagash loggers have been trying to get across for many years now. And three, he admitted that there is no hourly minimum to protect against depressing wages. The prevailing rates are based on prevailing practices, so no matter how bad they may be.

The pair who authored the study ran quickly through their pieces, reviewing the methodology and findings. They concluded that in fact there is a labor shortage and therefore the Bonafide Labor program, which had been created to overcome labor shortages during WWII, should stand. From the audience asked them how they drew that conclusion. They blushed. "Do you really want to know? Well, we used the Bertrand Game and the Cournot Game developing equations based on inverse labor supply elasticity — is that what you wanted to know?"

Mitch Lansky put the spin of simple logic to the question: It is clear that the labor shortage is created by wages so low that families have been forced to leave the place they have called home for generations. It is a labor shortage created by and in the dominant landowners. He pointed out, from the study's own findings, that in the past 25 years, the large forest landowners have realized a 169% increase in profits, while Maine loggers have witnessed a decline of 32% in real wages.

At one point in the meeting, when it became obvious that government officials were all passing the buck on taking responsibility for doing something to help the loggers, some audience members suggested that the answer was for legislators to force the audience asked them how they drew that conclusion. They blushed. "Do you really want to know? Well, we used the Bertrand Game and the Cournot Game developing equations based on inverse labor supply elasticity — is that what you wanted to know?"

Mitch Lansky put the spin of simple logic to the question: It is clear that the labor shortage is created by wages so low that families have been forced to leave the place they have called home for generations. It is a labor shortage created by and in the dominant landowners. He pointed out, from the study's own findings, that in the past 25 years, the large forest landowners have realized a 169% increase in profits, while Maine loggers have witnessed a decline of 32% in real wages.

At one point in the meeting, when it became obvious that government officials were all passing the buck on taking responsibility for doing something to help the loggers, some audience members suggested that the answer was for legislators to force the

The Allagash loggers responded that to the extent that they organize, they get black listed and replaced by Canadians. If Canadians organize, they are not invited back to work in Maine. Sandy Brelsaw, representing the Professional Logging Contractors of Maine, said that her members can't even talk about certain subjects in public meetings for fear of losing contracts with the big landowners. Lansky responded to this line of talk by asking the audience, "Where are we? What country is this? Is this America?"

At the end of the day, Alan Hinesey announced the formation of the subcommittees to deal with some of the issues raised by the general committee. One issue is to come up with prevailing rates for the dominant machinery in the woods, such as grapple skidders and feller bunchers. For all the years of the bond program, the DOL has only set rates for chainsaw and cable. Canadians have always been able to bring in the prevailing equipment with no government regulations.

The legislature is forming a committee that will also address import of Canadian labor and export of raw woodlot cuttings. Able to Studying Labor and Labor Issues Relating to the Forest Products Industry. The Allagash loggers have seen studies and committees over many years. The studies collect dust on the shelf. In the mean time communities are in decline and so are the forests that sustain them. — Nancy Galland

ers coming to work at the Kittery Shipyard, the United Aircraft plant at Berwick, and wood products plants in Bethel. They are simply politicized because of the international boundary. One hears no talk of protests over these cross-border movements of workers.

This argument is more editorial than objective reporting, and reflects a bias. This argument might not be so well accepted in California or Arizona in regard to Mexican workers.

Wage levels, government programs, and laws are different in other countries. International borders are not the same as state borders — except, perhaps, for multinational corporations in which pay rates are set and expect their government to benefit them, with the exception of people from other countries at their expense. The bond program is a form of government market intervention in a competitive market.

The study states that the "H-2 Summer Solstice 2000 program is an effort in government price fixing in a labor market." (my emphasis) The study authors support that role: "We support the idea that employers be required to pay hourly minimum wages or their equivalents..." (pg. 217)

The key problem (not focused on by study) is that the government is fixing wages at levels that are too low. Real wages are falling. The study argues that since free-market prices could be 36% higher (pg. 210), which is still 10% lower than real wages in 1975 — which were low enough so that loggers won't strike. Even if modest increases in wage were not sufficient to attract enough workers to totally eliminate a labor shortage, they are not useful to stop this slide in real income. Many workers are putting in 60 hours a week or more (plus transportation time). In this job dedication, or an attempt to take enough to live on?

The ratio of bonds to domestic for covered labor was actually higher in 1998 (27 to 1) than in 1975 (19 to 1) despite the program (pg. 176) (though this is going down). The DOL has not set prices for the most widely used equipment — grapple skidders and feller bunchers. This is a serious deficiency of the program. Government should take a comprehensive approach that benefits loggers, their communities, and the forests they depend on, as well as those who own the land and the mills. If the government is going to set prices to correct for a severe market imbalance — it should find out what a fair price would be given levels of skill and experience and travel. Loggers don't just need skill in cutting trees with minimal damage. They also need to pay forestry technicians (there is very little making of trees, so loggers must decide what trees to cut). Mechanics, Businessmen, Aware of all laws, regu-

Story Continues on Page 23

guidelines) but are making less. Loggers should make more than burger flippers in Portland — but many do not. Investment in loggers should be seen as an investment in better forest management and increased future revenues. Logging is supposed to be part of forest management (a topic hardly mentioned in the report). Avoiding mention of forest management in a discussion of logging is like avoiding discussions of sex in a high school dealing with an epidemic of teen pregnancy.

Government studies show that over last 15 years, the level and quality of logging has produced some serious problems: A decline in inventory. A shift in timber types, with an increase in acreage of seedlings and plantings. A decline in hardwood
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Greenbacks and Green Goals: Economics & Environmental Forestry

by Mitch Lansky

Can landowners manage for biodiversity and still make a decent economic return? That was the major theme around which Tom Montague, the Dean of the University of Maine and attended by around 150 participants. The conference was sponsored by the Forest Service, Inland Fisheries and Game Board of the University of Maine, the Maine Forestry Council, and the University of Maine. The goal of these conferences is to answer the following questions:

What do we know?
What can we do with what we know?
What can we still do to learn?

Conference speakers represented a mix of landowners—industrial, timber management inventories, local family-owned, public, and smaller private. Labor, concerned citizens, and forest commission representatives were not represented. This lack of representation made the conference unbalanced, even with the mix of landowner types.

Forest Economic Primer

David Field, a professor at the University of Maine, started the conference with a primer on forest economics. He stressed the "four Ps.": Is it possible (biologically)? Is it profitable (economically)? Is it permissible (legally)? Is it practicable (technologically)?

Dr. Field stressed that forest economics deals with efficiency at accomplishing goals. Some of these goals include intangibles such as aesthetics. He briefly went over basic concepts, such as: returns on investment, the cost of money, time, real (inflation-adjusted) prices, unpriced values, taxation, risk, multipliers, and opportunity costs (the cost of not investing the same money elsewhere).

He stated that timber goes did not have the luxury of learning about or discussing some of the more controversial sides of forest economics. We did not discuss the appropriate discounting future benefits that we will never enjoy or the problem of externalizing costs to others in the present or future. We did discuss the market itself—which is dominated in the northern landowners who can dictate artificially low prices for labor and paper mills that can set artificially low prices for purchased wood. We did not discuss the perverse incentives that result from tax breaks and subsidies.

These market "imperfections" can have a big influence on prices and, ultimately, on how much wood products people consume. If there is no full cost accounting and commodities are artificially cheap, then labor and forests can be cheated. Increased consumption (egged on by advertisements) would reduce timber output.

Only occasionally did we have a glimpse that the market might not be completely "free." Consulting forester, David Parker, had a number of complaints about environmentalists being a major threat to timberland owners in Southern Maine. He also was concerned that the price of pulpwood is so low that it might be better to leave it on the ground then to chip it to the mills. David Field earlier explained such pricing when he rhetorically asked (and then answered), "Why don't paper companies pay more for their pulpwood? Because they don't have to."

