VERMONT LEGISLATORS NIP AT CHAMPION DEAL

A rear-guard legislative effort is underway in the Vermont Legislature's House of Representatives to chip away at the Champion land deal. Specifically, legislation has been pursued that would prevent the watered-down wilderness area of 12,500 acres from being managed as forever wild. In these pages, we have already expressed the opinion that the Champion deal had an initial flaw, based on a calculated and at least rhetorical exclusion of Wilderness by deal architects from what was being proposed. The legislature should have been aware that this was the case and that a reserve was likely, and desirable. Better to have debated then than now.

But since legislation is proposed and may at this time have passed the House, the onus of a fair debate is now on those legislators who seek to enshrine existing camp leases and forever logging on the state lands. Why? While the cause is wrapped in nativism and accusation against flatlanders, even while being led by outlanders, there has been little or no evidence of the alleged Vermont tradition of fair-minded consideration of either the facts or the ideas behind reserves.

One young man who spoke at the Island Pond listening session on the West Mountain pointed out that in his graduating class from that town, not one individual is employed in the woods. He went on to ask that portion of the audience hostile to a small wilderness area how they proposed to get together with those supporting it. Opponents to the reserve from outside the immediate area have no compunction about playing a divisive, us and them argument, and have shown no real interest in extending olive branches. Why? Could it be they are all about self-interest? Legislators from the area, (uh...some born "elsewhere"), persist in treating local supporters of the reserve as outliers and conspirators, rather than citizens worthy of representation. Cogged newspaper reports play the story as locals versus enviros, and apparently always will.

Hopefully, the Vermont legislature does contain a few worthy supporters of reserves, of wise and balanced public policy on public land. What is clear however is that as much as we hear stories of how Northeast Kingdomers think this and think that, there is more recognition on the local level than in the Statehouse that the job base has shifted, the woods are beat up, and pure protection makes sense.

WHY CONFUSE US WITH THE FACTS?

We've looked for some examples of constructive reaction by local leaders to the Thomas Power's economic impact study of the proposed Maine Woods National Park. Other than a few positive letters to the editor, we haven't found any. That's too bad.

What that study seems to demonstrate, in abundant detail, is that as a provider of employment, the Maine woods is failing and will continue to do so. It is unfortunate that response to the study has determined to react to it as propaganda, rather than a case built on facts. It is one thing to argue with it, but to dismiss the study without reading it?

Too often, the leadership in rural communities across the region suffers from either a misplaced nostalgia for an old industrial dream, or a belligerent defense of a steadily declining, shifting status quo. The people of this region deserve better from their elected representatives. One student of regional history recently lamented to us that, in his reading of past journals here, there was in the 19th century a greater appetite for events in Maine this summer have demonstrated that public purchase of land is in the long-term the best protector of public values. Mega-easement deals, where used indiscriminately, misallocate resources, sacrifice in any time, and can erode the notion that landowners have no responsibilities, other than what they are paid for. Private purchase of large blocks of forest will inevitably reduce access, increase liquidation and fragmentation. Default logging practices will continue to erode the economies of forestry.

Meanwhile, defenders of forest biodiversity have been making the point all along: the link between economic and ecological health is fundamental. Ignoring one is ignoring both. Time to shed our ignorance.

Cover Art — Magnolia Warbler (Dendroica magnolia) by Gabriel Willow

This is one of the most characteristic and abundant songbirds of our northern woodlands. It is misnamed, as its typical breeding habitat is regenerating boreal spruce/fir forest, not a habitat in which magnolias occur. The first specimen of this species was shot in a magnolia in the south during migration, and the name stuck. Like other warblers, this species breeds in temperate forests and migrates to tropical areas from southern Mexico to Honduras for the Winter. Many other families of birds follow this pattern, including many shorebirds, hawks, curlews, swallows, flycatchers, viros, thrushes, tanagers, sparrows and buntings, and blackbirds and orioles. Neotropical migrants, as these birds are known, are of particular conservation concern, as they are sensitive to impacts both to their breeding grounds in northern forests, and their wintering range in tropical forests, as well as migration routes in between. The breeding pair of Magnolia Warblers is shown at their nest in typical spruce/fir habitat. Below, an immature Magnolia Warbler is shown in the tropical forest where they winter. I find it remarkable that these species are able to adapt to such different habitats and thrive in each.

Opposite: Blue-headed Vireo
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A NATIONAL PARK FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE'S PITTSBURG LANDS WOULD DIVERSIFY LOCAL ECONOMY

(This letter was c/o to the Northern Forest Forum and is re-printed by permission. It was addressed to Mr. David Houghton of the Trust for Public Land, principal in the B/Pittsburg deal.)

Dear Mr. Houghton:

My name is John Jahoda and I am not a resident of Pittsburg, but I have roots in Pittsburg that go deep. I spent my summers growing up from when I was about 7 on my grandfather's farm in Pittsburg and during my 50 some years of spending summers and occasionally parts of the fall and winter in Pittsburg I have observed a great deal about the Great North Woods. My Grandfather's land is now the "Johnson Memorial Forest" and I have a small camp along Back Lake Brook where I spend part of the summer. I have a Ph.D. in mammalian ecology and I have been involved in a long term research project on the diversity of the northern forest for several years. I am currently a professor of Biological Sciences at Bridgewater State College in Massachusetts.

All that I have observed over the past 50 plus years is nicely encapsulated in the chart that appears on Page 31 of the Northern Forest Forum fall 2001 issue. This chart shows the unsustainable fire/recovery practices that have resulted in the current state of affairs in this northern tip of New Hampshire. My wife and I spent a lot of time in the woods, exploring, fishing and hiking. I have seen what is shown in this chart first hand. We have observed massive clear outs, having walked and driven into these areas. This summer we observed the final sorry chapter as Interstate-93 passed. We were able to see how the even smaller remnant stands remained. The result is a forest which cannot support a viable timber or logging based economy. This is the simple and sadly unavoidable fact. I read in the paper statements that the forest in the "best shape it has ever been in." I don't know what forest this person was looking at, but it is certainly not the one I have spent my time in over the past 50 plus years.

I also observed the rhetoric and the passion of the local people. It appears that some people are still confusing their hearts and not their minds. They are undeservedly trying to retain a way of life that can no longer be sustained. The timber companies have repeated the cut clear mentality that striped the land at the end of the previous century as shown to the extreme left of the chart and we have entered the new century in pretty much the same place that we were in 1929. It may be a good thirty years before a viable timber economy can return to the area. I seriously doubt that there are any timber companies willing to wait that long before seeing a return on their investment.

For me, time to time is in the last twenty years I have mentioned the idea that the best thing for the town would be the establishment of a Northern Forest National Park. This idea received with enthusiasm. I have also spent a great deal of time traveling during the past 40 plus years. I have been to the Amazon and studied black caiman, studied marine mammals in the Caribbean and gray whales off the California coast. I have spent a great deal of time in national parks both in the US and in other countries and I have seen first hand the tremendous benefit of having a national park in the back yard can have on local economies. It is not all good, without controls you can get a Gatlinberg, Tennessee. But with good planning you can get a very active and viable tourism based economy. You don't even have to go that far afield. The economy in the town south of the West Mountain Wildlife Management Area, the state's black bear headquarters, is doing very well.

It is only a matter of time before people will realize that this can happen to Pittsburg. Pittsburg would be the establishment of a Great North Woods National Park. I don't know if this is even a remote possibility given the political climate at the local, state and national level, but it may very well be the best long term option for the economy of the northern part of the state.

The eastern part of the US has a large population and very few national parks. Most national parks are out west, having been established after the east was already populated. Public lands, under the control of the federal government, are a great asset to local economies everywhere I have seen them. As you know there are major management controversies regarding the use of some public lands in the West. But National Parks can produce a viable tourist based economy and a viable economy is something that the Northern tip of New Hampshire desperately needs. If the state and federal government, in their DNA of Maine coyotes. Paid certified snarers provided the carcasses. Although not the purpose of the study, it provided an opportunity to see how well Maine's best snarers were doing in regard to technique and the humane dispatching of coyotes. An experienced snarer, who knows how to set the lethal wire correctly, allows a coyote to struggle for a few minutes. The coyote then passes through the snare as though it closes in around its windpipe. What the data revealed was shocking. Sixty-three percent of the 94 snared coyotes didn't die, a quick, humane death. Instead, to quote from the records, hemorrhaging was evident in most of the coyotes' swollen heads. Their eyes and mucous membranes were bloody, their lips split and their teeth broken from trying to chew their way out of the snare. There were broken limbs resulting from long struggle. And in many cases, because the coyote wasn't even dead when the snarer returned, it was clubbed to death. (State law requires that snares be tended within 48 hours.)

For More Information & What You Can Do, Please Turn to Page 15
Open Space Institute: Supporting Working Forests and Ecological Reserves in Northern Forests

New York, New York—Dec. 13 The Open Space Institute (OSI) today announced four grants to non-profit land trusts totaling $1.44 million to support the purchase and permanent protection of 62,854 acres of private forestlands in the Northern Forest.

The grants are the first to be made from the Northern Forest Protection Fund (Fund), a $12 million matching capital fund created by the Open Space Conservancy (OSC), the land acquisition affiliate of the Open Space Institute. The grants were made on the recommendation of an eight person advisory board comprised of representatives from around the region. The Fund was made possible with a $10 million grant last year from the Davis Dodge Charitable Foundation and a $2 million grant from the Surdna Foundation, to protect through acquisition or easement, forestland in northern New York, Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine.

The Northern Forest comprises a vast undivided landscape of 26 million acres stretching across northern New York and New England. The first of its kind, the Fund was established in response to development threats posed by forestland sales in the Northern Forest totaling almost 5 million acres in the last three years. This rapid turnover in ownership presents a unique opportunity to protect the values of the sweeping forest landscapes for sustainable forestry, wildlife, water quality and public access. The amount of the fund is the result of the region’s woods and waterways. These four purchases conserve the forest landbase that feeds the mills in the region, protect habitat for so much wildlife and allow the public continued use,” said Joe Marnas, President of the OSI. “The Fund’s mission is to support the groundbreaking work of the region’s land trusts.”

The Fund’s first round of grants reflects an emerging trend in which conservation groups were made to compete for the limited funds available to conserve valuable lands in order to protect forests and the economic and ecological values they support. Conserved lands are generally protected from future development through conservation easements. Conserving forestland from development, but allowing the land to be retained in private hands for purposes of forestry and wildlife and water quality protection.

A grant was awarded to the Trust for Public Land (TPL), in the amount of $400,000 for the purchase of three tracts of land totaling 13,910 acres in northern New Hampshire. These parcels will link the two units of the White Mountain National Forest to create 950,000 acres of contiguous conserved lands.

“The Pond of Safety project in New Hampshire is an outstanding example of how partnerships can benefit a community and the forest that surrounds it,” Marnas explained. Within 18 months of being awarded the TPL grant, the Fund has closed on its end of the transaction and will result in 10,198 acres to be managed as a working forest by the Town of Randolph. The balance will be added to the White Mountain National Forest. Pond of Safety is a model for future projects because it resulted from a partnership among the town, state and federal governments and private philanthropy. The project will assure public recreational opportunities, wildlife protection and productive working forests. “This is an innovative new community development model we hope to encourage throughout the north country,” said U.S. Senator Judd Gregg (R-NH). In New York, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) was awarded $400,000 to support the purchase of three tracts of land totaling 26,500 acres in the heart of the Adirondacks. The purchase will join 195,000 acres of contiguous protected lands.

With its International Paper Company lands in the Adirondacks came on the market, The Nature Conservancy was ready. “Conservation science led the Conservancy to focus on a 1-million acre area in the western Adirondacks where vast unbroken forests, lakes and wetlands are more than paved roads, buildings and homes. Here, nature still holds sway,” said Michael Carr, Executive Director of The Nature Conservancy’s Adirondack Chapter. In addition, two more grants were awarded. The Green Mountain Club, Inc. is receiving a $400,000 grant for the purchase of the Black Falls Tract, 3,764 acres of forestland in the northern Green Mountains of Vermont. The Nature Conservancy’s New Hampshire Chapter will receive a $400,000 grant toward the purchase of the Bunnell Tract, 18,680 acres in northern New Hampshire including 13 peaks over 13,000 feet. To encourage additional public and private sector support to Northern Forest conservation projects, each grant recipient is required to match the Fund’s award on a blended basis of at least 1:4 or greater. Over $400 million of conservation easements and fee purchase opportunities have been identified in the Northern Forest. “We're committed to investing in projects that assure healthy forests that will be able to produce wood products long into the future while protecting basic ecological functions such as water shed and wildlife protection,” commented Dr. John Gordon, a member of the Fund’s Advisory Board who is a resident of Holderness, New Hampshire and former Dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

The Open Space Institute is a non-profit organization that acquires significant recreational, environmental, agricultural and historic properties throughout New York State. Since its inception nearly 25 years ago, OSI has added to or created more than 30 parks and preserves and permanently protected more than 70,000 acres stretching from the Palisades to the Adirondacks.

Project Descriptions

New Hampshire

Pond of Safety

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is receiving a grant of $400,000 for the purchase of land totaling 13,910 acres in northern New Hampshire. Approximately 10,198 acres will be owned and managed as a sustainable community forest by the Town of Randolph, protected through a conservation easement. The remaining 3,712 acres will be purchased in fee by the U.S. Forest Service as an addition to the White Mountain National Forest. The acquisition permanently protects a critical wildlife corridor between the Kilkenny and Presidential units of the White Mountain National Forest. The project contains very high recreation and scenic values and provides the critical linkage to create 950,000 acres of contiguous conserved lands.