Reserves and Global Timber Supply

The keynote speaker was Brian Schnepf of the Ohio State University. He presented the results of a computer model of the forest economy. He and his colleagues projected timber supply, productivity, and prices over the next 130 years to determine the impacts of taking forests out of production for reserves. His model predicted that there would be some negative impacts, including increased use of plantation forests, and increased demand of marginal or currently inaccessible forests. Tropical plantation forests, he emphasized, were the most productive and the best investment.

A question from the floor wondered whether, if environmental labels were powerful enough to proportion of the world's forests into protected reserves, would they have adverse impacts on the economic impacts that the model was projecting over the next 130 years? Schnepf admitted that the model did not take that possibility into consideration.

Certified Green

Blake Brunson, chief forester for JDI Irving (JDI), made the case that certification is necessary and increasingly popular. He surprised and disarmed the audience with his admission that there is a lot of room for improvement in industrial forestry, including the need for more openness to concerns of other stakeholders. When asked if smaller owners should see a premium for wood delivered to mills he responded, "Not from us."

When asked how his company could justify increased costs from certification when the market gives no premium, he said that JDI would have done these practices anyway because, "it's the right thing to do." He implied that (besides the costs of the audit) there were no real extra costs. Other landowners (Chip Bessey and Roger Milliken), however, could not justify the increased costs, and are not currently pursuing certification. Brunson's insistence that JDI would be doing this anyway contrasts with the company's resistance to accept the guidelines of the regional Forest Stewardship Council's Maritime standards committee. The committee recommended that certified landowners wear themselves from biocides. JDI, instead, has been playing hardball with the committee to make it back down from recommendations that Irving does not want to follow.

Family Legacies

Chip Bessey and Roger Milliken gave the perspectives of families owning large acreages. In both cases, the lands they own also garnered homesteaded earlier in the 20th century. Bessey is managing by selection and not seeing very good returns. Costs are going up faster than revenues. His value is on the land, but, unless he sells off parcels, he won't have that value in his pocket.

No one mentioned an economic analysis done by the U.S. Forest Service of a range of cutting methods done on the Penobscot Experimental Forest in Bradley over the last 40 years. This study, by Paul Sendak, showed that both productivity per acre per year and managed forest value are higher for shortcycle selection cuts. The key assumption of this study is that the forest will be managed in perpetuity. Maybe if the Bessey's persist and value improves so will his returns.

In response to a question from the audience concerning the risk of having too much inventory, Milliken made the point that the forest is both the product and the factory producing the product. If he wants more value in his product, he has to ensure that the forest is intact. His method of managing his farm's 100,000 acres is to use shorthand to 80 year rotations, cutting in small blocks (15-25 acres). In 80 years, he wonders if large blocks of later successional forest (older than 100 years) will be on his land.

Both Milliken and Bessey stressed the importance of passing on the land ethic to the next generation. Without this, they felt, the land ethic might do to cash. They jokingly suggested that they instill this ethic through brainwashing.

Public Lands

On public lands, managing returns on investment is not the dominant goal. Government agencies have to manage for many values, and because of the degree, they have to set the example of good forestry.

In the case of Jessen Bissell, who is managing the Baxter State Park, the example of exemplary forestry is a prime mandate. He ensures that most of his workers have a job. He is trying to work with minimal damage. Bissell says he knows his costs, but he does not know yet what the benefits will be in the future.

Managers for the White Mountain National Forest and in the public reserved lands have additional mandates for recreation. On these state and federal lands, there are areas set aside (or will be set aside) for recreation. Bissell has Baxter State Park abutting his management area. Unlike Bissell, these other state and federal land managers are currently not paying per diem wages to workers, but are putting most of their cutting areas for bids. For both state reserved forests and White Mountain National Forest land, new plans are in process, and policies on labor and export of logs may change.

Timber Management Investors

One of the most detailed presentations came from Steve Morgan, of Landvest. Morgan represents a wide array of investors in the forest industry. Most try to make a maximum of 7-10% returns on their investment with a time horizon of 10-15 years (shorter when the market is right). He also mentioned "whole- sellers" who look for much quicker turn around with higher returns and a short-term "wholesalers" liquidators. Morgan attributed environmental values to all his clients, including "whole- sellers" who, he added, are benefiting society by offering house lots to those seeking land.

Morgan also mentioned that his private investment comes from more than just timber investment. Investors look also at land values, prices in the moment (sawlogs are increasing in value faster than inflation), and "buying smart." Investors also learn to take advantage of tax breaks and easing.

Indeed, some recent investors have had a good percent of their purchase price paid back in publicly-funded easements (mostly around beauty strips) that allow them to do whatever they were going to do anyway. He suggested that smart investors can get good returns and still do environmentally sensitive management. He cited the Landvest investment at Arten Pond as an example, but neglected to mention that Lowell sold most of the land to a logging contractor, so all environmental forestry should be for more than just 10 years.

Environmental Investors

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) recently purchased 185 acres from the land that bars Vickery and her colleagues are not sure what to do with. Vickery and her colleagues have been heavily cleared. She called these clearcuts, "openings," much to the amusement of industry foresters. She mentioned that there is evidence of lots of fires in the region and wondered if clearcutting might be an appropriate mimic of such natural processes. Industry foresters smiled even more.

The Nature Conservancy has a big debt that it must pay off in five years. While some of this money is coming from fund raising, some will come from cutting timbers. 90% of the land is reserved as reserves for now. Mr. Vickery did not discuss whether the TNC will use Canadian labor to cut the wood or whether the company will export raw sawlogs to Quebec. It certainly would be ironic if Maine loggers blocked the border to Quebec to protect management practices of an environmental group.

The Nature Conservancy, along with green-certified companies like JDI Irving, can do a good job, but the real question is whether the public will care.

Industrial Forestry

Industrial landowners are making money for their shareholders and managing sustainably—and if you don't believe it, try it. Steve Morgan is shooting for as 5-15% return after taxes. Traditionally, mills have used their lands to "stabilize prices" for purchased wood. Now, they are trying to get rid of their timberlands and buying all their wood. He said that the company would have to save some money for payroll and also showed charts indicating very low proportions of sawlogs, especially in hardwoods.
CONFERENCE...

He neglected to mention that timber quality has declined after half a century of industry management. He, like Dave Parker, saw the bigger risk coming from environmentalists and regulatory changes. "It's OK to want things," he told the group, "but not OK to take them." He made a strange argument that he knew the public had rights to clean water and wildlife, but somehow this got tuned around to mean that when the public tried to protect these rights it was somehow taking away creation. He said, "Give us incentives," instead of laws or mandates. This argument, to some, is akin to giving forest managers the tools to beat one's wife. Organized crime calls it "protection." Balch also suggested (in questions to other speakers) that holding a lot of jobs leads to higher risk. This contradicted Milliken's analogy of the fishing job, perhaps, explaining the lowering this risk aversion philosophy, inventories on industry land dropped precipitously from 1982 to 1985. Growth rates on industry land have also been very low. All in all, the companies removed the forest factory along with the product.

Risk is an important topic for forestry investment. It is not clear how efficient regulations that only stop the most egregious practices increase risk. Heavy cutting that leads to poorly-stocked stands increases risk of windthrow. Excessive residual stand damage increases the risk of lowered productivity and lowered future values. Diameter-limit cutting that removes large, more windfirm, more vigorous trees, increases the risk of windthrow, insects, diseases, and lowered productivity.

Depleting "natural capital," such as habitat specialists, or soil productivity should not be computed as "income." Ironically, shoddy forestry not only increases risks to the residual forest, but also increases the risk that the public will be more serious about effective regulations.