Bunnell Tract

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) New Hampshire Chapter will receive a $400,000 grant toward the purchase of 18,680 acres in northern New Hampshire. It is contiguous to the Nash Stream State Forest. TNC will manage 10,350 acres as a ecological reserve, which will protect 13 peaks above 3,000 feet and 28 miles of streamfrontage. The remaining lands will be protected through a working forest conservation easement and sold to a private timberland investment company.

Vermont

Adirondack Lakes

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) New Hampshire Chapter purchased three tracts of land totaling 26,500 acres in the heart of the central western Adirondacks. The tract encompasses 4 lakes, 12 small ponds and extensive river frontage. TNC will sell some lands to the State of New York for additions to the State Preserve and some as a working forest, protected with an easement. A historic canoe route will be reopened with this purchase. An area of 12,500 acres will be managed by TNC as an ecological reserve. The area joins 195,000 acres of contiguous protected lands.

Vermont: Black Falls

The Green Mountain Club, Inc. is receiving a $420,000 grant for the purchase of 3,764 acres of forestland in the northern Green Mountains that will be added to the Jay State Forest. The 2,654-acre Upper Basin will be managed as an ecological reserve. Timber harvesting will be permitted on the remaining 900 acres. The Catamount Trail, a cross-country trail running the length of Vermont traverses the property. The Long Trail, the nation’s oldest long-distance hiking trail is adjacent to the property and spectacular views across the land. The project is part of a growing complex of conservation lands in the area totaling 30,000 acres.

NEW ENGLAND’S GLOBAL WARMING ASSESSMENT: WELCOMING THE OAK-HICKORY FOREST

Climate change, if it occurs as projected, will fundamentally change both the character and the quality of life of the New England Region. So says the report of a global climate change impact assessment mandated by Congress over 10 years ago, its conclusions are based on two climatological models.

One model predicts a much warmer and wetter climate for New England; the other predicts a slight gain in precipitation punctuated by periodic drought and a greater rise in temperature. Both models project a greater rise in minimum temperatures than in maximums — decline of our modesty by whimper rather than bang.

Overall, the report makes clear that our regional ecosystems are interlocked with global systems. The models suggest possible massive changes in the vegetation of the landscape — such as a transition to an oak-hickory forest for much of New England. Increased precipitation, such as gypsy moth and woody adelgid outbreaks, is thought likely, as are extreme climatic events such as the ice storm of 1998.

The report repeatedly links the particular with the general. One scientist studying floomier population in Narragansett Bay has looked at the impact of warming winters on these estuarine breeders and concluded that warming is “clearly unfavorable” for the species. More broadly, another scientist is studying the North Atlantic oscillation, and its circulatory links to winter climate in the northern hemisphere. Snowfall, streamflow, and drought may be a reflection of this system’s variations. Its response to increasing greenhouse gases may be a key to understanding broad range impacts on New England’s climate.

Economic impacts of likely changes are discussed in the report. While some positives are noted, the negatives are considerable. Maple sugaring, skiing and other aspects of our accustomed wintriness will certainly decline if not disappear over the next century. In the case of sugaring, a northerly shift in the industry is already discernible, as is its century-long decline in New England.

A postcard mailed in Portland, Maine in December 1906 to the writer’s brother in Greensboro, NC: “It seems so very cold up there [sic] be careful in the woods.”
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The report’s look at New England forests will be of
especial interest to *Forest* readers. While some may
quarrel with the proposed coping strategy’s call for
planning of warm climate species and forest fertilization
as a mere extension of habits in a habitric situation, the
forest study section also states that “It will be important
to maintain contiguous forest regions and not continue
the current land use practices that foster fragmentation
of the landscape with subsequent impacts on wildlife.”
The forest study also predicts increased conflicts in the
area of land use and increased encroachment on
natural ecosystems.

But what natural means on a planet subjected to
human-induced climate change is a good question.
Should forests be left to evolve as they will, in response
to change, or will man-the-interferer interject himself
again?

While the study repeatedly notes the uncertainties
of its models, the impacts of human-induced climate
change are clearly reverberating throughout the systems
that surround us. While many will continue to use the
uncertainties as an excuse to avoid action, the impact
of inaction, the study makes clear, is grave.

The conclusions of the model were assessed by
experts in various fields and the report summarizes their
observations and concerns. The report notes several
weaknesses of the models employed in the study, which
were used for the entire national assessment. Lack of
regional-specific data is one. The Canadian and Hadley
models employed in the current study both assume a 1%
annual gain in greenhouse gas concentrations over cur-
rent levels; the cooling effect of certain gases is also
allowed for. Impacts were assessed over both a short-
term (2030) time frame and a long term (2100 and
beyond). Climatological models are more accurate,
notes the report, at greater spatial and temporal scales;
impacts in the near term and within the region are
somewhat uncertain. The National Assessment scenar-
ios, says the report, provide a “minimum basis” for judg-
ing climate change impacts.

While the United States has been preoccupied over
the past months with issues of security, global climate
change clearly looms as a challenge of even greater pro-
portions— even if our only standard is human well-
being. Let us hope that we find some leadership, soon,
to lead us out of the fossil age. —Andrew Whitaker

Vanishing Spirit of the New Deal

“His colleagues knew where he stood on most issues. He unabashedly accepted liberal
deges. He was for the individual over government, government over big business, and the
environment over all else.”

The judicial philosophy of William O. Douglas, appointed to the Supreme Court in
1939 by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving until forced into retirement by a stroke in
1975. From The Brothers, by Fach Woodard & Scott Armstrong.
DYNAMIC TENSION:
A BRIEF HISTORY OF MAINE'S ECONOMICS & LABOR ROUND TABLE

How can we deal with complicated, contentious issues, especially after various committees, councils, and government agencies that had the power to address these issues preferred, instead, to punt?

The following article, about the Round Table to Study Economic and Labor Issues Relating to the Forest Products Industry, tells of an approach that may prove useful. The roundtable approach did not solve the problems, but it created an opportunity to discuss the problems in a broad context and recommend next steps.

The hope for such an approach is that participants can act for the betterment of the whole system, rather than try to advance their interests at the expense of others.

by Mitch Lansky

Why would an environmentalist be interested in lumber and timber processing? Part of my concern comes from living in a zone of multi-stakeholders. My neighbors are working 55 or 60 hours a week for wages less than those paid to burger flippers in Portland. The value of the local school depends on the quality and number of jobs available. Lots of small towns like mine are suffering as the manufacturing base, be it shipbuilding, marinas, or a forested community. My neighborhood is being transformed into an area dominated by a handful of big landowners in an isolated region.

During this same period, huge areas of land were sold. The new landowners, who were typically not the people they employed, started to feel the squeeze. The Maine Forest Products Council, which represents landowners, contractors, mill owners, and sawmills, was divided over labor and economic issues. Council director Abby Holman recognized that a roundtable process might be helpful if its goals were phrased as positives, rather than negatives.

The legislation I cooperated with Ms. Holman to rewrite the bill so that the goals were to:

- "Study key economic and labor issues related to the forest products industry with the goals of helping to keep more valued-added wood processing in the State and improved policies as determined by the roundtable; the market forces and government policies in Maine, the United States and other countries that impact this trade; the status of value-added manufacturing; and the relationship of these issues to employment in Maine.

- "An evaluation of trends in logging, including changes in mechanization, training and education, workers' compensation and insurance, employment relationships, types of wood measurement and means of payment; and "An assessment of regional variations in and seasonal capacity of the logging labor force in Maine, policies which work both for Maine and in nearby Canadian provinces and factors, including current and projected resource availability, transportation costs and rates, and impediments and opportunities in raw material supply and employment opportunities for Maine workers."

Some issues that seemed promising when we first encountered them got dropped by the time we came to findings and recommendations. For example, in the early phases of our work, Tom Howard told us about the headaches of shipping raw materials and manufactured products by rail. Often a company has to ship through a number of lines owned by different companies that charge widely varying prices per mile of freighting. We invited representatives from a rail company to come up with findings and make recommendations. For example, in the early '90s, the Maine Council on Sustainable Forest Management, during the mid '90s, also punted, but suggested that they happened to address these issues. The Maine Council's Office of Policy and Legal Analysis (OPLA) wrote up summaries of these meetings and distributed the summaries to the whole group. The plan was to come up with findings and make recommendations based on this mass of information. We had barely a year to do this work.

PROBLEMS

Our project was to establish a roundtable to look at these issues. But the Round Table (RT) was (at least on paper) designed to involve landowners, a rural sociologist, a forest economist, and representatives from the Department of Labor, the Maine Forest Service, the University of Maine, and the legislature to meet twice a year. RT members included loggers, contractors, mill owners, landowners, a rural sociologist, a forest economist, and representatives from the Department of Labor, the Maine Forest Service, the University of Maine, and the legislature to meet twice a year. The idea, however, was to avoid similar roundtable meetings, which might lack the time for follow-up.

The idea that generated the most weight of paper in our bulging files was Canadian competition with Maine lumber mills. Many Maine mill owners insist that they have trouble competing with Quebec mills for work, which, in Maine, are subjected to high duties, the Canadian health-care system puts pressure on the roundtable to address these issues. The RT had a working relationship with the Office of Responsible Wood (ORW) held a series of meetings with the roundtable. The RT was divided into three subgroups, each with a specific focus: labor; market forces and imperfections; and forest economics. The RT made three important decisions, which included the following:

- "An assessment of the impact and economic of Canadian lumber and other wood products as determined by the roundtable; the market forces and government policies in Maine, the United States and other countries that impact this trade; the laws of value-added manufacturing; and the relationship of these issues to employment in Maine."

- "An evaluation of trends in logging, including changes in mechanization, logging training and education, workers' compensation and insurance, employment relationships, types of wood measurement and means of payment; and "An assessment of regional variations in and seasonal capacity of the logging labor force in Maine, policies which work both for Maine and in nearby Canadian provinces and factors, including current and projected resource availability, transportation costs and rates, and impediments and opportunities in raw material supply and employment opportunities for Maine workers."

We were supposed to have a year to complete our work, we actually had much less. For nearly six months, while the legislature was in session, both the legislators and the staff were unavailable for meetings. We were on hold between February and August of 2001.

When we got back together in August, one of our legislators, Roland Sampson, was replaced by Rosita Gagne (formerly Georgia-Pacific), attended sporadically. Troy Jackson. Two of our members from the University of Maine, David Field and Bruce Wierenga stopped attending due to scheduling difficulties. Some other members such as Ken Coffin of Irving or Tom Howard of Domtar (formerly Georgia-Pacific), attended sporadically. At all because of scheduling difficulties. We also lost the services of staff member Todd Jorgensen. These changes in personnel magnified the discontinuity caused by months off the issue.

At another market forces meeting, we toured the wood engineering facilities at the University of Maine. This unit is developing state-of-the-art products, such as laminated wood beams for bridges, laminated beams made from wood/glue composites, or insulating structural panels. Much of the manufacturing of products developed by this research facility, however, is being done in places like Pennsylvania or Quebec — not in Maine. We needed a meeting with industry leaders to find out why, but such a meeting never happened. Again, we lacked the time for follow-through.

The issue that generated the most weight of paper in our bulging files was Canadian competition with Maine lumber mills. Many Maine mill owners insist that they have trouble competing with Quebec mills because, for example, the mills are subsidized with cheap Crown stampage, the Canadian health-care system puts pressure on the roundtable to address these issues. The RT had a working relationship with the Office of Responsible Wood (ORW) held a series of meetings with the roundtable. The RT was divided into three subgroups, each with a specific focus: labor; market forces and imperfections; and forest economics. The RT made three important decisions, which included the following:

- "An assessment of the impact and economic of Canadian lumber and other wood products as determined by the roundtable; the market forces and government policies in Maine, the United States and other countries that impact this trade; the laws of value-added manufacturing; and the relationship of these issues to employment in Maine."

- "An evaluation of trends in logging, including changes in mechanization, logging training and education, workers' compensation and insurance, employment relationships, types of wood measurement and means of payment; and "An assessment of regional variations in and seasonal capacity of the logging labor force in Maine, policies which work both for Maine and in nearby Canadian provinces and factors, including current and projected resource availability, transportation costs and rates, and impediments and opportunities in raw material supply and employment opportunities for Maine workers."

We were supposed to have a year to complete our work, we actually had much less. For nearly six months, while the legislature was in session, both the legislators and the staff were unavailable for meetings. We were on hold between February and August of 2001.

When we got back together in August, one of our legislators, Roland Sampson, was replaced by Rosita Gagne (formerly Georgia-Pacific), attended sporadically. Troy Jackson. Two of our members from the University of Maine, David Field and Bruce Wierenga stopped attending due to scheduling difficulties. Some other members such as Ken Coffin of Irving or Tom Howard of Domtar (formerly Georgia-Pacific), attended sporadically. At all because of scheduling difficulties. We also lost the services of staff member Todd Jorgensen. These changes in personnel magnified the discontinuity caused by months off the issue.
Maine's forest product industry and its forest both appear to be in decline. Here are the two conditions related:

Mitch Lansky (ML): The word "decline" needs a little discussion before I answer this. The US Forest Service's 1995 inventory of the Maine woods found a decline in volume, a shift from softwoods to lower-value hardwoods, an increase in the percentage of acres in seedlings and saplings, and a continued decline in hardwood quality. The state's latest surveys are indicating that the decline in volume may have bottomed out and that the inventory may actually be beginning to replenish.

The statistics I've seen show an increase in the number of forest-products manufacturers, but a decline in jobs, mostly due to a decline in the volume of the woods and in the more mechanized paper mills and saw mills. Also, in the last few years, a few log mills have shut down. There has been a steady decline in total revenues generated, but if one looks at the forest industry as a percentage of the whole economy, the forestry industry's share is in decline because the rest of the economy is growing faster.