Plum Creek recently bought a million acres of the former Cape Cod lands. The company is now one of the biggest forest landowners in the US. Most of its revenues come from milling lumber. According to Peter Lehner, only 3% of revenues come from land sales. The company does not have mills in Maine and is trying to use the quarter million acres to move into that market.

Lehner told the group about all the company's environmental principles and its adherence to SFI (Industry's Sustainable Forestry Initiative). After he talked about their internal audit by Price Waterhouse Coopers, a questioner in the audience wondered about some news he heard recently about conflicts of interest in that company. Another audience member stated that some executives at Price Waterhouse had caught investing in the stock they were auditing. Lehner assured the audience that this was not related to forest auditing.

Steve Young, a biologist for Fraser, talked about his company's use of a monitor to protect wildlife habitats. When industrial foresters were asked if we knew enough to take action to protect biodiversity, Si Balch said no, and asked biologists to give managers more information. Young, however said we'll never know everything, but we do know enough now to do something.

CONCLUSION

The conference, unfortunately, was not adequate to give a rounded picture of forestry economics. Too much time was taken up with public relations and too little discussion of the key issues. One of the key issues should have been past performance, rather than future promises. In the past, short-term forestry became the long-term mode of behavior. We are left, in many cases, with poor stock- ing, poor quality, shifts to lower-valued, shorter-lived species, millions of acres of seedlings and saplings, and many damaged trees. It will take time to fix this mess. Status, high grading, and habitat destruction are a cost that this and future generations will have to pay for one way or another. But who pays the costs and who gets the benefits? That was not the topic of the conference.

Summer Equinox 2000

Champion Forester Testifies on Erosion

On the following pages, we offer a mix of information and opinion that may or may not be sufficient for you to evaluate the truth of the claims made in the Clear Water Act rule changes proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency. Here is a portion of the written testimony of the ERB of Champion forester Joel Swanson. We selected those portions of his testimony that go best with the photos above and on following pages that illustrate some of the conditions on Champion lands now held by the state of Vermont. Pictures are of course a selection from reality, so I urge you to form your own evaluation of Champion summer in northern New England, particularly on those corporate lands open to day use. Decide for yourself. Thanks to Apricot Brands for these photos.

"We, and the communities we live in, depend directly on the health and productivity of our forests for our livelihood. One of the core values and responsibilities of forestland ownership is water quality. We take our responsibility for water quality seriously. Our ownership in New Hampshire, 170,000 acres just north of here, includes the headwaters for the Connecticut and Androscoggin Rivers. Both important bodies of water in this region."

"In our region, silviculture is not a significant threat to water quality. Champion's forest management activities in the northeast region include harvesting, forest management road construction, and other silvicultural activities to improve the health and productivity of our forests (planting, thinning of young stands, herbicide treatment to control competing vegetation, etc.). All of these activities have planning and monitoring components that address water quality."

"In Maine, we abide by state regulations which govern the amount of wood we can remove in a streamside management zone. Best Management Practices developed with the state government, for example, how we build roads, how we build culverts, and how a logger can drive a skidder through the woods during harvest so that it does not create a channel that might cause soil erosion into a stream."

"Ongoing monitoring of our property by state natural resources agencies and informal monitoring by members of the public also assures that if a water quality concern arises, we are aware of it."

"SFI [The Sustainable Forestry Initiative] requires that we establish riparian protection measures for all streams and lakes."

"In Maine and New Hampshire, we participate in an SFI process for the public to raise concerns about forest practices that appear to be inconsistent with SFI principles. By calling 1-888-SFI-GOAL, people can identify a site-specific area of concern, such as water quality, and be assured of follow up on that operation by a forester that will focus on education and change in behavior, if necessary."
Fiction Vs. Fact

How EPA's TMDL and NPDES Regulations Pertain to the Timber Industry

From the Clean Water Action Project

On August 23, 1999, the National Forest Protection Agency proposed changes to its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program (40 CFR 122). The proposed changes have been misrepresented by industry and others as an attempt to regulate non-point sources of pollution from the timber industry. It's time to set the record straight.

FICITION: EPA's proposed revisions to the NPDES regulations remove the Clean Water Act TMDL exemption for forestry activities.

FACT: When Congress wrote the Clean Water Act 28 years ago, it did not include an exemption for forestry activities. In 1983, EPA decided to require NPDES permits for some components of forestry operations, while giving most silviculture activities a specific regulatory exemption from point source controls. The Agency has now wisely decided that an automatic exemption is no longer appropriate. In only a limited set of circumstances, EPA would consider requiring silviculture activities that meet the statutory definition of a point source, such as those with pipes, ditches or other conveyances, to get NPDES permits. Those circumstances are described below.

FICITION: EPA's proposed revisions would mean that all forestry activities would require pollution control permits.

FACT: While EPA's proposal would remove the automatic regulatory exemption for forestry point sources, it does not require permits for any forestry activities or even authorize permits for more than a limited set of forestry activities. In fact, the proposal lays out a series of tests that would have to be met before EPA would consider requiring a permit on a case-by-case basis. The waterbody receiving the discharge has to fail to meet water quality standards. Then the forestry operation in question has to be a serious source of the pollutant causing the impairment. Thirdly, the state has to completely walk away from the TMDL process for that particular water — either by failing or refusing to develop an adequate TMDL that will meet water quality standards, thus shifting the burden to prepare a new TMDL. That's the idea behind the Clean Water Act's TMDL program to find that the activity in fact includes a "point source" under the Act (defined as a pipe, ditch or other discrete conveyance from which pollutants may be discharged). As you can see, this is a proposal that can only be used in severe circumstances — where point source discharges are significantly impairing a waterbody. And in cases where states develop the TMDL, EPA has to work closely with up to the states to whether the state wants to require a permit. The bottom line is that if states and timber operations are getting the job done to protect water quality, no permit will be required.

FICTION: Existing Best Management Practices are adequate for reducing pollution, therefore silviculture activities that contribute to pollution in an impaired waterway shouldn't be subject to TMDL regulations.

FACT: EPA's proposed changes to the NPDES regulations only apply to forestry point sources of pollution. See first and second paragraphs. Fact/discussion above.

For non-point sources of pollution, where BMPs are demonstrated as effective in reasonable and cost-effective terms, nothing more would be required under the TMDL program. But let's face it: perimeter runoff is the largest remaining source of pollution today. Forty percent of recently surveyed waters are unfit for fishing, swimming, aquatic habitat or other uses. And nearly 10 percent of pollution is from non-point sources of pollution. BMPs and the backstop of the TMDL process are the only programs in the Clean Water Act for reducing non-point source pollution. The federal government provides millions of dollars in grants a year to help implement BMPs. While these programs should be better funded, a TMDL is the safest and most efficient way to allocate responsibility for reducing pollution among the non-point sources of pollution. A TMDL would outline where voluntary measures would be needed for non-point sources, in addition to enforceable controls for point sources, in order to meet water quality standards.

FICTION: The TMDL program requires non-point sources of pollution to be permitted.

FACT: Non-point sources of pollution are NOT required to obtain federal permits. The TMDL program does not allow EPA to require NPDES permits, or any other kind of permits, for non-point sources of pollution such as runoff. Indeed, the power of the TMDL program lies in the fact that it requires states to draw together all the tools in the Act and coordinate their clean-up watersheds. States develop TMDLs for impaired waters, using watershed specific data to determine sources of pollutants and a fair way to divide up responsibility among polluters for lowering water pollution levels. The program requires that if a state decides to allocate pollutant reductions to a non-point source, there must be a plan put in place to assure the reductions will be made. It's a decision made up of voluntary programs, state regulatory programs or many other means allowed by law. A state could decide to target grant money and staff expertise of the Act's 319 program, state Best Management Practices (BMPs) programs, and other approaches to reduce pollution.

A recent court decision emphatically supported the fact that the Clean Water Act requires the TMDL program to address non-point source pollution, outside of permits. In Pronoligo v. Marcus, the United States District Court found "...as to whether TMDLs were authorized in the first place for all substantial and evident water pollution, there is no doubt. They plainly were and remain so today — output required to the source of pollution." However, the TMDL program address point and non-point sources of pollution differently - with NPDES permits for point sources and through planning and coordination of existing voluntary programs for non-point sources.

For more information on the TMDL program and forestry and water quality, contact the Network at 202-289-2392 or visit our web site at www.cwn.org.

ATLAS OF AMERICAS POLLUTED WATERS
http://www.epa.gov/owow/tmdl/atlas/index.html

A NEW REPORT from EPA that includes maps showing waters within each state that do not meet state water quality standards. States listed these waters in their most recent submision to EPA, generally, in 1998, as required by section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. This provision of the Clean Water Act requires a "total maximum daily load" or TMDL for each listed water. Over 20,000 waterbodies across the country are identified as not meeting water quality standards. These waterbodies include more than 300,000 miles of rivers and streams and more than 5 million lake acres. The overwhelming majority of Americans — 218 million — live within 10 miles of a polluted waterbody.

A key feature of the 1998 lists of polluted waters is that, for the first time, the agency provided computer-based "geo-referencing" data that allow consistent mapping of these polluted waters. In order to better illustrate the extent and seriousness of water quality problems around the country, EPA prepared this Atlas of State Impaired Waters that identify the polluted waters in each state. The maps are color coded to indicate the type of pollutant causing the pollution problem. And, bar charts show the types of pollutants in each stream/tiver/coastal miles, and lake/covet/wetland acres.

Source:
<http://www.epa.gov/OW/new.html>

NEW HAMPSHIRE COMMENTARIES ON EPA'S PROPOSED TMDL RULE CHANGE

A Prepared & Circulated By New Hampshire Timberland Owners Association 54 Portsmouth Street Concord, NH 03301

"Additional federal regulation of [forestry] activities would only add an unnecessary regulatory burden to the forestry industry without any clear environmental benefit." — Harry Sansom, Director of the NH Department of Environmental Service's Water Division in a January 20, 2000 letter to the EDB Comment Clerk

"The proposed rule is misguided. It creates an ominous and uncertain federal regulation over agriculture and forestry management. The regulations of these activities on private lands belongs with the states, not the federal government." — Phillip Bray, Director of the NH Department of Resources of Economic Development's Division of Forest and Lands in a January 20, 2000 letter to the EDB Comment Clerk.

"We believe that the proposed rule changes are onerous in scope and could force land out of productive forestry and into development. Forcing landowners to choose between healthy forests and selling for development is not good for New Hampshire's environment, or for the nation's environment. For the sake of the forests, we recommend that you not proceed with this rule." — Susan Neches, Policy Specialist for the Society for the Protection of NH Forests in a January 19, 2000 letter to the EDB Comment Clerk.

"Regrettably we have a few people in our town and surrounding communities who do not believe a tree should ever be cut...These individuals will welcome your proposed rule, especially the opportunity to bring legal action against landowners for perceived violations. It would only take a couple of well-publicized cases not only to cut down on present lands, but also to cause our forests to lose more private lands. More private land now open to the public will likely be posted against trespassing." — Whitefield Tree Farmers, in a January 27, 2000 letter to the EDB Comment Clerk.
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impaired watersheds.

We can be justly dubious of regulatory timidity, which seems intent on permitting bacteria out of the food system by clinging down on small farms (wherein levels of nutrition that the capitalized can afford) and promoting irradiation and other forms of dead feed. Any permitting system on the other hand can become just that: a permit is obtained for an offending behavior by those who can afford lawyers or equipment. Hopefully conditions can be imposed that mitigate, but perhaps the offending behavior should not occur at all — thus the nature of compromise. The man-in-the-street argument is that regulation falls on the heads of the small while the offenders go scot-free. I tend to agree, in that the weight of our system is definitely behind the large, and that we have no political organization that articulates for the small scale.

Instead, we have the phenomenon of corporate giants effectively using the fears of small scale land and business owners to ward off government. The Whitefield hearing was little different, to my mind. I sat near the Champion representative, whose write-up I procured, and whose parties confer oddly with those practices on the ground I am familiar with. Champion has added great value to much of its North Country land, much of it now closed streets run in old rail trails, small ponds sit in skidder wheel-wells.

But Champion was only one voice at the field hearing; more numerous were the small landowners who, whipped up by the New Hampshire Timberland Owners’ Association’s state of disinformational releases, attacked the idea of federal regulation of forestry operations. Forest commissioners Ron Lovaglio and Phil Bryce of Maine and New Hampshire were there, and the usual suspects from Vermont who routinely denounce attempts to regulate logging (while usually being well-positioned to influence the outcome of any regs that do sneak through)—thus the nature of compromise.

I was surprised by the EPA’s Charles Fox, and his stout defense of the proposed rules changes. I think (how about Maine?) and that impaired watersheds tend to correlate with good monitoring. I recall James Cornin’s talk on her BMP survey work, shortly before her untimely death, and her observation that the lack of BMPs to do damage is “consistently under-estimated in our topography.” All of this is a signal that the NH should be aaspire modest: since extremists on both ends oppose a solution, it must be good.

Well, no. The attacks by extremists often raise real problems that we have to deal with, (at the same time that they weaken the thin façade of ideology we can dispense with). If small landowners have a confidence problem with governmental regulations that ought to be addressed — and given the prevalence of small landowners in the timber industry, and the bodies disbursing conservation monies (often to themselves) it would seem the mechanisms for protective, cooperative steps exists. If environmentalists are saying we need greater monitoring, and more effectiveness of enforcement, I do not think we are well-served by those who say enviros should “moderate their demands.” Sometimes the extremes are looking at the same problem. In the case of the Clean Water Act, the common thread does appear to be that the big boys are getting off scot free. Meanwhile, the apparatus to keep rural people misinformed — and that is founded on trade groups funded by big industry and buttressed by a local press that too often faithfully prints half-truths as fact, while editorializing in heroic defense of the little guy.

So, two cheers for these TMDL rule revisions, but more to the point, let’s get out of the field and start making changes where we need to, and where we can’t be duped by press releases.

ECCOLOGICAL IMPACTS OF ROADS

from the American Lands Alliance “Reawakening the Waterway” THE FEB. 2000 issue of Conservation Biology includes 8 articles focused on the ecological effects of roads. Copies can be obtained through Blackwell Science Inc., 888/661-5800 or online at http://www.combo-rica.edu/edGis to the Journal section and scroll down to the Blackwell online journal website.

Several papers discuss the “road effect zone.” The consensus of these articles is that there are noticeable ecological effects from roads that extend at least 100 meters into the forest. These effects include influences on soil organisms, large mammals, also plant growth, birds, amphibians, wetlands, understory species, etc.
ADIRONDACK PARK REPORT

by Peter Bauer

THE ADIRONDACK PARK is a model for people living amidst wild areas in a way that's usually mutually beneficial to both. Of six-million acres in size—bigger than the State of Vermont—the Adirondack Park contains a checkerboard of publicly owned Forest Preserve lands (2.5 million acres), which is marketed as wilderness, and 3.5 million acres of private lands. 2.5 million of which are commercially managed forests. The Forest Preserve is protected as lands "to be forever kept as wild forest" in the state constitution. This is the tightest wilderness protection in the U.S.; no timber harvesting, strictly limited use of motor vehicles. Created in 1885, lands in the Forest Preserve represent 85 percent of the total wilderness lands in the eleven Northeast states. 130,000 people make their homes and livelihoods in the Adirondacks spread throughout better than 100 communities.