The condition of the woods and the condition of the forest are very much related. To the extent that large, high-quality trees diminish as a percentage of the timber base, industries that could thrive with such timber have the options of either importing their supply and thus causing future collapse; importing more wood at a higher cost, or declining with the inventory. Ironically, a good percentage of some of the higher-quality sawmills in Maine are not milling in state but are shipped raw to sawmills in Quebec.

Industries relying on low-quality wood, such as pulp, are producing commodities that compete in the global market. The profitability strategy for such industries is to cut costs, since increasing prices means losing market shares.

The larger companies have learned to use their leverage to reduce costs in terms of labor, purchased wood, pollution control, and taxes - all of which has an impact on state and local communities. If more and more of the forest industry is based on low-quality wood, we can expect not to see major increases in the quality of life in timber-dependent regions.

What we need are new industries that can internalize all the costs of production, not externalize them, as the pulp and paper industry has done.

AW: Thomas Power's economic impact study of the proposed Maine Woods National Park found that the ratio of employment to harvest has dropped by about half over recent history; at the same time that direct employment in logging has dropped. He also says that Maine's timberland owners have the option of overcutting for about 50 more years, but that the economy of decline will continue, and eventually undergo a precipitous drop. Do his observations bear out what you and others see in Maine's forests and forest industry?

ML: Donella Meadows, just before she died, ran projections of the Northern Forest-products economies. She said that the same pattern of overcut and eventual collapse and found that most simple fixes at best delayed the inevitable. A key strategy for avoiding this collapse would be to get average cut to be about long-term average growth.

I have a little trouble, however, with predictions based on past trends - such as the US Forest Service's productivity that came with mechanization. Trend is not always destiny. There may come a point where mechanization in the woods reaches a plateau, or even recedes. For example, instead of relying on fellers-bunchers and grapple skidders, loggers might shift to mechanized cutting with smaller machines, such as feller-processors and forwarders, that do less damage to the woods and increase long-term economic benefits, but are less productive in terms of output per worker.

As the Danish physicist, Niels Bohr, once said, "It is difficult to make predictions, especially about the future." So many things can change the trajectory of any projected trend, such as terrorism, war, goody policies, economic depressions, catastrophic weather changes, or major outbreaks of insects or diseases in the woods. There is also the, admittedly unlikely, possibility that social policy might become more sane and work for the forest industry that depends on it could show a steady recovery.

AW: Can the industry in northern New England shift to smaller equipment, perhaps greater labor input, and still produce a low enough cost to be productive and competitive?

What market forces believe it will make this shift?

ML: The reason that companies have shifted so heavily to the big machines is that they are operating on a short-term economic basis. They are looking at the profitability of the removal of wood, which they want to do as cheaply as possible, rather than the productivity of the forest over the long term. They are paying loggers based on how much and how fast wood is removed, rather than what shape they have left the residual stand. Large landowners have also used their forest and timber ownership to keep labor costs down, as I indicated before.

Continued Page 9
meeting, I sent a memo out to all RT members to consider having a logger summit, where the following issues could be discussed:

What are the impediments towards paying loggers to reach a desired outcome (rather than to just cut wood fast)?

What are some of the models being tried by landowners in Maine (including Baxter State Park Scientific Management Area) and other parts of the world (such as Scandinavia) where high quality logging is rewarded, rather than penalized?

What are the costs and benefits of landowners to switching to a different payment system?

I also wanted to see exploration of an apprenticeship training program for loggers. This is an issue brought up by one of our members, Stephen Hanington, a woods contractor. An apprenticeship requiring long periods of learning all phases of the logging industry would be more significant than declaring a logger a "professional" after a 4 day training and would lead to a true professional logging force.

The most significant response I got to this was an e-mail from a large-landowner representative saying that he would not participate in any forum that would set prices for loggers (this would be a violation of antitrust law). I assured him that the purpose of a logger summit would be to explore payment models, not to set prices.

The issue still did not get into the RT agenda. I saw an opportunity, after the public hearing in September, when I noticed that we had an item #5, having to do with logger trends, with no recommendations. I suggested adding findings and recommendations about exploring logger payment issues to fill that empty slot. A number of members of the RT agreed, and it was put in as an item of discussion for our October meeting.

In October, several members objected to some of the wording of the "finding" section, which, they claimed, put the blame of low logger wages on landowners (it actually didn't). Another member, Maine Forest Service director, Tom Dook, suggested that if the goal was to attract more loggers, the findings and recommendations should be broader in scope, to include issues relating to landowners, truckers, and the like.

For the November meeting, item #4 had been rewritten. The recommendation called on examination of "increased costs for owners of forest lands, transportation policies that regulate the transportation of logs over Maine roads, State election policies that enable forestry practices to be established and altered by public referendum, and State policies that negatively impact logger wages." There was nothing in there regarding the model or method of how loggers are paid, which was the original issue. I reasserted my original proposal with modifications to improve the language where RT members had specifically pointed out problems.

At (and after, with the use of letters, phone calls, and e-mails) our November meeting, we had something of a show-down. It appeared that the majority were going to support some version of my approach—to deal specifically with logger payment methods. Senator John Nutting, the chairman of the RT, did not want to send out a divided report, however, so he and I, and John Cashwell (president of Seven Islands) could work out a compromise. John and I sent each other a flurry of e-mails. I did my best to incorporate his concerns while retaining the original thrust of a public forum to look at logger payment. To my surprise (and to the surprise of other RT members as well), we reached agreement:

AGREEMENT

The Round Table recommends that the Joint Standing Committee on Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry conduct a series of field hearings in 2002, in regions of the state where logging operations are concentrated, to examine how logging contractors and their employees are paid and to explore new models of payment that provide incentives to loggers to enhance the quality of their work. Additionally, the hearings should also examine state forest policies to promote better forestry or protect wildlife habitat can give landowners incentives (that, in part, can be passed on to loggers), rather than create increased burdens for both landowners and loggers. Further, the hearings should examine whether there are forest policies that give incentives for mismanagement or disincentives for improved management. At the completion of the field hearings, the Agriculture Committee should convene a "logger summit" with representatives of a broad spectrum of forestry interests with a direct relationship to the forestry community to further discuss the new payment models identified during the field hearings, to consider working examples of new approaches, and to discuss the costs and benefits of switching to these new approaches. Additionally, the summit should examine the incentives and disincentives of public policy identified in the field hearings.

The committee shall also examine State labor and educational policies that govern the creation of apprenticeship programs and identify the opportunities for and barriers to creating logger apprenticeship programs.

The Charles Atlas Method

Was it worth it? We obviously had too much to do in too little time. It would have been better if the bill had been more focused or was extended for a number of years and had adequate funding for expenses for members. The Round Table did not solve any major problems. Our contribution was, at best, incremental. Loggers who want to see action to make their profession more viable will still have to wait as more forums lead to more talk. Unfortunately, action does not often happen without a power base and public support. Loggers do not have that yet. But maybe a public forum will help change that.

The diversity of our group, though it was a barrier to immediate substantial changes, did lead to rich discussions that were, in general, constructive. I wish more people in (and out of) the industry could learn what we learned. John Cashwell observed that our group had a kind of "dynamic tension. I pointed out that dynamic tension was the method that Charles Atlas used to turn 90-pound wrinkled muscle men. Unlike the model, we did not have enough time to get the full results.
FINDINGS ON LOGGER PAYMENT

Logging in Maine is under pressure from complex global and statewide forces that impact all aspects of the forest industry from mills and landowners to logging contractors and their employees. Over the last two decades, average inflation-adjusted logger wages have fallen at a faster rate than most other forest-industry professions. This decline in real wages occurred despite major increases in productivity over the same period and in conjunction with a logger labor shortage in some regions of the state that allowed importation of foreign workers through the federal H-2 program.

Public demands for improved forest practices, changes in state forest policy, and the enlightened awareness of some landowners regarding the effects from residual damage are creating increased short-term costs for landowners and increased responsibilities for loggers. Landowners, while internalizing these costs, are not always compensated with higher revenues for their wood. Loggers are not always compensated for their increased responsibilities.

The Pan Atlantic study done for the Department of Labor in 1999 found that logging contractors and their employees in some parts of Maine are operating in “imperfect markets” and have little bargaining ability. Decreasing costs or increasing revenues for landowners in these markets do not always translate into benefits for loggers. Employers are finding it difficult to recruit new, young loggers into the profession. The Pan Atlantic study estimated that the average age of loggers in their survey was 43 years. This same study found that a majority of loggers and contractors, both domestic and bonds, are telling their children not to get into the logging business.

Training programs are an important means of recruiting and educating new loggers. Training alone, however, is not sufficient to attract sufficient new domestic workers if trained workers face falling wages and diminished power to negotiate.


**Answers to viewer comments:**

**Owen lethal Mitch Landry...**

Based on any research, in many circumstances the extra costs involved in doing more careful logging with smaller machinery can be justified in the short term by lower costs of residual damage and in the longer term by higher productivity of more valuable timber products. To the extent that landowners can start to think in terms of longer-term economics, a shift in technology and labor practices should make sense. The hay in paying loggers to pay them for desired results. Unless the condition of the residual stand is accounted for in the way loggers are paid, it will not be their first priority.

**AW:** Many in industry are very concerned about the recent collapse of pulp markets and the possible loss of more pulp purchased in the future. Foresters say they need to peddle pulp to pay for improvements in fuel processing and eventual sawtimber. There is an associated push to reintegrate chip markets. Should we go that route?

ML: Ironically, an important means of paying for stand improvement is to have good markets for junk wood. Such markets, in themselves, do not insure good management. After all, if markets for junk wood are good enough, why bother from nearby.

**AW:** Why do you view the woods as a source of direct employment and an economic asset to rural communities in your region?

ML: Wood is great stuff. I just built a house out of wood, most of which came from nearby. I heat with wood. Wood is in the paper of the Northern Forest Forum. My tool handles are made of wood. It makes sense in Maine, which is 90% forested, to use locally-produced wood products, rather than import stuff made of mined materials from thousands of miles away.

Given that we are going to use wood products, how are we going to obtain them in a way that is both ecological and socially sustainable for the long term? While I see a need for reserves, reserves will never cover every inch of Maine’s forest. How can we complement existing reserves, rather than isolate them, does heavy cutting.

It is possible to do less cutting and have a healthier forest because of higher-value products are grown, if the land is locally owned and profits are reinvested locally, if the wood is used more locally, and if there is more local value added. Moving in directions just a little different can have lots of benefits to the local economy.

A well-managed forest has aesthetic benefits. It enhances the neighborhood. It shows that someone cares. People like to live near such forests, even if the forest is not their own. There is thus a real-state benefit from well-managed forests. Such a landscape attracts a broader range of people to the area who contribute to economic diversity by bringing in more professions and starting new businesses.

So, low-impact forestry can be an important economic asset, not only from direct employment, but also from indirect effects.
Liquidation Logging in the State of Maine

What is Forest Liquidation?

"In short, liquidation is the brutal exploitation of a forest property for maximum immediate gain."

"3% to 12% of all [Maine] timber harvests can be characterized as liquidation harvests, the equivalent of 16,000 to 64,000 acres each year.

"Stripping land and subdividing it, on a recurring production basis, is not the same as a paper company clearingcutting 100 acres which it plans to hold for future growth.

"The solution is better long-term management so that owners can realize income over time and have more value on the land.

"Liquidation cutting has no place in a civilized society. It is a relic of an exploitive frontier mentality"

By Lloyd C. Irland The Island Group, Winthrop, Maine

Liquidation Harvest is a Problem

It is wrong. Now is the time to deal with it.

I have been asked to offer a few suggestions for action, but do not have detailed proposals to recommend. My basic proposal is that we start taking this issue seriously.

I offer my congratulations and support to those who have already had the courage to rise before us, to speak out, and to stand up for what they believe is right. This is not for the faint of heart, and for this I make no apology. As much as anything I am angry with myself in basic proposal is that we start taking this issue seriously.

I am angry with myself for not speaking up sooner. My own experience has been quite similar to that of a large number of people who have organized to protest liquidation. Years ago I was a strong advocate of this method of forest management, and in other instances they may operate wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.

The Liquidators have many accomplishments. There are landowners who acquire ownership of timberland by means of large block sales and in other instances they may manage wood for others in a responsible manner.

One thing is not in doubt: owners who sell to known Liquidators are also Liquidators.
Where in the state, enough to supply needs for social goal of more people owning a bit of land? This is patent, self-serving nonsense and more indication and subdividing are proceeding quite fast in the Maine forest and its recreational potential and time and generate additional opposition to Tree Liquidation cutting has no place in a civilized society. The abuse of Tree Growth by some of these liquidation is very profitable. Efforts to eliminate it will be resisted fiercely. Anyone saying that Liquidation is NOT a solution is not being consistent with the management plan. Full Text below.

Observations...
Trees will grow back. Unless we pave the place, as they say. Occasionally, by accident, some will of commercial value. In some of these Dumb Growth subdivisions, some of the lots may in time produce at least a bit of firewood. It is not clear that we are affecting wildlife habitat much — yet. What is happening is that informal access to the woods is being steadily eroded by the "No Trespassing" signs that inevitably pop up when tracts of land are fragmented and sold to outsiders. Those who take on the Liquidators can expect to pay a price for doing what's right. One of the costs will be the divisiveness within our ranks. This will be a painful but we must endure it. More and more people out there are sick of what the exploiters are doing to the woods. Many have been afraid to be the first to speak.

Does the future matter to Maine? Liquidation cutting has no place in a civilized society. In a society with lies and distortions. Anyone saying that Liquidation is NOT a problem, or that we should do nothing — is answering this question with a NO. We have terms in the Maine Woods — who suggests we do nothing when we need to declare a long-term War against these forces.