All land use in the Adirondack Park is managed jointly by the State of New York spread through various agencies and local governments. While there are many complaints all around, the Adirondack Park works extremely well and is not only a place where people and wilderness systems coexist, but represents a successful model for large-scale landscape protection. Each issue the "Adirondack Park Report" details the most pressing recent issues facing the Adirondack Park.

PATATA SIGNS LANDMARK ACID RAIN LEGISLATION

On May 24, 2000 Governor George Pataki signed the Acid Rain Pollution Credits Trading Bill, which sets into law punitive roadblocks for New York electric utilities that sell excess sulfur dioxide pollution allowances to companies that use them in 14 states upstream of New York. This law was developed as a response to the frustration of New York political leaders and the environmental community about the failure of the 1990 Amendments to the Clean Air Act to decrease acid rain. While sulfur levels have fallen sharply across the U.S. as a result of the 1990 Clean Air Act, higher levels of sulfur continue to fall on Adirondack waters and forests. Nitrogen oxide and mercury levels have also increased in the Adirondacks over the last 10 years.

This legislation sets into law fines against any utility operating in New York that sells a pollution credit that are used and deducted from roadblocks that are stacked in 14 states upstream of New York. These states are Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Kentucky, Indiana, Wisconsin, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. Pollution credits are allocated to utilities for each ton they reduce sulfur emissions below federal standards. These credits are then sold on the open market to older power plants that find it cheaper to buy credits than to switch to cleaner fuels or modernize energy producing or pollution abatement equipment. Pollution credits are sold on the Chicago Climate Exchange Market and have recently been an area attracting investors. Marine Midland Bank, which owns no utilities, recently purchased 100,000 tons of pollution credits.

Under this new law, the State of New York will not only provide a New York utility gains from sale of credits to a company that uses them in one of the 14 designated states. Fines would be imposed equal to the amount of the sale (monies would be used to promote development on non-polluting energy sources). Each pollution credit is assigned a serial number when released and this law creates mechanism through which would be tracked through the initial sale, and any subsequent resales, until the credit is used. The law begins immediately. There are currently over 700,000 tons of pollution credits being held by New York utilities and more are released every year.

As a state, New York is a net exporter of pollution credits. The Midwest states—Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky and Wisconsin—all import credits. It's also interesting to note that as a state, New Hampshire imports credits. Of the more than 20 power utilities in New York, all but three meet federal emission standards and are thereby awarded credits to sell on the open market.

This law by itself will not reduce the amount of sulfur dioxide that hits Adirondack lakes and forests each year. But it will make it a little harder for utilities that rely on pollution credits to obtain them. This law is significant, perhaps the most significant action in the fight against acid rain, since the 1990 Clean Air Act, because it changes how the federal clean air act works. In essence, New York has acted unilaterally to force changes to the federal act by designating where a specific pool of credits can and can't be sold. Lawmakers in Vermont, Connecticut, and Massachusetts have made inquiries to New York lawmakers about enacting similar measures in those states.

GOVERNOR SIGNS BILL TO STOP USE OF MTBE

Governor Pataki also signed new legislation to ban the use of MTBE (methyl tertiary butyl ether). California has also banned MTBE, which was authorized for use under the 1990 Clean Air Act. The Act forced companies to reformulate gasoline to increase the oxygen content so that it burned more cleanly. While MTBE is an effective gasoline oxygenate, it is a suspected carcinogen and is responsible for polluting groundwater supplies. MTBE is blamed for contaminating water supplies in many urban areas in New York because it leaks from underground gasoline storage tanks. Combined New York and California actions may lead to a national ban on MTBE.

LANDS UP FOR SALE IN THE ADIRONDACKS

A HALF DOZEN PROJECTS totaling over 200,000 acres are up for sale across the Adirondack Park. The Pataki Administration has slowed its pursuit of land acquisition in the Adirondacks after the 139,000-acre purchase of lands and conservation easements from Champion International Corporation.

After this purchase the Administration was sued by the Property Rights Foundation of America and several of the hunting clubs on the Champion lands. Several counties in the Adirondacks also passed resolution condemning this purchase. The Champion deal had followed closely on the heels of the 15,000-acre Whitney Little Upper Lake purchase, the 19,000-acre Long Pond easement, and the 12,000-acre Niagra Mohawk deal. While the Pataki Administration is taking some "time off" from the Adirondacks, important opportunities are being squandered.

Foremost among these is an opportunity to purchase a conservation easement over the 105,000-acre Donnar tract in Clinton and Franklin counties, in the northern Adirondacks. Donnar has owned these lands since the 1960s, and these lands have been in continuous forest management for more than 100 years. In the late 19th Century these lands, like much of Clinton County, were heavily harvested for the charcoal industry. It was clearcut and torn up. Pictures from that era show a landscape that looks like the surface of the moon. In the early 20th Century, these lands were consolidated by mining interests with speculative interests in those lands that operated mines in Lyon Mountain and Dannemora. In the first several decades of this century the clearcut lands regenerated and in the 1960s the Donnar purchased the lands from Republic Steel.

Donnar, based in Cornwall, manages extensive holdings of Crown Lands in Canada and has a number of mills on the St. Lawrence River in Canada. Donnar is currently in the final stages of completing a Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) sustainable forestry certification and will be the first industrial landowner to do so in New York, and one of just a handful in the Northeast.

Donnar has long been interested in selling a conservation easement to the State, but has been frustrated that its lands don't possess highly valuable lakes, like Little Tupper Lake, or wild rivers, like the St. Regis and Grasse Rivers on the Champion lands, that make for a visible public advocacy campaign. The environmental community has backed the Donnar deal and instead, referring to these lands as "plain vanilla woods". Well-managed forests and maintaining huge swaths of lands in perpetual open space make this an attractive deal. The property, spread across six towns, is intermixed with Forest Preserve inholdings (to which there is no public access), but has relatively few waterbodies and no rivers. It's dominated by northern hardwood upland forests and about half the property is leased for recreational hunting camps.

The hunting camp issue was a major factor in the controversy over the Champion deal. With the Champion deal, hunting clubs were grandfathered in for 15 years on lands where the state purchased conservation easements that included both the recreation and development rights. The clubs leasing from Donnar organized among themselves and deployed a delegation to meet with Donnar representatives and local political leaders (one club member has
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manneled the district office for nearly three decades for 34-year incumbent Senator Ron Stafford). Only half of the Domtar lands are leased and the clubs and fishing companies that make the conservation easements that includes only the development rights and forestry conditions on areas that are leased and easements that include public access on non-leased lands.

If the hunting club issue can be worked out this deal enjoys strong support from local government. All of the Domtar lands are in one of the Preferential Forest Tax Law Program, 480 or 480-a, which provides about a 75 percent reduction in all local taxes. The State cannot give itself in its own reduction, so if the state were to buy an easement, full taxes would be paid on the Domtar lands, split according to values on rights held between Domtar and the State. This deal should start to take shape by the end of 2000.

Two other deals for conservation easements involving much smaller tracts are also being negotiated by the Adirondack Nature Conservancy. The first involves a 5,000-acre tract in Long Lake owned by the Boy Scouts and called Cedarslands. This tract surrounds McRorie Lake, a large undeveloped lake which connects with Mud Lake and Big Brook. Big Brook Connects Slim Pond, part of the 36,000-acre Whitney Tract, with Long Lake, and was a major artery in a popular canoe route 100 years ago. McRorie Lake, via a short portage and paddle through Mud Ponds, offers a great new camping opportunity for this canoe trail. The Cedarslands deal has the support of local government because the lands are currently tax exempt because they are owned by the Boy Scouts. If the state purchases the development and recreational rights, which would constitute about 75 percent of the land's value, the Town of Long Lake stands to receive a windfall in local tax revenues. The deal would also open up the property for public access 10 months of the year. While the central core of this property, some 200 acres, where the Boy Scout buildings, ball fields, and barracks are located would remain an exclusive area for the Scouts, the remaining 5,000 acres would be open for public use during the months, September through June, when the Scouts are not in residence. This tract also borders Forest Preserve and International Paper Company lands.

The second tract is in the Town of Duane. It involves a mixture of fee lands for the Forest Preserve and purchase of a conservation easement over a 5,000-acre tract owned by the pension fund of the Chemical Medical Company. This tract has extensive frontage river on the Middle Branch of the St. Regis River, from where it passes under state Route 30, on the outlet of Mercess Lake. This lands borders the lands recently purchased from Champion International Corporation on the St. Regis, the Town of Owenson Clary. This deal matches up similarly: the river corridor would be protected as fee lands; the upland areas by conservation easement. This deal should also move ahead by the end of the year.

STATE FUNDING FOR LAND ACQUISITION

The Legislature passed a budget just about a month late, which for New York is close to on-time. Land acquisition funding was allocated at over $60 million. The land list of eligible projects is extensive and its total costs could eat up the $60 allocated many times over.

After this year, there will only be $5 million remaining from the $150 million for land acquisition in the 1996 Bond Act. Each year, between $30 - $35 million is allocated as part of the Environmental Protection Fund (EPF) for land acquisition. With the Bond Act spent, the New York environmental community searches for ways to expand the EPF next year.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT THROUGH BEAUTIFICATION

Two years ago Senator Ron Stafford addressed a conference on Adirondack tourism and complained about the ramp-

ugliness of Adirondack hamlets. He talked about the need to clean up and make more attractive Adirondack hamlets. Local government officials responded that they weren't going to pass ordinances to force other businesses or residential landowners to clean away the junk cars, put up attractive signs, maintain fences, among many other issues. But they said that they would welcome funding to undertake a range of projects. Stafford responded to the challenge to, in short, make the most developed areas of the Adirondack Park, its hamlets, more hospitable and welcoming. Using his muscle as head of the Senate Finance Committee, Stafford established a $2 million fund to provide grants of up to $25,000 for beautification projects in the Adirondacks. Adirondack communities have queued with projects.

Peter Bauer is the Executive Director of the Residents' Committee to Protect the Adirondacks based at North Creek, in the central Adirondacks.

HERBICIDE WEBSITE

OVER THE YEARS OF FIGHTING forestry herbicide applications, the Herbicide Project has received numerous requests for information about herbicide (and pesticide) use in general. This has caused us to consider what is the most effective way to provide information to consumers interested in researching and eliminating herbicide use. We are putting together a website which will provide up to date information and resources for local organizing efforts and would appreciate your feedback and help!

Our current list of links include:

- Commonly used herbicide products- status of current research; inert ingredients
- Legislative/legal updates
- Forestry herbicides- products used; status of current research;
- Regulatory climate and use in ME and NH;
- Aerial photos taken one year post-spray;
- Status of bio-monitoring (or lack thereof) in spray areas
- Aquatic applications- products used;
- Status of regulation and use in ME, VT and NH
- Right of Way applications- products used;
- Status of regulation and use in ME, NH and VT

We'll be contacting people who are doing this work individually for any information they'd like to share, and permission to use them as contact people. In the meantime, please e mail us @ homosee@ncia.net, or fax/call (603)922-5544 with your helpful suggestions or information.

THANK YOU!
Daisy Goodman/Tom Obomsawin Herbicide Project

VERMONT LOGGERS' GUILD ANNOUNCES SUMMER WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

The Vermont Loggers’ Guild announces the following events from June through October. These workshops will afford both Guild members and anyone interested in participating the opportunity to exchange ideas about local forest-related issues in Northeastern Vermont. Please call Barbara Alexander at 802-586-2494 or email baforest@sover.net for further information. All events by donation; bring a brown bag lunch. See you there!

JUNE 14 — URBAN FORESTRY in Greensboro at the Town Hall with logger and dendrologist Tracy St. Louis. General care of residential trees and related issues.

JULY 22 — WOODLOT TOUR from 1-4 pm in Greensboro with logger Kerry Smith. Topics include long-term management strategies regarding future site productivity, wildlife habitat protection and species diversity.

AUGUST 19 — MANAGEMENT of woodlots before and after major wind events, with loggers Chris Katsenbach & Steve Moffatt. Morning and afternoon tours of two woodlots, 10-2.

SEPTEMBER 9 — TWO SAWMILL OWNERS, Joel Carrier and John Hancock, discuss value-added sawmilling and certification at Hancock Lumber Co. in Morrisville 9am-1pm.

SEPTEMBER 30 — MANAGING A HEALTHY sugarbush, with Adam Parker, sugarer, and Scott Bailey, Hubbard Brook soil scientist. Tour of 3 different bushes in the Barton area, 10am-3pm.

OCTOBER 14 — ANNUAL RED HOT CORN Roast & Guitar Picking Shindig, bonfire, etc., 6 pm on in Wheelock.

THE GUILD IS ALSO CO-SPONSORING on the weekend of October 21-22 a regional conference on Water Quality & Forestry. Other sponsors include the Vermont Leadership Center and the Northern Appalachian Restoration Project. Details to follow in the next issue of The Northern Forest Forum.
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THE USDA FOREST SERVICE TIMBER INVENTORY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

by Mitch Landy

DURING 1993, the USDA Forest Service and New Hampshire's Division of Forests and Lands released preliminary data from the 1997 timber inventory of New Hampshire's forest. Phil Bryce, New Hampshire's State Forester, found the results, "encouraging," in part because cut is less than growth and the inventory is increasing. "This indicates that we do have a real opportunity to manage our forests sustainably into the future."

The Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA), however, also shows that there is reason for concern in some regions of the state and some landowners. In particular, forest industry lands appear to have been poorly managed, leaving poorly stocked lands with low volumes. Since a certain percentage of private woodland owners do no cutting at all on their lands, the cut/growth ratio for the lands that are actually managed may not be as favorable as it appears.

New Hampshire's forest

New Hampshire is the second most forested state (by percentage), after Maine. Fifty-eight percent of all tree volume is in hardwoods, but the most abundant tree, by volume, is the white pine. New Hampshire, rather than Maine, could be called the "Pine Tree State." In Maine, pine isn't even in the list of top four softwoods.

Top trees by volume in New Hampshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardwoods</th>
<th>Softwoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red maple 25%</td>
<td>White pine 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red oak 16%</td>
<td>Hemlock 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar maple 15%</td>
<td>Red spruce 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper birch 9%</td>
<td>Balsam fir 13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly half of New Hampshire's forest area is in the northern hardwood type. Less abundant, but still important are white/red pine, spruce/fir, and oak/hickory types. New Hampshire's forest industry has a different distribution of forest types than the rest of the state. It has almost no oak or hickory types and very little pine. Most likely has northern hardwoods and spruce/fir, (see chart 1). These forest types have changed in distribution since the last survey (in 1983). Spruce/fir and aspen/birch have declined, while pine and oak types have increased.

The forest in New Hampshire is maturing. Fifty-two percent of timberland area is in saw-timber stands—an increase of over 15% since the last inventory. The area of seedling/sapling stands has also increased — by nearly 54%. This is an indication of heavy cutting or other forms of disturbance.

Forest ownership has shifted since the last survey. Forest industry land declined by 200,100 acres. In contrast, state public forest increased by 164,550 acres and National Forest by 53,900 acres. Private forests declined by 321,800, leading to a total net loss of forest land of 290,000. Despite the loss of forested acreage, there was an increase of total volume of 6% since the last inventory.