We need allies. We will need patience. We need to recognize that liquidation is a chronic social problem with long-term effects and that the government may have only limited leverage on it. The "let's pass a law" instinct may need to be restrained here. There are many possibilities for unneeded collateral damage.

Addressing Liquidation Through Changes to the Tree Growth Taxation Statute

The bill asks that the landowner on Tree Growth provide a signed document that any cutting is consistent with the management plan. Full Text below.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Maine as follows:

Sec. 1. 12 MRSA §8868, sub-§2-C is enacted to read:

2-C. "Landowner." "Landowner" means a person, company or other entity that holds title to land, including joint ownership or tenants in common. If the ownership of the timber located on a parcel is different than the fee ownership of the parcel, the owners of the timber are deemed to be a landowner and are jointly and severally liable with the fee owner of the parcel. If a corporate landowner is a wholly owned subsidiary of another corporation, both parent and subsidiary are deemed to be the same landowner.

Sec. 2. 12 MRSA §8833, sub-§1, as amended by PL 1999, c. 361, §5, is further amended to read:

1. Notification prior to harvest. Unless an alternate form or method of reporting is provided in rule, notification must be on forms supplied by the bureau and must include the following information:

A. The name, address and phone number of the landowner, any designated agent, and, if known, any harvester or harvesters. B. The name and address of any licensed professional forester consulting the landowner on forest management or harvesting practices.

C. The municipality or township and county of harvest.

D. The name of the nearest public or private all-weather road.

E. The approximate dates the harvest will begin and finish.

F. The anticipated acreage to be harvested.

1-C, An indication whether the land being harvested is taxed under the provisions of the Maine Tree Growth Tax Law. If the land being harvested is taxed under the provisions of the Maine Tree Growth Tax Law, the notification includes a signed statement, signed by the landowner, indicating that the harvest is consistent with the forest management and harvest plan required by Title 36, section 754-B, subsection 1-A. A licensed professional forester who signs a fiduciary responsibility to the landowner may sign the sworn statement required by the landowner in this paragraph.

Mount Blue State Park Expands by 2,468 Acres

by Pamela Prudden

Mount Blue State Park in Weld, Maine is loved for its spectacular mountain views, popular trails and wildlife. Thanks to the concerted efforts of the Trust for Public Land Conservation Alliance (TCA) and its partners, the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands and the Trust for Public Land, more of these valuable natural resource amenities gained protection in December. Through a 2,468 acre purchase, existing multi-use, snowmobile and ski trails are now site permanently part of Mt. Blue State Park, as well as a number of valuable ecological features, including streams, wetlands and a deer wintering yard. The purchase was made possible through a goal of $100,000 through the generosity of hundreds of donors, large and small, mostly from western Maine or having close ties to the Weld region. TCA needed to raise private matching contributions to add the 2,468 acres, including the popular Hedgehog Hill, to Mt. Blue State Park. Many thanks and congratulations are in order to all who contributed to this success, achieved despite a failing economy and the September 11 tragedy.

Public dollars so far have come from the Land for Maine's Future Program, Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Outdoor Heritage Fund and federal Forest Legacy Program. The private fundraising campaign received a boost when TCA obtained a cap challenge of $25,000 in mid-November from an anonymous foundation, with the grant to be made once TCA raised $275,000 in private dollars toward its goal. The additions to the park cost approximately $400 per acre.

With fundraising for the first phase concluded, the State is completing the rest of the first phase acquisitions in the immediate vicinity of the State Park, which will include adding another 272 acres to the park along East Brook and next to the Webb Beach campground. About 4,200 additional acres adjoining the State Park will also be conserved in the first phase through conservation easements. The sale of the parcel, Thomas Dillon, a Madison-based logger. Finally, in 2001, Trust for Public Land reached agreements with several local families to purchase 1,700 acres of land and the September 11 tragedy.

My name is Needed Stay tuned — the Hedgehog Hill acquisition is only the first in a series intended to protect important natural areas as well as working landscapes in the Tumbledown/Mt. Blue region. In the longer terms, TCA's vision is to conserve over 50,000 acres through a combination of conservation easements and fee purchases, encompassing lands in the Webb Lake and Wilson Lake watersheds. TCA also plans to establish an endowment fund to help manage the conservation lands.

More Money Is Needed

Continued on Page 13
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This edition of The Park Report features information on three recent events that together paint the portrait of chronic mismanagement of the Forest Preserve by the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) under the Pataki Administration and a failure by the Adirondack Park 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.

Trampled Forest Preserve
In New York we have a proud historical legacy of a 106-year-old wilderness system in our Forest Preserve. Long undisputed as the finest state-owned public land system in the U.S., the Forest Preserves consists of 2.5 million acres in the Adirondacks, and another 350,000 acres in the Catskills. This edition of The Park Report features information on three recent events that together paint the portrait of chronic mismanagement of the Forest Preserve by the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) under the Pataki Administration and a failure by the Adirondack Park 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.

Illegal ATV Trespasses
Illegal use of All-Terrain Vehicles (ATV) in the Forest Preserve has skyrocketed. This past summer, the RCPA conducted field visits to areas across the Forest Preserve to look into these complaints. What we found is not pretty. Trespasses are numerous, in many areas commonplace. Damage to trails is severe. Illegal ATV use seems to be highest on snowmobile trails, though it's occurring on some roads. A number of Wilderness Areas, where all motor vehicle use is prohibited, have experienced illegal ATV use, with new routes being bushwhacked by these machines. Last, enforcement seems practically nonexistent. In fact, in many areas the high rates of ATV use could only be occurring with the assent of the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC).

The trails showed in pictures in this article show some of the most glaring examples of chronic ATV use. The RCPA visited several of these remote trails over the past few months and all had some use by the ATVs. The summer of 2001 was dry, so damage was minimized, yet many destroyed trails were found. Some of the most notable are the Hellbery Vly trail in the Shaker Mountain Wilderness Forest, the Gull Pond Trail in the Black River Wild Forest, the many trails off the Powley Picnic Road in the Ferris Lake Wild Forest, and Shaker Mountain Wild Forest. Extensive bushwhacking of ATVs is evident in these two areas, as well as the Debake Mountain Wild Forest, the Sentinel Wilderness and the Jay Mountain Wilderness.

Where in the Forest Preserve is ATV use allowed? ATV use is allowed on some roads in DEC Region 6 that are specifically marked as open. While motor vehicles are allowed on designated roads in Wild Forest Areas, ATVs are only allowed on roads that have been "signed open" (see picture). As the custodian of the Forest Preserve for the State of New York, the DEC has authority under the state Vehicle and Traffic Law, much the same as a town, county or village, to open public roads for use by off-road motor vehicles, such as ATVs. Currently, more than 12 roads have been opened for ATVs in Region 6 (Forest Preserve). The DEC has issued regulations for the use by off-road motor vehicles, such as ATVs. Currently, more than 12 roads have been opened for ATVs in Region 6 (Forest Preserve).

The lack of enforcement by the DEC is an enormous problem, but the lack of Unit Management Plans compounds this. Only through an approved UMP will the DEC and APA officially designated routes in the Forest Preserve as "roads," "foot trails," "horse trails," or "snowmobile trails." The common assumption by ATV users is that snowmobile trails are open for ATV use. Further, ATV advocates maintain that the only way to control ATV use is to provide more opportunities, not fewer. While sales of ATVs have soared in the 1990s, paralleling increases in sales of Personal Watercraft (jet ski), and snowmobiles, they are widely disliked. Again, the maxim of one person's fun destroying the experience for many others in appropriate. More so than snowmobiles, and arguably more so that jet skis, ATVs destroy the ground on which they ride. Some roads can handle ATV use, but snowmobile trails and foot trails cannot. ATVs have a place on gravel roads and on managed forest lands or farms and other private lands, but the potential for destruction should not be sacrificed to ATV use because of the negative impact on trails caused by these machines. Because of this ATV use by landholders has been banned by private commercial landowners in the Adirondacks.

Illegal Snowmobile Trail Widening
The Adirondack Park State Land Management Plan sets policy that snowmobile trails should be "essentially the same character as a foot path." State Environmental Conservation Law states that snowmobile trails should be no wider than eight feet. The character of the trail in the Adirondack Park is narrow, rocky, and with a closed canopy overhead. Unfortunately, the past few years have seen a number of snowmobile trails widened. An event that has paralleled DEC contracting with snowmobile clubs and local governments for trail maintenance and a concerted advocacy by the snowmobiling community for wider trails (which accommodate high speed, two-way travel).

In 1999 and 2000, the APA issued two Settlement Agreements for illegal widening of snowmobile trails in the Adirondacks as of DEC, or those under DEC contract, on the Vanderwacker Snowmobile Trail in the Vanderwacker Wild Forest Area and the Rock Lake Trail in the Northeast Forest. Additionally, a settlement for illegal widening of the Safford Lake/Ronde Lake snowmobile trail has been pending for three years and remains without completion. As the pictures show, these trails were widened considerably beyond eight feet, in many places upwards of 30, 40 and 50 feet wide.

Unfortunately, these three trails are not isolated incidents. A number of other trails have recently been visited and reviewed by the APA for an investigation over whether or not the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan or the Wetlands Act was violated. The snowmobile trail system is a shared trail system. While it is permissible to hike in Wide Forest Areas, these are the principle hiking trails in Wild Forest Areas the rest of the year.

The Bear Pond Road Massacre
In 2000 and 2001, the DEC undertook a maintenance operation on the Bear Pond, in the Warren East Forest. The DEC's goal was to improve drainage. The Bear Pond Road is publicly accessible for ten miles before it is gated as it enters three inholdings in the southernmost reaches of the Five Ponds Wilderness Area. The road is used by the public and has been opened for ATV use by DEC Region 6, despite the fact the landowner's Unit Management Plan was even done for the unit.

While maintenance work is done by the DEC on a trail or a lean-to or a boat launch, among other activities, a Unit Management Plan is completed. If the job in question involves tree cutting, a DEC Forester marks the trees to be cut. Case law involving the Constitutional protections for the Forest Preserve ruled that trees protected by the constitution must be 25 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH) and that the DEC would not be able to remove the area before the constitution is violated. If a potential job involves removal of more than 50 trees DEC legal staff is consulted. Last, the DEC should consult the APA to ensure the proposed activity is consistent.
with the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan or the Unit Management Plan, if one is written. Often an activity is undertaken, field visits are made by DEC staff in supervisory positions. Unfortunately, on the Bear Pond Road no work plan was ever approved, a forester never marked trees, no constitutional amendment was ever made, the APA was never consulted, and no field supervisory visits were ever performed. The result: a massive breakdown of all internal and external checks and balances for the protection of the Forest Preserve.

The RCPA first visited the Bear Pond Road in early July 2001. Our first impression was that something had gone terribly wrong. Downed trees were strewn all along the roadside. The canopy over the road has been eliminated. The State Land Master Plan sets guidelines for roads in Wild Forest Areas stating that roads "must be compatible with the wild forest character of an area." Typically the Bear Pond Road is now 40 feet or more. In many places it was estimated another 1,000 trees were strewn all along the road. The RCPA counted downed and destroyed trees. No count was done for downed trees. Nothing was mentioned about a violation of "wild forest character" by the immense swaths of cleared area on both sides of the Bear Pond Road. The RCPA filed a lawsuit challenging the MOA last November.

Conservation Races Liquidation in Western Maine...

Continued from page 11 for these dollars, but TCA hopes that enough money can be raised this year to purchase 4,000 acres in T6 from Hancock Land Co. for public ownership. This includes the mountain tops of Tumbledown, Little Jackson and Jackson Mountains and the Stockbridge Branch. If sufficient funds can be raised, an additional 7,800 acres of the Hancock Lumber land in T6 will be protected by a conservation easement held by the State. Hancock Lumber Company is widely respected for its conservation efforts. It was the named the 2001 Gannett Family Business of the Year in the large business category, which includes companies with more than 150 employees. The Gannett award recognizes business-owning families that have taken steps to ensure their company's vitality and continuity. Hancock Lumber, founded in 1848 and now in its sixth generation of ownership and management, is the largest manufacturer of eastern white pine in the U.S. In addition, it manages timberland and retails building materials. The Hancock family says that they see their primary role as "stewardship," and they intend to pass the company on to the next generation in better shape than when they found it.

Meanwhile, in the Weld region, sales of land continue to liquidation loggers who plan to further subdivide and resell. This instability in the land base first reached the level of a crisis after the 1998 bankruptcy sale of United Timber Corporation's 90,000 acres to McPherson Investments, a McDonald subsidiary. A new phenomenon is the appearance of a Canadian corporation from Beauceville, Beauce, Quebec, by the name of "9110-2814 Inc." In December, the McDonald subsidiary. A new phenomenon is the appearance of a Canadian corporation from Beauceville, Beauce, Quebec, by the name of "9110-2814 Inc." In December, the McDonald subsidiary. A new phenomenon is the appearance of a Canadian corporation from Beauceville, Beauce, Quebec, by the name of "9110-2814 Inc." In December, the McDonald subsidiary. A new phenomenon is the appearance of a Canadian corporation from Beauceville, Beauce, Quebec, by the name of "9110-2814 Inc." In December, the McDonald subsidiary. A new phenomenon is the appearance of a Canadian corporation from Beauceville, Beauce, Quebec, by the name of "9110-2814 Inc." In December, the McDonald subsidiary.

Peace on Earth

"It is easy to get international agreement in science. Scientists all have the same standards they are set by beliefs, but by what works best. Of necessity, there is therefore universal unity. And unity makes for good will."

Comments of the Natural Resources Council of Maine on Plum Creek's Proposed Concept Plan and Subdivisions For First Roach Pond

This proposal represents a major shift in Maine's North Woods. It is the first time, at least in 11 years, if not ever, that one of the 10 largest landowners in the state has proposed a major subdivison development in the unorganized townships. Until now, the large landowners have consistently asserted that they were not real estate developers, but rather forest products companies. This is no longer the case, at least for Plum Creek.

This project raises a number of policy issues. The Commissioner's decision on these issues will undoubtedly be closely watched by the other large landowners in the state as they decide whether to continue managing their land for timber or whether to get into the real estate development business themselves. Some of those policy issues include:

A. Whether the project strikes a publicly beneficial balance of conservation and development.
B. Whether the project represents the amount of development on a lake constitutes " orderly growth?"
C. Whether the Commissioner is going to allow large lots that unnecessarily fragment the landscape.
D. How much consideration will be given to the impact of the proposed development on existing uses and resources on Class 3 lakes?
E. Whether the concept planning process will allow the public to present and the Commission to consider all of the relevant facts and issues.

The Natural Resources Council of Maine agrees that First Roach Pond is a lake "potentially suitable for development." However, it doesn't mean that anything goes.

The First Roach Pond Area
First Roach Pond is located east of Moosehead Lake. The Maine Lakes Assessment determined that First Roach Pond contained five (out of a maximum of seven) significant resource values: fisheries, scenic values, shoreline character, botanical and cultural values. It is designated a resource class 1B lake, indicating that it is a lake of statewide significance.

Fewer than ten miles from First Roach Pond are a wide variety of areas that also have significant resource values: national, state, or local significance.

Traditionally, Greenville has been the gateway to this spectacular region, providing year round housing and the infrastructure required to support year-round housing such as electricity and phone service, schools, health care facilities, police and fire protection, and stores selling outdoor equipment (boats, snowmobiles) and outdoor equipment (boats, snowmobiles).

Kokadjo, 18 miles from Greenville, has been a small town with a history of interesting and often tragic events. Kokadjo has people who work in the woods.

In recent years, development and the gateway to the North Woods has begun to push toward Kokadjo. The road from Greenville has been paved, development is creeping north along the road, and more products and services are provided at Kokadjo.

If this proposal is approved in its current form, the march of development north from Greenville will transform Kokadjo into the North Woods. Kokadjo will become a bedroom community to Greenville. Instead of feeling like we are entering the remote North Woods when we leave Greenville, we will not feel that sense of remoteness until we leave Kokadjo.

Bicknell's Thrush & Global Warming

by Dan Lambert

A number of factors contribute to the vulnerability of Bicknell's Thrush, including its limited, and naturally fragmented breeding range. In the United States, Bicknell's Thrush breeds in dense, montane forests of New York and northern New England (Atwood et al. 1996). In southeastern Canada, it inhabits montane fir (Ouellet 1993), maritime spruce-fir (Erickson 1992), and regenerating mixed forest (Vitosh 1996). The species is similarly restricted in its wintering distribution, occurring primarily in wet, broadleaf forests of the Dominican Republic.

These forests have been reduced to less than 10% of their historic extent in the last 50 years (Stattersfield et al. 1998). Loss of the Northeast's montane fir habitat may also threaten Bicknell's Thrush. Ski area expansion, road construction, and wind power development have received the most regulatory attention, as each results in highly visible forest loss. However, climate change represents the most far-reaching, long-term threat to the species. A warming climate is expected to cause incremental, but widespread changes in the composition and structure of high-elevation forests. Forest ecologists predict that balds (balds) will beoutraged at low relative humidity, and that they will be replaced by grasslands or heathlands. Bicknell's Thrush occupies areas with these grasslands and heathlands, so any increase in the area of such habitat would be a positive development for the species.

In addition, mountain birdwatchers monitoring Bicknell's Thrush in the White Mountains in New Hampshire (Monroe et al. 1999) have found a decrease in population size of up to 25% over the past 20 years. This decrease is likely due to climate change, as each year's breeding population is dependent on the previous year's wintering population.

The Vermont Institute of Natural Science (VINS) will be launching Mountain Birdwatch, a citizen science program to monitor Bicknell's Thrush in the Green Mountains of Vermont. The project will involve citizen scientists collecting data on Bicknell's Thrush in the Green Mountains on a bimonthly basis over the next five years. The data collected will be used to assess the impact of climate change on Bicknell's Thrush populations in the Green Mountains.

GOOD NEWS FOR ONTARIO WOLVES

The Ontario government is finally proposing to introduce measures to protect the wolves of Algonquin Provincial Park. The proposed measures include a year-round moratorium on wolf hunting and trapping in 39 townships surrounding the park. This is good news for the Algonquin wolves; however, the moratorium includes an unacceptable automatic sunset clause after 30 months and it does not apply to the killing of coyotes. Excluding coyotes from the moratorium renders it unenforceable. It would be difficult to charge anyone for killing a wolf as long as they had the option of claiming that they thought it was a coyote. Furthermore, traps and snares do not differentiate between wolves and coyotes. Please write the Ontario government that the moratorium must remain in place and that coyotes must be included in the moratorium. Please visit www.patientwolves.com for more information.
MYTH 1: SNARING IS HUMANE

All one needs to do is read the above statements from professional snarers caused 64% of the animals they caught, extremely long and difficult deaths. The Maine Trappers Association. Investigation, not from animal rights people. Chuck Hulsey, an IF&W biologist wrote in a memo to Ken Elowe, also an IF&W biologist, that "coyotes are not a significant threat to our deer population", that "killing an animal by strangling it with a wire loop often results in a slow, painful death, sometimes lasting days", that the "presence of a large canid predator is a benefit to deer, not a detriment", that "recreational snaring lacks the mechanism for accurate review, control and input like that associated with all other hunting, trapping, or fishing activities", and that "it would violate state humane laws to treat a domestic dog in this same manner..."

This field biologist further states that "the real obstacle to attaining a higher deer population is not the coyote, but the state is the declining quality and quantity of wintering habitat... The reason that deer are scarce in the northern part of Maine is that this is the northern limit of their range because of severe weather conditions and as stated above, because of timber harvest practices, winter cover has been decimated. This program is being implemented solely for the purpose of increasing the deer herd for hunters to have more deer to kill. Partly due to IF&W management of the deer herd, we have close to 25% of the deer in Maine as it is. In central Maine, where coyotes abound there are as many as 25 deer per square mile so the presence of coyotes has not done anything to hurt the deer in that part of the state. In some areas of southern Maine where natural predation has been virtually eliminated, the deer are so overpopulated that they are considered a nuisance and are causing human/deer conflicts such as auto collisions and deer predation in gardens.

MYTH 3. SNARING IS EFFICIENT AND COST EFFECTIVE IN CONTROLLING COYOTES

How, during a time of huge budget deficits, which IF&W says it is suffering from, can we spend a significant amount a year to pay snarers? Every scientific study shows that unless you remove 70 percent of a coyote population every year (a virtual impossibility) you can't succeed with any meaningful reduction. This IF&W program doesn't make sense biologically or economically. Some in IF&W have expressed the opinion that the money could be better spent for deer habitat restoration in the north woods. Chuck Hulsey, a regional wildlife biologist for IF&W, said "coyote bounties [the term for IF&W's snaring program] have along history of absolute failure." And "Resources devoted to the recreational snaring of coyotes are resources unavailable to devote to habitat protection and management." Notice that he considers this snaring program recreational.

MYTH 4. NON-TARGET ANIMALS DON'T GET CAUGHT IN SNARES

There are documented cases of lynx, bobcat, eagles and even moose caught in snares. The Chair of the Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Committee, Representative Matt Dunlap of Old Town, asked at a recent hearing if IF&W believed that if an endangered animal such as a lynx got caught in a snare that the snare would report it? Good question.

To read more, this list of web addresses provides access to recent, informative, newspaper articles about snaring in Maine and the controversy that surrounds it. We hope you will take the time to read them.

http://mainetimes.com/newspage.htm
http://www.boston.com/dailynews/006/research/research_to_determine_whether_snare_habilitation/

WHAT YOU CAN DO

There is a rising tide of protest from the citizens of Maine against this cruel practice of killing wildlife in this manner. Please contact the following with letters, emails, phone calls.

1.Governor Angus King
Office of the Governor
# 1 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0001
207-287-3531

2.Commissioner Lee Perry
Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife
284 State Street
41 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0041
lee.perry@state.me.us

3.Committee Of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife
Representative Bryant
house76@exploremaine.com

4.State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0041
SenaDavid Carpenter
susan_cockrell@umit.maine.edu

5.Committee On Inland Fisheries and Wildlife
Representative Matt Dunlap
2 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0041
rep.dick@state.me.us

6.Committee Of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife
Representative Joe Clark
Repjoe@clarks@state.me.us

7.Representative Monica McGlocklin
	mcmcglocklin@mainesenate.com

8.Representative Roesch
	Roesch.Dick@state.me.us

9.Representative David Tracey
	Rep.Dick.Tracey@state.me.us

10.Representative David Trahan
	Rep.David.Trahan@state.me.us

11.Representative Bob Usher
	Rep.Rob.Usher@state.me.us

12.Representative Chandler Woodcock
	SenChandler.Woodcock@state.me.us

4.Write letters to the editors of your local papers

COYOTE TALKING POINTS

Snaring should be stopped for the following reasons:

- Snaring is extremely cruel
- Snaring is not cost effective and the money could be used for habitat restoration. Coyotes are not a threat to the deer herd and might in fact be beneficial. A large coyote predator keeps the herd healthy.
- Two small interest groups, SAM and MTA are determining Maine's wildlife policy. There is no public input on this issue. There should be public hearings as there have been with other wildlife issues. Non target animals such as the lynx, bald eagle and eastern cougar are at risk. Snaring is biologically unsound. Coyotes compensate by reproducing in larger numbers when their populations are threatened. Thank you.

If you need more information contact:

Susan Cockrell
503 South Road
H Holden, Maine 04429
207-843-9023
susan_cockrell@msn.com

Maine Friends Of Animals
196 Rt.1
Falmouth, ME 04105
207 781 2187
The Vermont Wilderness Coalition Proposes 80,000 Acres of Wilderness for the

The proposed Romance Mountain Wilderness is located in the northern half of the Green Mountain National Forest, in the towns of Hancock, Ripton, and Rochester. There are five mountains in the area with altitudes exceeding 3,000 feet: Mount Monadnock, North Mountain, Romance Mountain, Mount Horrid, and Philadelphia Peak. The area is a rare ecological gem. It contains many patches of large, mature northern hardwoods, the longest section of roadless and trailless ridgeline on the Green Mountain National Forest, and the headwaters of Biggo Brook, one of the most pristine, high-quality trout streams in Vermont. Because of its remoteness, the proposed Romance Mountain Wilderness has not been well studied or documented. Still, the Vermont Department of Fish and Game describes the land as critical black bear habitat. In addition, the Forest Service has identified 17 rare, threatened, and endangered plant and animal species on Mount Horrid alone.

Much of this proposed wilderness was earmarked to be forever wild long before it was acquired by the Forest Service. The core of the area — Monastery Mountain to Worth Mountain to Romance Mountain — was bequeathed as a “park” to Middlebury College by Joseph Battell in 1911. In his will, Battell directed the trustee of these lands to “preserve as far as reasonably may be the forests of said park, and neither to cut nor remove permit to be cut thereon any trees whatsoever except such as are dead or down and such as it may be necessary to cut in making and repairing needful roads; it being a principal object of this [will] to preserve intact such wild lands as a specimen of the original Vermont forest.”

Middlebury sold nearly all of Battell’s lands to the Forest Service in the 1930s and 1950s. Despite Battell’s intentions that the lands remain forever wild, the college sold the lands without restrictions. The importance of this area, both ecologically and historically, cannot be overstated. It was the sale of these very lands that prompted the federal government to create the northern unit of the Green Mountain National Forest. Now is the critical time to reverse the direction in which these lands are headed — a direction that will constrict Vermont’s vision for them. Establishing the Romance Mountain Wilderness will ensure that the last wishes of Joseph Battell are fulfilled: “the preservation of a considerable tract of mountain forest in its virgin and primeval state.”

The proposed Glastenbury Wilderness is northeast of Bennington, beginning just north of Route 9 and extending to Kelley Stand Road to the north. Most of its 35,000 acres are in Glastenbury (pop. 6), one of only two unorganized towns in southern Vermont. Seen from Route 7, Glastenbury Mountain possesses a massive and beautifully wild ridge line that dominates the landscape to the east. To this day the watershed remains undeveloped, due to a combination of high elevations, deep snowfalls, long winters, and its lack of suitability for agriculture. Despite these conditions to the north and east, this area is quiet and remote. The forestland and extensive stands of mature beech trees provide critical black bear habitat in the proposed Glastenbury Wilderness, and cliff-marked beech trees are a common sight demonstrating the presence of bears throughout the area. The Vermont Fish and Wildlife Department has identified Glastenbury as a region “supporting relatively high densities of cub-producing females, and an area containing critical habitats necessary to bear survival.”

The rich forest habitat of the Glastenbury area is home to a large variety of birds. The presence of Bicknell’s thrush (designated in Vermont as rare and of special concern) has been documented as well as Swainson’s thrush, yellow-rumped warbler, Cape May warbler, winter wren, dark-eyed junco, and white-throated sparrow.

Glastenbury offers extensive opportunities for backcountry recreation. The hilly terrain of the area includes several summits surpassing 2,000 feet, with Glastenbury Mountain the tallest at 3,748 feet. More than fifteen miles of trails offer access to hikers, snowshoers, and cross-country skiers. The Long Trail/Appalachian Trail crosses the entire area from north to south by an old fire tower on the top of Glastenbury Mountain. The Green Mountain Club describes the view from the tower as “more wilderness than is to be seen from any other point on the Long Trail. Here, Hell Hollow Brook, in the southern edge of the area, contributes to the public water supply of Bennington. The township of Glastenbury is almost entirely National Forest, but for much of the last one hundred years it was owned by one family. The timber magnate Trenor W. Park passed Glastenbury along to his grandson, Hall Park McCullough, whose grandson, Trenor Scott, sold most of his holdings to the Forest Service. Scott still retains substantial acreage today.