In contrast to Maine, which barely has around 5% of its land in public ownership and a little more than 1% of its land in "reserved forest" or "wilderness", 20% of New Hampshire's forest is publicly owned (12% is in National Forest), but actual "wilderness" is still small — only around 3% of forest. New Hampshire's 149,000 acres of reserved forest is barely more than its 114,000 acres of rights-of-way.

PROBLEMS WITH DATA

Numbers on a page have the aura of "science" and "truth." New Hampshire's forest inventory is a statistical construction based on a limited number of samples. On finer levels (such as the county level, landowners types, forest types, or species), the reliability of the numbers diminishes.

The FIA data represent a snapshot of a forest that is continually changing. To be truly useful, it would be good to have data stretching back many years to chart the direction of change. Unfortunately, there is little such data available. The current inventory does have some measures of change (cut and growth figures), but some of these figures are suspect as to their accuracy.

For example, according to the FIA, landowners cut white birch at nearly 13 times the rate of net growth. According to the data, the National Forest cut of hardwood at a rate nearly 5 times the growth (even though cut of softwoods was well below growth). The FIA lists only 4,000 acres of clearcuts in the entire state of New Hampshire between 1983 and 1997. All of these clearcuts, according to the data, were in the aspen/birch type. I talked to a manager of Champion who assured me that most of their clearcuts were in mixedwoods or spruce-fir — and statewide there were obviously more than a few hundred acres of clearcut per year as implied by the FIA data. Besides the questionable data, there are also mislabeled charts, that further erode confidence.

New Hampshire's forest industry

Despite the above mentioned problems, the data are consistent in showing problems with Forest industry land in New Hampshire. For example, of all landowner types, the forest industry had the lowest volume per acre (chart 2), the lowest percentage of sawtimber, the highest percentage of seedlings and saplings (chart 3), and the poorest stocking (chart 4). The forest industry was the only landowner type that cut more than growth. The only county in New Hampshire where cut is greater than growth is Coos, which has the highest concentration of industry lands.

It seems odd to have the forest industry, which overcut its forests and left many stands understocked, promote itself as being an exemplar of sustainable forestry. It is possible that these statistics are from the bad old days, and the industry has turned over a new leaf. We won't know until the next survey, however.

CONCLUSIONS

New Hampshire's forest is, in general, in better shape than Maine's. There is more wood, and thus more potential for management. There are some problem areas in Coos County and on industry land. There are also problems, apparently, with liquidation. The many thousands of acres that were converted from timberlands do not show up in forest statistics. New Hampshire, with its higher level of public ownership than Maine, has greater potential to set up a representative array of ecosystem reserves.

This potential is like the two roads diverged in a yellow wood, that Robert Frost alludes to. New Hampshire can look down one path (Maine's) and see an unworkable future. Maine's timber inventory has declined; there are no restraints to stop overcutting, understocking, or liquidation; and it has a small percentage of land publicly protected as "reserve." New Hampshire could take the path less traveled by and make a difference.
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Silvicultural Practices of the Past

Excerpted from Company Forests; Large Private Holdings in the Northeast, by
Shirley was assistant dean of the New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University.

OWNERSHIP OF LARGE FOREST holdings in the North is distributed among individual owners, families, investment companies, pulp and paper companies, lumber companies, mining companies, and some others.

The large private holdings are concentrated in Maine, which has 31 owners who control more than half the total area in large holdings in the North. Protection of forests against fire is good in almost all cases. The exception are forests owned by coal-mining companies, where hazards are high, local interest low and public cooperation meager. The degree of protection attained, however, is determined more by the work of the State fire-control organizations than by special effort of individual owners. The companies that have their own fire-control organizations are the exception in the North.

The cutting practices currently applied over most of the large holdings leave much to be desired. Many properties that are operated on essentially a sustained-yield basis have cutting standards best designated as "chopper's choice." Some companies attempt to apply diameter limits and a few mark trees before cutting. Where only extensive management is practiced, marking of individual trees is not always essential—particularly in areas and stands that are subject to windthrow and among tree species such as aspen and jack pine, that have relatively short lives.

Yellow birch, although subject neither to windfall nor early decadence in a closed forest, declines in vigor on areas selectively logged. Over much of northern Maine, where roads are lacking, hardwoods are still unmerchantable. Serious losses are occurring from birch dieback and beeche scale. The death of old trees will, however, release spruce and balsam fir that will produce a valuable crop.

Case studies of a few owners will be presented.

Those selected are not the only ones with good forestry programs, nor have they necessarily the best programs. Some were selected because they have some distinctive feature in their program. Information has been gained from published articles, letters, interviews with company foresters, and conversations with other persons familiar with the programs.

The first group of examples includes the individual, family and investment holdings.

That type of large forest holdings is found primarily in the unorganized towns of Maine, where the remoteness and lack of transportation restrict operations to extensive, rather than intensive, forestry.

The Coe and Pingree estate, built up in the late nineteenth century, at one time included more than a million acres. The founder, David Pingree, insisted on restricting cutting of spruce to trees 14 inches in diameter and larger. The practice was abandoned soon after the turn of the century, when pulpwood cutting came to the fore. The heirs still own a large area of the land. Management practices today are on an extensive basis, but the property continues to yield periodically a substantial income to its owners.

Gifford Pinchot and Henry S. Graves, among the first Americans to be trained scientifically as foresters, drew up management plans in 1898 for Nehasance Park and the Whitney Preserve, two Adirondack properties that were held primarily for recreation. The owners, however, early became interested in scientific forestry as a means of making the properties self-supporting.

Careful timber estimates were made, type maps were prepared, and contracts for cutting spruce trees to a 10-inch diameter limit were drawn up. The white pine, considered overmature, and cherry were cut without restrictions. Other hardwoods were not merchantable. Yield studies indicated that a cut of the same intensity could be had at the end of 36 years. Nehasance Park was logged first in 1898 and 1899 and again in 1915 to 1930. A third cutting is now under way. It is difficult to make an accurate comparison between actual and anticipated yields. In the first place, the management plan as prepared by Mr. Graves was not fully carried out. The cutting intervals were shorter than he had expected and the diameter limits were lowered. Furthermore, defective hardwoods were not removed and they expanded following the removal of merchantable trees. The volume of softwood and the quality of hardwood declined because of logging practices.

Operations on the Whitney Preserve have always been somewhat more conservative, and the forest is somewhat better in quality. On the whole, both properties have fared better than average Adirondack land. Cutting policies have varied with markets, however, and [with] the economic requirements of the owners more than they have with the silvicultural requirements of the forest. Neither property can be considered an ideal example of applied forest management, but the properties have returned substantial incomes in the past and give every promise of continuing to do so in the years ahead. Because much of the hardwood timber is now merchantable for pulpwood and because prices of timber have increased considerably during the 50 years, today's cash income from the property equals that of the past, even though the volumes being harvested now are considerably less.

The Dead River Co. and the Eastern Corp., manufacturers of paper, recently concluded a 10-year renewable management agreement on a sizeable acreage of land. It requires diameter cutting limits as follows: Balsam fir, 6 inches; spruce and hemlock, 10 inches; pine, 10 inches for pulpwood and 12 inches for sawlogs. Large pine and large hardwoods suitable for saw timber, veneer, and novelties are reserved by the Dead River Co. Cutting may not exceed three-fourths of the calculated growth over any 5-year period. Areas are selected for cutting with regard to maturity, protection of forests against fire, insects, and disease, and in a manner that will insure reasonable silvicultural control. Past management of the Dead River Co. holdings has been conservative, so that properties cut over now contain more timber than when acquired.