Fayville, a logging community in the northeast corner of Glastenbury, is the only area of the town that was ever thickly settled. Fayville is now abandoned and all that remains is a clearing of some fifty acres. A logging railroad known as the Bennington & Glastenbury briefly became a tourist attraction near the turn of the century, taking people to an inn converted from a boarding house used by loggers. The railroad tracks were washed out in the 1898 flood and were never replaced. A cell hole is all that remains of the inn. A century ago, Glastenbury was completely clearcut to supply vast quantities of charcoal to the iron industry in nearby Shaftsbury and Troy, New York. Glastenbury is now a rich mosaic of balsam fir, red spruce, white and yellow birch, beech, and mountain ash. It is interspersed with patches of firs, raspberries, black berries, bluebells, lily, and dwarf dogwood. It now supports mature forest.

The proposed 5,000-acre Lamb Brook Wilderness forms the southeastern rip of the Green Mountain National Forest in a rugged and mountainous section of Readsboro, just north of the Massachusetts border. It forms part of a larger, 17,500-acre, undeveloped area bounded by Vermont Route 9 to the north, Route 100 to the south, Route 8 to the west, and Harris Reservoir to the east.

The Forest Service logging road (FR266) that climbs north from Heartwellville, near the junction of Routes 8 and 100, gives quick access to the interior of this quiet landscape. From the height-of-land there are glampers of the terrain south to Massachusetts. Off the road, most views in Lamb Brook are closer and more personal in scale: a narrow trail before the next curve, a small stream as it disappears into an explosion of ferns. Even in the open November woods, filled with patches of bright snow, there is only a slightly longer vista to the next hemlock stand or the next hill.

As with so many recovering New England forests, a careful look at Lamb Brook reveals signs of former human presence. The two-century-old Albany to Boston stage route now glow a network of old roads “coated” and drained by culverts made from hollow logs, winds through overgrown apple orchards, past stone walls, tree-filled cellar holes, and hard-won rock piles where pastures once existed. Ancient maple trees, marking the edges of former fields, are now surrounded by clusters of birch, red maple, and the beech that now comprise these woods. Away from the trail, the signs of bears abound. The smooth, gray bark of the beech show the claw marks of bears climbing for the autumn nut crop. The many bear “tears,” tree-top branches gathered together as the bears strip the nuts, attest to the importance of Lamb Brook for black bears. Deep in the woods is a huge circle of bear-nested beeches. On the ground, in the center of the circle, lie the toppled trunks of trees marked by bears over one hundred years ago.

After visiting Lamb Brook, bear biologist Dr. Albert Manville wrote, “in my all work assessing bear feeding habitat for hard mast in New England, upstate New York, Wisconsin, Michigan, and elsewhere in North America, I have never seen such a heavily utilized stand of American beech as this one in the Lamb Brook area.” The soft ground along the stream in Lamb Brook provides witness to the daily parade of deer, moose, fox, coyotes, and fisher. In addition, Lamb Brook is breeding habitat for interior forest-dependent neotropical birds like the scarlet tanager, warbler, and black-throated blue warbler, which winter in Central and South America but fly north to Vermont in the spring to raise their young.

Lamb Brook is a rare large block of unbroken forest cover, which these birds require if they are to reproduce successfully in the region. Lamb Brook begins as a small trickle in a hallow north of the Old Stage Road, gathers in small pools and navigates among moss-covered rocks on its way down to the Deerfield River. Although this land was used for sheep farming during the nineteenth century, the brook, and later the entire area, were in fact
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named for the Lamb family whose descendents still live in Bennington County.

Under a federal court order issued by Chief Judge Murtha in 1995 and affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in 1997, Lamb Brook is temporarily off-limits to logging and road building. Wildlife designation would preserve Lamb Brook forever as a haven for wildlife and a quiet, remote place where people can hike, camp, fish, hunt, or simply enjoy a bit of solitude.

The Vermont Wilderness Association (VWA) proposes that the 15,847-acre Eye Brook Wilderness be expanded to include approximately 10,000 additional acres. The additions border the southeastern and southwestern corners of the existing wilderness and the proposed Glisterbury Mountain Wilderness south of Kelley Stand Road. The Forest Service acquired much of the land forming the proposed Eye Brook Addition from International Paper in 1986. It did this with the help of a bridge loan from The Nature Conservancy, which held the land for a year until federal funding was secured. Essentially roadless, the area includes the lower hills, valleys, and wetlands around Stratton Pond, and other wetlands near Branch, Beebe, and at least nine other smaller ponds. Valuable riparian areas exist by the streams of the Black Brook, the east branch of the Deerfield River, and near the North Alder Brook.

These lands are heavily forested with beech, birch, balsam fir, maple, and scattered apple trees. The dense interior forest in the area is valuable black bear habitat, some of which has been designated as "critical" by the Vermont Fish and Wildlife Department. Several rare animal, plant, and natural communities are found in the proposed Eye Brook Addition. The Vermont Natural Heritage Program has documented a very rare shrub bog near Stratton meadow bog, consisting of plants such as leatherleaf, Labrador tea, bog laurel, small cranberry, hare’s cotton grass, and flowered sedge. Birds frequenting this natural community include the Lincoln’s sparrow, common yellowthroat, rusty blackbird, and northern hier. Several uncommon dragonfly species and meadow voles also live here.

Near the Winhall River, which forms the border of the current Eye Brook Wilderness and the proposed Eye Brook Addition, there is another uncommon natural community, the poor fen, which includes among its plant life leaf, Labrador tea, bog laurel, small cranberry, hare's cotton grass, and white beakrush. A rare plant, the fall dropped rush, and an uncommon bird, the rusty blackbird, frequent the Winhall River area.

The proposed Eye Brook Addition provides extensive opportunities for backcountry recreation, including hiking, camping, cross-country skiing and snowshoeing. More than seven miles of the Long Trail/Appalachian Trail cross the area. Stratton Pond, the largest pond on the Long Trail, is a popular spot for swimming and fishing, and receives the heaviest overnight use of any campground on the trail with more than 2,000 users per year.

Because of the large number of visitors, the VWA proposes that Stratton Pond become part of the Robert Stafford National Conservation Area. A central principle of conservation biology is that larger wilderness areas will likely become more biologically diverse. Increasing the size of the Eye Brook Wilderness to 25,000 acres, and joining it with another large natural area, the Robert Stafford National Conservation Area, will provide lasting benefits to wildlife and ensure a variety of recreational opportunities for the many people who seek a wilderness experience.

A Summary of the Proposed Additions
From the Vermont Wilderness Association website: www.vwa.org

ROCKS AND MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS, 15,000 ACRES

This mountainous land, much of it owned in the early 1990s by philanthropist Joseph Battell, is south of Route 125 in the towns of Hauxwood, Ripton, and Goshen. The high ridges include Philadelphia Peak, Monastery Mountain, and Roxanniec Mountain. Geologists, birders, and hikers agree that steep, rocky streams carrying some of the cleanest water in Vermont. The area is rich with wildlife, and a joy for hikers and hunters.

GLASTERBURY MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS, 40,000 ACRES

This is the largest unbroken tract of land in southern Vermont, and home to the Long Trail and Appalachian Trail.

The summit of Glasterbury Mountain offers views of Stratton, Mount Snow, Somerset Reservoir, and some wild, uninhabited land that can be seen from any other place on the Long Trail. This is the future crown jewel of Vermont wilderness. Lamb Brook Wilderness, 5,000 acres, The singularly beautiful Lamb Brook basin offers a wonderfully quiet and remote setting. It provides important nesting habitat for neotropical migratory songbirds, and critical nesting and feeding habitat for black bears.

ADDITIONS TO EXISTING WILDERNESS AREAS

Since the passage of the 1984 Vermont Wilderness Act, new land acquisitions and changes in land use have made possible the expansion of three existing wilderness areas. Bristol Cliffs, now 3,085 acres, can be expanded by 200 acres. Breadloaf, now 21,043 acres can be expanded by 9,000 acres, and Eye Brook, now 13,847, can be expanded by 10,000 acres.

NATIONAL RECREATION AREAS (NRA)

National Recreation Areas are established to recognize and protect outstanding recreation and natural values. Existing roads and motorized recreation, including snowmobiling, would continue, and commercial logging would be prohibited. The White Rocks NRA (23,750 acres) was established in 1984. Two new NRAs are proposed. The Robert Stafford NRA (38,000 acres) is named in honor of the former Vermont Governor and Senator who championed environmental protection and passage of the 1984 Vermont Wilderness Act. This beautiful southern Vermont area contains miles of snowmobile trails, hiking, mountain biking, and cross country ski trails, as well as extensive wetlands and clear streams.

The Moseslamoos NR (7,000 acres) provides many of the same opportunities on the northern part of the national forest. National Conservation Areas (NCA) National Conservation Areas are established to recognize, protect, and restore an area's extraordinary ecological values while allowing compatible recreation activity. Existing roads and motorized recreation, including snowmobiling, would continue, and commercial logging would be prohibited.

THE ROBERT STAFFORD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA (NRA) will provide one of the finest areas for backcountry recreation east of the Mississippi. The proposed NRA will link together 38,000 acres of non-wilderness conservation lands with nearly 65,000 acres of existing and proposed wilderness, and incorporate sections of the Appalachian, Long, and Catamount Trails. It is a large area of mountainous, lakes, trails, secluded bogs and blueberry barrens, and an outstanding array of wildlife habitat. The Robert Stafford NRA will include the headwaters of the Deerfield River, and will connect four vital wildlife areas: the George Allen Wilderness and the proposed Lamb Brook Wilderness in the south, the proposed Glasterbury Wilderness to the west, and Eye Brook Wilderness to the north. This is a once-in-a-lifetime chance to protect an entire landscape with immense benefits for wildlife and unsupervised opportunities for recreation.

In addition, the proposed NRA surrounds approximately 15,000 acres of land, formerly owned by the power-company NEPSCO and now owned by Pacific Gas and Electric. This includes the Somerset Reservoir, a beautiful lake surrounded by the towering peaks of Mount Snow; Stratton Mountain; and Glasterbury Mountain, with views down the valley into Lamb Brook. The high ridge to the east and Glastenbury Mountain to the west offer a sense of seclusion that is nearly unmatched in New England. The proposed NRA would create a protected area spanning approximately 100,000 acres of forest. The non-wilderness portions of the NRA would be managed much like the existing White Rocks NRA, allowing snowmobile use on designated trails, while the remainder would be managed as wilderness. Commercial logging would be prohibited.

THE PROPOSED MOOSALAMOO NATIONAL RECREATION AREA (NRA) is located in the towns of Salisbury, Ripton, and Goshen in the northern part of the Green Mountain National Forest. The area is bounded by Vermont Route 125 to the north, Route 73 in the south,
TIMBER MANAGEMENT ON THE GREEN MOUNTAIN NATIONAL FOREST

The US Forest Service hosted a December 11, 2001 educational forum on timber management on the Green Mountain National Forest. 4 panelsists offered their views: Chris Casey, a USFS silviculturist; Ed Larson of the Vermont Forest Products Association; Richard Carbonetti, a Landfirst forester; and Jim Northrup, past Green Mountain planner for the USFS and current director of Forest Watch, the Wilderness advocacy group. Dr. Don DeHays, dean of the University of Vermont's School of Forestry, moderated.

by Andrew Whitaker

The context of the timber forum was the ongoing Green Mountain planning process and the Wilderness proposals of the Vermont Wilderness Association. The VWA hopes that Vermont's Congressional reps will legislate their proposals while the USFS and industry GMNF support the primary of the planning process. Other groups in Vermont are part of the national End Commercial Logging campaign which aims to do just that on national forests, again through congressional action.

Industry and USFS personnel clearly feel aggrieved by plans for more Wilderness on the Green; the presentations by Richard Carbonetti and Ed Larson reflect a little doubt that they feel the time has come to say enough! They hammered on the political and cultural aspects of more Wilderness as an assault on rural life and livelihood.

Northrup called for an end to drawing on the Green as a timber source, with much greater emphasis on Wilderness and a subordinate role as demonstrator of sustainable, low impact forestry techniques.

Casey presented a portrait of declining timber harvest over the course of the last plan, a frustration of timber harvest goals for the forest. A timber role as demonstrator of sustainable forest management was an obvious in its failure to fulfill the timber mandate.

Lands Everybody Wants

GMNF supervisor Brewer prefaced the panel discussion with a recapitulation of USFS multiple-use philosophy, which spans Wilderness and timber supply, and a brief summary of GMNF history. The forest's 384,000 acres were, at the turn of the last century, heavily cut-over or reverting forest. The GMNF is fulfilling their mission of that recovery, with thinning and clearcutting contributing to wildlife habitat.

Casey's goals for the forest are a rebuilding of the timber program and a pipeline of sales.

A Silent Majority Speech

The heavy for the night was Landfirst forester Richard Carbonetti who assured the audience at the start that he probably wouldn't make some folks happy with his remarks. His thrust, an echo of the general message being directed by the hard elements of industry at what they must hope to be a receptive public, is that forest policy discussion has been hijacked by extremists. He used as one example the way in which the recommendations of the North-Woods Forest Lands Council were ignored by environmental outfits the "day after" their issuance.

Carbonetti said that the intention of these extreme groups is to turn national forests into national parks. He said that this, and other efforts to end logging, is a myopic view of our citizens and the world. "Throughout the night he repeated the "moral obligation" we have to produce what we, as Americans, consume, (fortunately, an audience member confronted him with the "Our national obligation to our consumption." By his statistics, 30 acres of forest are degraded for every acre cut in the Green. "If that's not immoral, I don't know what it is.

Carbonetti claimed further moral high ground, stating that while others see forest policy in black and white, he seeks gray area solutions. "Locking up a forest in a terrastrion is not a solution; nor is the environmental community willing to talk about the negative impacts of taking the Green out of Vermont's timber equation. The beauty of public land, he stated, is defending below-cost sales, is that it doesn't fall under the financial constraints of private operations.

Carbonetti also stated that the claim that logging precludes other uses is a fabrication by conservation biologists: "We can't allow it to be in the debate — it's a lie. He further stated, "I am a conservation biologist," saying of the pedigreed kind, "They talk about it but haven't been responsible for decisions" on the ground, as he has. During question period, he also claimed that private wealthy clients of his are scared of managing their land when they read in the paper about Wilderness plans for public land.

Carbonetti concluded that a silent majority of people "should appeal the debate." While agreeing that we need more wilderness but also a "vast timber-base" in Vermont, the ad hominem nature of his talk left many environmentalists in attendance displeased.

New Vision for GMNF

While providing a point of departure, Jim Northrup of Forest Watch, calling for vision and leadership from the Forest Service, indicated what he believes to be their obligations: eco-forestry; wilderness; backcountry recreation. Northrup also offered evidence (see report) that logging precludes other uses.

"Our moral obligation is to alter our consumption habits," saying of the pedigreed kind, "They talk about it but haven't been responsible for decisions" on the ground, as he has. During question period, he also claimed that private wealthy clients of his are scared of managing their land when they read in the paper about Wilderness plans for public land.

Carbonetti concluded that a silent majority of people "should appeal the debate." While agreeing that we need more wilderness but also a "vast timber-base" in Vermont, the ad hominem nature of his talk left many environmentalists in attendance displeased.

In which an audience largely receptive to Wilderness also rejects the black & white arguments of an industry spokesperson invoking shades of grey...

Focus Shifts to Private Lands

Northrup's recommendation that the USFS demonstrate low impact forestry as a model for private timber owners contributed to the focus shifting in part, to the condition of private lands in Vermont. Several audience members suggested their degraded condition, as generational highgrading has reduced availability of sawtimber.

Larson offered a point of departure: the green as a timber source, with 3000 to 50 public lands, should offer public lands. Larson, who said he felt the financial performance of the forest would have been much different with augmented sales. Northrup's recommendation that the USFS provide less than 1% of the state's timber harvest, could provide virtually non with negative impact (Carbonetti and Nelson quarreled with this point, Nelson later stating that as a Cabot sawmill owner, he felt the impact of sale's forest would have been much different with augmented sales. Casey's goals for the forest are a rebuilding of the timber program and a "pipeline of sales.

The Well-Tempered Audience

Very few members of Carbonetti's silent majority were given the tenor of audience questions and comments. What was clear was that very few shared his black and white view of good Vermonters and bad environmentalists.

Northup also offered evidence (see graph) that demand for timber on the GMNF is weak, which public attitude to the sales occurred at a time of high stumpage, of the cut showed a decline from 20 million to 6 million feet in annual production. The fact that the recent decline in sales occurred at a time of high stumpage, which paid to landowners for standing timber, was a further frustration to Casey, who said he felt the financial performance of the forest would have been much different with augmented sales. Casey's goals for the forest are a rebuilding of the timber program and a "pipeline of sales.

A Silent Majority Speech

The heavy for the night was Landfirst forester Richard Carbonetti who assured the audience at the start that he probably wouldn't make some folks happy with his remarks. His thrust, an echo of the general message being directed by the hard elements of industry at what they must hope to be a receptive public, is that forest policy discussion has been hijacked by extremists. He used as one example the way in which the recommendations of the North-Woods Forest Lands Council were ignored by environmental outfits the "day after" their issuance.

Carbonetti said that the intention of these extreme groups is to turn national forests into national parks. He said that this, and other efforts to end logging, is a myopic view of our citizens and the world. "Throughout the night he repeated the "moral obligation" we have to produce what we, as Americans, consume (fortunately, an audience member confronted him with the "Our national obligation to our consumption." By his statistics, 30 acres of forest are degraded for every acre cut in the Green. "If that's not immoral, I don't know what it is.

Carbonetti claimed further moral high ground, stating that while others see forest policy in black and white, he seeks gray area solutions. "Locking up a forest in a terrastrion is not a solution; nor is the environmental community willing to talk about the negative impacts of taking the Green out of Vermont's timber equation. The beauty of public land, he stated, is defending below-cost sales, is that it doesn't fall under the financial constraints of private operations.

Carbonetti also stated that the claim that logging precludes other uses is a fabrication by conservation biologists: "We can't allow it to be in the debate — it's a lie. He further stated, "I am a conservation biologist," saying of the pedigreed kind, "They talk about it but haven't been responsible for decisions" on the ground, as he has. During question period, he also claimed that private wealthy clients of his are scared of managing their land when they read in the paper about Wilderness plans for public land.

Carbonetti concluded that a silent majority of people "should appeal the debate." While agreeing that we need more wilderness but also a "vast timber-base" in Vermont, the ad hominem nature of his talk left many environmentalists in attendance displeased.

In which an audience largely receptive to Wilderness also rejects the black & white arguments of an industry spokesperson invoking shades of grey...

Focus Shifts to Private Lands

Northrup's recommendation that the USFS demonstrate low impact forestry as a model for private timber owners contributed to the focus shifting in part, to the condition of private lands in Vermont. Several audience members suggested their degraded condition, as generational highgrading has reduced availability of sawtimber.

Larson offered a point of departure: the green as a timber source, with 3000 to 50 public lands, should offer public lands. Larson, who said he felt the financial performance of the forest would have been much different with augmented sales. Northrup's recommendation that the USFS provide less than 1% of the state's timber harvest, could provide virtually non with negative impact (Carbonetti and Nelson quarreled with this point, Nelson later stating that as a Cabot sawmill owner, he felt the impact of sale's forest would have been much different with augmented sales. Casey's goals for the forest are a rebuilding of the timber program and a "pipeline of sales.

The Well-Tempered Audience

Very few members of Carbonetti's silent majority were given the tenor of audience questions and comments. What was clear was that very few shared his black and white view of good Vermonters and bad environmentalists.

Northup also offered evidence (see graph) that demand for timber on the GMNF is weak, which public attitude to the sales occurred at a time of high stumpage, of the cut showed a decline from 20 million to 6 million feet in annual production. The fact that the recent decline in sales occurred at a time of high stumpage, which paid to landowners for standing timber, was a further frustration to Casey, who said he felt the financial performance of the forest would have been much different with augmented sales. Casey's goals for the forest are a rebuilding of the timber program and a "pipeline of sales.

The Well-Tempered Audience

Very few members of Carbonetti's silent majority were given the tenor of audience questions and comments. What was clear was that very few shared his black and white view of good Vermonters and bad environmentalists.
“If there is one thing I know,” said Marion Leonard, Rochester, Vermont, “we need all the wilderness we can get.”

Remarks in support of Wilderness were buttressed by gestures of informed support for a sustainable woods industry. Several Wilderness skeptics also offered more temperate views than did industry partisans. In all, the evening demonstrated the progressive centrism that has persisted through generations of Vermont politics.

A teacher of children with Attention Deficit Disorder in the calm and courteous his students experience in natural areas — and that they have never showed negative attitudes toward logging. Jared Wood of Burlington spoke of the benign neglect enjoyed by the Green Mountains in the 30s and 40s, and development pressures since then. Saying that “we should strive to keep more wilderness areas and efficient logging,” he said that since cut-over land comes back, it “doesn’t come back in wilderness form.”

Perhaps the final word of the meeting belonged to Marion Leonard, born in 1909, who spoke also of the many changes she has witnessed to the planet. “If there is one thing I know,” she said, “we need all the wilderness we can get.”

Rural Development

The actual final speaker at the meeting asked, How do we bring ourselves together instead of battling against each other? Similar questions were asked at the Island Pond hearing on the West Mountain. In some quarters, the question may seem rhetorical; in rural communities, it is a growing need. To the extent that Wilderness is seen as a detraction from a timber base, rather than a universal, progress.

New England has thus far inspired far less investment in natural resources and environmental education. Here is potential future of the area. The proposed National Conservation Area has largely interior forest habitat in an area of Vermont that is large — the core area — and rich in wildlife. Protecting this area will increase the stability and viability of local wildlife populations.

80,000 Acres of Wilderness Proposed for Green Mountain NF…

the Long Trail and the spine of the Green Mountains to the east, and Route 53 to the west. Predominantly roadsides and 7,250 acres in size, the Moosalamoo NRA has extensive interior forest habitat in an area of Vermont that is largely.

Many interior-dependent neotropical migratory songbirds breed at Moosalamoo, and great blue herons nested recently in a wetland along Green Pond. Importantly, Moosalamoo also contains extensive deer yards.

The proposed Abbey Pond National Conservation Area would protect 3,500 acres of the 8,000-acre Robert Frost Mountain area in the Green Mountain National Forest. South of the Bristol Cliffs Wilderness Area, west of the Breadloaf Wilderness, and spanning the towns of B LOOK and Middlebury, the Robert Frost Mountain region is predominately wild in character despite repeated logging by the Forest Service. The area has high ecological value because of its valuable habitat for a variety of wildlife, including black bear and migratory song­birds dependent on unfragmented interior forest. In addition, there are outstanding opportunities for backcountry recreation, education, and scientific research. The Abbey Pond Trail, which leads up the steep escarpment into this area, is popular with local residents for hiking and picnicking.

The Forest Service has logged the Robert Frost Mountain area for approximately 50 years, employing intensive logging methods such as clearcutting and other even-aged management, and building roads. Despite the land’s superb natural values, the Forest Service has only proposed placing less than 500 acres near Abbey Pond off limits to logging and road building. Ensuring the area’s ecological characteristics will require the inclusion of much more land in protected status. The core of the proposed Abbey Pond National Conservation Area hosts at least three rare plants: Jacob’s ladder, ovate spikerush, and matted spikerush. Great blue herons have nested on one of the wetlands.

Large mammal research has revealed regular use of the proposed NCA by bears, which forage on the sedges, reach, nuts, acorns, and apples found there.

The proposed NCA borders Mid­dleton College’s Battell Preserve on the north and east. The 1,097-acre old-growth forest, with northern hard­woods, huge hemlocks, and native red pines, can provide a window into the potential future of the Forest.

The proposed National Conservation Area has fewer than 20 natural communities, all within walking distance of one another. While individual community types like these are found elsewhere in Vermont, it is their close convergence here that makes the area such rich habitat for a wide range of native wildlife. Protecting this area will increase the stability and viability of local wildlife populations.

George Flaviovas on Forests & the Future

“Where you see the rate the world is being demolished — people polluting the oceans and chopping down all the forests — unless somebody puts the brakes on soon, there isn’t going to be anything left. There’s just more and more people with less and less resources. In that respect, I feel very sad. But at the same time, I have to be optimistic… our planet is one little bit of the physical universe, and you can’t really destroy it,”

from an interview with Anthony DeCurtis reprinted in the Rolling Stone special George Harrison tackle edition

NOTE: In a striking development as we head to press, Roberta Berland of the newly formed Vermont Loggers Association has indicated in a letter to the Rutland Herald (January 24) that her group sees some possibility for compromise on at least federal Wilderness. Her letter also sought to distance the VLA (from hard-line elements of industry see story opposite page) The letter reads in part: “I have not been close-minded to core areas. We merely suggested the core areas be established on federal land, rather than state land. Loggers would like to see multiple-use management on state land, where local loggers could harvest with timber-productivity and long-term forest management objectives. VLA supports education and research on federal lands and believes if we could get to a point of no appeals — and federal land was divided like a pie, so that environmentalists got one-third for wilderness, recreation a third for their uses, and local loggers got a third for forest management — everyone would win.”

Some of the sparring between these groups relates to differing attitudes toward the Sustainable Forestry Initiative, which many loggers have criticized as a sham. SFI is an industry self-certification program that is in competition with FSC third-party certification, which has experienced credibility problems of its own.
The White Mountain National Forest (WMNF) began the public process of revising the existing plan, adopted in 1986, around the end of 1999. After a comment period areas of concern were identified and described in a series of issue focused working papers (forester management, biodiversity, wilderness recommendations, etc.) These papers were then exhaustively reviewed for objections by Local Planning Groups (LPGs). The LPGs met in Gorham, Albany, Woodstock, and Chelmsford, MA. They were open to any interested participant. Officially no decisions have been made as of this point, the purpose so far was just to establish the full range issues and options that the Forest service and the public feel need to be addressed.

In January 2002 this review was completed and the next stage, alternative development, is set to begin in February. The Forest Service Planning Team and the LPGs will undertake the development of several plans, each of which will address all of the issues determined to be significant by the working paper process. The Forest Service will then review these various alternatives and draft their own plan, which will be released for public comment. Following the receipt of these comments the Forest Service will then issue a Final Forest Plan.

This means that now is an important time for environmentally concerned citizens to become involved in the forest planning process by attending the LPGs. The WMNF web page (www.fs.fed.us/r9/white click on “forest plan”) announces the times and locations of these meetings. In the working paper entitled the Role of the Forest the planning team suggests that they intend to designate areas and trails for use year round by Off Highway Recreational Vehicles (OHRVs), that they intend to maintain the level of timber harvest of the 1986 plan (the 1986 plan set a goal of 35 Million board feet (MMbf) harvested per year, while in recent years the Forest has been selling only 20-25 MMbf per year, and that they have little enthusiasm to recommend additional Wilderness Area or to protect the Roadless Areas of the Forest. There are also suggestions that they intend to codify the change in emphasis which has already occurred away from even-age towards uneven-age cutting.