The properties are to be developed intensively by building all-year gravel roads and encouraging industries that are necessary to get higher returns from the properties. Complete utilization from the land is possible through markets for all commercial species that are growing on the land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume per Acre by landowner type</th>
<th>in cubic feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Volume per Acre
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NH Timberland Owners Association Outraged Over Timber Industry Insults
(From a Press Release from NHTOA, May 30, 2000)

The NHTOA today applauded Forest Service Chief Mike Dombeck for apologizing for the harassment of timber and timber-dependent communities found in the Roadless Area Conservation Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

A section of the statement reads, "Logging and millwork are not an inter-generational way of life for all participants..." and "timber communities have built their way of life for over a century." The statement went on to say, "Even reasonably prosperous timber-dependent communities are among the least prosperous rural communities, having high rates of unemployment, high rates of population turnover, high divorce rates, and poor housing, social services and community infrastructure."

According to the Forest Service, "Many people enter the wood products industry because it provides opportunities to earn high wages without having a high level of education. For these people what is at stake is not a traditional lifestyle and occupational culture, but rather an accessible route to a middle class lifestyle. If equivalent jobs were readily available these individuals would be happy to take advantage of them."

In a May 15th letter, Dombeck said that he has "a great deal of respect and admiration" for those who make their living in the forest products industry. "If there is anything in the roadless DEIS that implies otherwise, I apologize and will ensure it is corrected in the final roadless area environmental impact statement."

"No ifs, ands, or buts about it, this is an insult to the hard-working Canadians and women and families in that industry that contributes $3.9 Billion to New Hampshire’s economy every year," said NHTOA’s Executive Director Eric Kingsley. "It is this type of arrogance that gets in the way of New Hampshire citizens—through the congressionally mandated forest planning process—and not Washington bureaucrats should be deciding what the future of the White Mountain National Forest will be," said Kingsley.

"If the Forest Service’s Washington headquarters needs to have it pointed out to them that the people who work in New Hampshire’s woods may be offended by their sentiment, then they should not have unilateral control of the future of logging on the White Mountain National Forest," Kingsley continued.

"Many of the harvesters who work on the Whites are third and fourth generation loggers. They take pride in doing their job well, and their grandparents supported the creation of the National Forest to assure that their (sic) would be good paying jobs, and a sustainable timber base in the future," Kingkley pointed out.

Hampshire. Besides, the allegedly insult-
ing comments from the Forest Service apply to timber communities all across the nation, not just NH.

Below are a few of the most pertin-
ent items culled from the DOL study.

- Unemployment in timber com-
munities in Maine is 5.5 times higher than the state of Maine average. (pp. 54-
55)
- Loggers are rooted in their com-
munities, but are forced to leave their communities to find work. (p. 60)
- 68 percent of the Maine loggers who responded to a survey from the DOL study said "they would not encour-
ge their children to enter logging." (p. 72)
- Loggers receive half the wages of mill workers. (graph on p. 85)
- "Our survey reveals that twice as many US workers as Canadians receive health insurance benefits as their employ-
ers. Nevertheless, the overall number receiving such benefits is low." (p. 90)
- One in six of our interviews, a logging contractor noted that his workers are working for the same wages in current dollars as they were 20 years ago. (p. 124)

The market power shifts to whom ever controls the supply of logs. This is the landowner. One hint that the land and timber are the scarce resource is the divergence of price paid to land and individual investors willing to undertake independent ownership of these resources for the first time..."[T]here is no bargaining power for workers."

The study repeats this point over and over again. The mills and landowners put the screws to the contractors who then squeeze the loggers.

-Wages in Maine for "timber and wood products (including wood harvesting), mill and sawmill worker total average wages C1973 and 1997..." (p. 137) In 1997, the real wage of wood harvesters (loggers) declined by 31.8% in Maine. "This occurred despite a productivity gain of 74.4%..." (p. 138)
- "[l]andowners exploited their control over the supply of logs through large increases in stumpage rates (28%). In addition, the landowners’ ability to transfer profits from contractors was fur-
ther facilitated by the transition to a new (CLS) ['Contract Logging Services' between landowners and mills] contracting system. As a result, the landowners have..." A footnote to this statement adds: "...most contractors argue that the cost savings from lower workman compensation rates were ultimately transferred to landowners through increased stumpage rates yet lower CLS payments." (p. 138)

There are many other interesting statements in this study showing that the Canadian bond program (imported bonded Canadian loggers) does depress wages and labor standards. "Note: In 1997, NH imports 40 bonded Canadian Loggers to Northern NH, because, industry apologists maintain, you can’t get American loggers to work..." (p. 138)

-Walors running mechanical forestry equipment should be earning $14.00 - $16.00 per hour instead of the $8.00 - $10.00 they now earn. Landowners have col-
cluded to depress prices contractors and loggers receive. "(Comment from the 'Contractor Survey' and the "Worker Survey" done by the DOL study, see pages 278-280)

- "In the next 5 years I will lose many all-around loggers. Most loggers stop at 60 years of age. No new loggers because it does not pay, and the oldsters are not making it."

Let us return to Kingsley’s real message: the Forest Service has indeed insulted and stereotyped loggers, and is therefore unqualified to make decisions affecting national forests such as the WMNF. Now, if the National Forest Service Draft EIS are true, I presume this means that the Forest Service is qualified to make decisions regarding national forests. This seems to be the drift of Kingsley’s logic, but I’m no philosophy major, he was.
We Have An Opportunity
for Wilderness
for Restoration Forestry
for Sustainable Communities

What it will take is your support

The Northern Appalachian Restoration Project, a 501 (c) 3 not-for-profit educational organization, proudly publishes The Northern Forest Forum six times a year. We are also proud to have supported the activism of some of the region’s outstanding grassroots activists over the past 8 years. Collectively, they have helped shape a progressive environmental agenda for the region, kept pressing issues on the front burner, and acted as important resources for other community activists concerned with forest practices, biodiversity protection, and sustainable communities. Pamela Prodan, Mitch Lansky, Ron Huber, Barbara Alexander, Daisy Goodman, Jamie Sayen: diligent, tireless workers who see the big picture & have brought to the community level their initiative on the promotion of an ecological reserve network, marine wilderness, low impact forestry, and the elimination of herbicides from forestry. The Coastal Waters Project and the Vermont Loggers’ Guild are only two projects associated with this collection of activists.

With your support we can keep these folks going. We can ONLY do it with your support!

HOW YOU CAN SUPPORT

We Welcome All Support. Your subscription to the Northern Forest Forum, $15/year, defrays postage and printing. Membership in The Northern Appalachian Restoration Project can be had for any sum over $15; and that portion is tax deductible (contributions over $250 will receive a receipt). BECOME A RESTORATION PROJECT SPONSOR: Consider sponsoring one of our projects for one month, with a basic contribution of $1500 or more. We can put you in touch with any of our activists if you would like to learn more about what they do. Members will be invited to our next general meeting this fall.

PLEASE LOOK FOR THE RETURN ENVELOPE IN THIS NEWSPAPER & MAIL IT WITH YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO — NFF POB 6 LANCASTER, NH 03584

BECOME A MEMBER OF THE NORTHERN FOREST’S LOWEST SOCIETY: Contributors of $200 or more will receive a T-shirt emblazoned with the emblem of the Mycorrhizal Society, founded by Barbara Alexander and other forest activists. It is your opportunity to articulate the virtues of mycorrhizae to curious members of the public. And the shirts are handsome, too! IF YOU WOULD LIKE A T SHIRT, please send $22 and specify Small, Medium, Large or Extra Large. Hats are available for $15. You will get many questions about mycorrhizae, so we send an info. sheet, too.

Buy BEYOND THE BEAUTY STRIP: We have a few copies of Mitch Lansky’s encyclopedic dismantling of industrial forestry myths. These are signed copies and several are in the rare edition that contain typos that drive Mitch simply crazy. Send your check or money order for 20 dollars and specify that you wish to buy a copy of BEYOND THE BEAUTY STRIP.

This is our only major fundraising advertisement in The Forum this year. Please consider a donation. Thank you!