While there was a great outpouring of environmental support in the first comment period, and while groups such as the Friends of Sandwich Notch and the Friends of Wild River were able to present maps and proposals for Wilderness Area expansion and creation, respectively, these recommendations need to be incorporated into every alternative forest plan in order to insure their adoption into the Forest Service’s draft and Final plan.

In addition, the allocation of land to the different intended uses, such as timber harvesting or dispersed, non-motorized recreation are subject to revision by the new Forest Plan. It is imperative that these allocations be determined with a full appreciation of the premier status of the White Mountains as a location for outdoor recreation in the North East, and as the greatest opportunity for Wilderness preservation in New England.

Bangor Hydro-Electric Co. shows no sign of abandoning Tie Line Proposal

Bangor Hydro-Electric Co. shows no sign of abandoning Tie Line Proposal

by Pamela Prodan

In December, staff of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection issued a draft order denying a permit for Bangor Hydro-Electric to construct a 345 kV electric transmission line from Orrington to Baileyville, ME.

The draft order concludes that the proposed route, cutting a new corridor through central Washington and northern Hancock County, is not the least environmentally damaging alternative available. Two alternatives would be less damaging, either the preferred route of the Natural Resources Council of Maine (NRCM), located next to the existing MEPCO transmission line, or what has become known as the IP Route, located next to the Stud Mill Road and travels International Paper Co. land.

The Board of Environmental Protection (BEP) held a public hearing on September 10 and 11 and on October 3, 4, and 5, 2001 in Bangor, Maine, where the overwhelming majority of testimony heard was against the line. Many people spoke movingly of the adverse impact the new line would have on the Downeast region's wild, remote and undeveloped character. A denial by the BEP has practically been assured since November.

The BEP was scheduled to issue its final decision at its February meeting in Augusta. If the line is not reopened, and Bangor Hydro decides to continue to pursue the line, the utility will have to submit a new application using a different route. A decision is now expected to be made on reopening the record by February. Meanwhile, the deadline for comments on the draft order has been extended, pending a decision on the request to reopen the record. A new comment deadline will be set in a subsequent procedural order.

Also pending in Maine Superior Court are two lawsuits related to the transmission line. One, basically a contract of suit, relates to IP’s (formerly Champion) change of heart about granting Bangor Hydro an easement to cross IP land. IP now opposes routing the line through the woods and prefers the Stud Mill Road route (for more background, see “Bangor Hydro Transmission Line Threatens Downeast Lakes Wildland” by Pamela Prodan, Northern Forest Forum, Fall 2000, p.80-83). The other suit challenges the conservation easement that the Nature Conservancy and IP have negotiated in the Machias River region. Bangor Hydro alleges that the easement transfers to the easement holder utility corridor, river crossing and development rights that Bangor Hydro already owns.

New Brunswick Power Co. is a partner in the transmission line and has already scheduled to build 60 miles of new transmission line to connect to the Bangor Hydro line. New Brunswick Power has insisted that it will not connect with Bangor Hydro if the line is not connected along the route proposed by NRCM. Emera, a Nova Scotia Company that owns Nova Scotia Power, is buying Bangor Hydro and will be among the companies using the new transmission line, as will Hydro-Quebec. Bangor Hydro acknowledges that most of the electricity that will be transmitted will not be sold to or used by Maine consumers.
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USER FEES ON THE WHITE MOUNTAIN NATIONAL FOREST

John Joline is a co-founder of New England Public Forest Advocates, a group dedicated to fighting the fee demo program on the White Mountain National Forest. Through NEPFA, Joline has given the issue profile in NH, and networked nationally with other anti-fee activists.

A Dartmouth graduate and active rock climber, Joline may be reached at joline@dartmouth.edu

What is fee-demo and what inspired you to oppose it here in New Hampshire on the White Mountain National Forest?

Fee-demo is a national pilot program which was slipped into an appropriations bill in 1996 largely at the behest of recreation industry lobbyists, to demonstrate the feasibility of charging fees for activities on public land which have traditionally been free (that is, covered by public funds). It has been extended each year since then and now is due to expire 2 years hence.

All across the nation thousands of people like myself have been fighting to end this program because it represents a serious erosion of one of the most basic, fundamental liberties that we as citizens possess. Simple foot travel on public land should be as free as one's right to breathe. For some years, fees have been charged to enter national parks, but these represent a small fraction of public land. It is a mistake of epic proportion to begin charging people access to the vast, largely undeveloped lands such as those administered by the USFS and BLM.

When you begin to understand the implications of fee-demo—where it is coming from and where it is meant to lead us—it is even more dismaying, and it is clear that action must be taken to end the program. Basically, an attempt is being made to reverse the traditional roles of citizens as owners of the public lands—with the land management agencies as stewards of the land, caring for it at the citizens' behest—toward a system where the land management agencies are, in effect, considered virtual owners of those lands and able to use their lands as a kind of financial capital, essentially to make money to cover their budget and running their operations like businesses with the citizens now considered to be their "customers."

A private recreation lobby has pushed fee-demo. Are these folks just plain folks?

Yes, we have been fighting fee-demo for years, but the folks who really want this program to succeed are mainly in the recreation industry, and not of the public, or of the people of New Hampshire. They stand to make tens of billions of dollars in profits if they can be allowed to develop it in "partnership" with local land management agencies. It is a mis-guided program.

The radical privatization agenda [of the Reagan-Gingrich era] mostly didn't "fly" with the American people, so now what is happening is this instead of privatizing actual ownership of public lands, there is now an attempt to privatize access to public land. Fee-demo is the leading edge of this wedge to develop public land for private profit.

Fee demo has experienced some legal challenges and has not stood up too well. Have courts been saying?

For a long time, the federal Magistrate Judge in NH was dismissing cases after case of fee violators, ruling that just because someone's car was found in a WMNF parking area without a pass displayed, that did not, by itself, constitute "probable cause" that the owner of the car had failed to buy a pass. In so doing, the Judge set the standard of proof very high — so that since spring/summer of 2001, after many of them realizing that fee demo had shifted their enforcement strategy to actually approaching individuals and asking them directly if they have bought a pass (rather than just ticketing parked cars), there is now an attempt to privatize access to public land. Fee-demo is the leading edge of this wedge to develop public land for private profit.

Did the Congressional delegation weigh in on the subject?

All four are on record as being opposed to the program, at least as regards its being applied to the citizens of NH who live in the WMNF area. We would love to see them take a more aggressive, outspoken role against it, however — but at the same time we are grateful that they have the good sense to realize what a misguided program it is.

How do you respond to the argument that trail use and trail maintenance are a use of public land that impose added management costs and the user, not the general public, should foot the bill?

When you consider the following figure, it's a no-brainer: The Forest Service's own literature states that "a person with an annual income of $40,000 pays less than $0.03 per year in taxes to recreate on Forest Service lands, nationwide." Since the costs we're talking about are comparative paltry, and the income-tax impact on each citizen is negligible it makes no sense at all to replace the traditional fair, equitable way of funding public lands with a system that is intrusive, demoralizing, unfair, and difficult and costly to enforce.

The fees represent a supremely regressive tax which falls very harshly on those least able to pay. In fact, 1999 research funded by the Forest Service has shown that such fees have already had a "significant exclusionary impact" on low income people in Vermont and New Hampshire.

The traditional way it works is this: each American chips in a miniscule amount of money each year and this assures that all of us are free to visit our public lands without the coercive irritation of fees. Fee-demo is bad for the spiritual well being and peace of mind of the citizenry!

Do you have other thoughts about the WMNF and its management?

We have a lot of sympathy for the local FS personnel and managers in the WMNF. Washington, DC has put them between a rock and a hard place. Their budget is being cut on the one hand, but at the same time they realize full well that the program intensely conflicts of interest the ARC has conducted, and that resolution (asking for an exemption of the program) is.

Before the War

The Byronic postcard scene above is "from the Heart of the Notch, White Mountains", ca. 1910 from the Wilmer Sipple collection. It depicts the Frankenstein trestle or Willey Bridge Brook in Crawford Notch. The Maine Central Railroad's Mountain Division ran from Portland to St. Johnsbury, VT, part of a transcontinental route that linked the port of Oldenburg, NY with Portland. Mr. Sipple relates that a friend's summer job as a brakeman on the Mountain Division involved covering for a drunk engineer and fireman, who sloshed bile he hung the bell and ran the Sanders on the descent into the Connecticut Valley. The student brakeman also put some freight cars on the ground in Gilman, VT, which he was assured was not unprecedented in railroad history.
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By Jamie Sayon

Full ghost according to schedule (an lofty proposition) The Trust for Public Lands will acquire 171,500 acres in northeastern New Hampshire in March, 2002 from International Paper for about $35 million. When all monitoring, road maintenance, and property tax and TIP's expenses and profits are factored in, the deal will cost about $40 million. Once TPL owns the land, it will sell 25,000 acres to New Hampshire to be managed as "natural areas," about 200 acres to the State to expand an adjoining state park, and the remaining 146,400 acres to a New Hampshire-based timberland speculator, Lyme Timber.

Lyme Timber, a limited partnership, will pay $90 an acre. Since IP will receive about $200 an acre, this means that the public is acquiring a "conservation easement" for about $120 an acre. The easement will permanently extinguish development on the land and will be recorded on the property's title, which can be transferred to subsequent owners.

The "Natural Area" is actually three smaller parcels. Commercial timber harvesting will be prohibited. However, the state will manage 40 percent, or 10,000 acres, for wildlife. In practice, this means clearcuts to provide early successional habitat for common game species. Also, existing snowmobile trails that cross the so-called "natural areas" will remain open.

The NH conservation community, led by the New Hampshire Society for the Protection of NH Forests (SPNHF), and the leading political figures of the state are rejoicing over this "consensus conservation" utopia. They claim the deal "permanently conserves" the land and ensures "sustainable forestry" will be practiced on Lyme's holdings. It all sounds too good to be true, and, sadly, a closer reading of the fine print of the "Draft Easement" released on January 7, 2002, suggests that rhetoric exceeds reality by a goodly distance.

Easement Language

The "Purposes" of the Easement, we are told include:

- "maintain traditional forest uses," but not restore the traditional forest that was dominated by spruce more than 150 years of age and was home to wild brook trout, wolves, lynx, and even wolverine, caribou, and Atlantic salmon.
- Conserve "the quality of groundwater" and "a biological diversity" (while permitting clearcuts and serial herbicide spraying).
- Guarantee public access for motorized vehicles, even on "natural areas," while prohibiting low impact hillycountry camping.

"To retain the property "as an environmentally viable and sustainable tract of land for the production of timber, pulpwood,..." "Retention" implies that something is ongoing. But anyone even vaguely familiar with the condition of these lands realizes there are essentially no quality spruce stands on the land today, and any that do remain are more important as habitat and seed source than as 2 X 4 ft. The only way to recover the squandered economic viability of these lands is patience for many decades. Clearcuts, herbicides, and other commercial activities in the near term can only exacerbate the current crisis.

Flawed Justifications

To justify the cost of the Conservation Easement — 60 percent of the price of the Lyme lands — the dealmakers tell us that the public secures three important protections:

- Development is permanently foreclosed on the entire tract. This is certainly good. But, how much should we pay to prevent non-existing threats? Ninety percent or more of these lands are not threatened by development. The dealmakers ignored repeated requests for an analysis of the real value of development rights and a cost-benefit analysis of the easement. As the claim that development was the greatest threat to the integrity of the land became increasingly untenable, they shifted attention to the other two protections: public access and sustainable forestry.

- Public access is guaranteed on the entire tract for snowmobiles, but, fortunately, not for ATVs. Access is also guaranteed for a four-wheel drive with the tires and pedestrians. But overnight camping is prohibited. The dealmakers also ignored warnings that paying millions of dollars to guarantee public access to lands that the public already pays for access via low current use property tax assessments sets a dangerous, and potentially very expensive precedent. What are other large, corporate landowners going to think when they read that Lyme and IP held up the public for access guarantees? Will Throack and Moid opt to be public benefactors or from the temptation to close off their lands until they secure their payoffs?

- Sustainable Forestry is assured, if our politicians follow through promised by the Easement. But, as we read through the sections that spell out how the sustainable forestry will be practiced, we discover that the easement actually contains that many of the worst excesses of industrial forestry will be perpetuated.

An Occasional Old Tree

The easement calls for sustaining an economically productive hardwood forest. Forests remain more important as habitat and seed source than as 2 X 4 ft. The only way to recover the squandered economic viability of a forest that is now 90 percent hardwood. Only time can naturally restore the lost hardwoods. This easement ensures that time will not be tolerated.

The Easement calls for "early successional hardwoods" for moose. (p. 2) There are already too many early successional hardwoods; indeed, one could make a case that that category is the dominant condition after a century of abuse. The Easement does mandate that logging operations leave behind "occasional very large/old trees." (p. 5) Occasional doesn't sound like 27 percent of the forest, the proportion of the old-growth eastern even-aged forest that was covered by trees 300 years or older.

"Clearcut settlement forest was composed of a mix of species and age classes, ranging from zero to 300-400 years of age. Natural disturbance events rarely created open canopy gaps of an acre or more, but, on rare occasions, every decade, every century, or longer, the dead and downed trees remained in the forest to assist with the healing process following catastrophic disturbance. There were few large even-aged stands. The easement states that "even aged and uneven aged forest management" are equally appropriate. In other words, as part of the sustainable forestry strategy, the easement encourages the imposition of rare, catastrophic events on a routine basis. This may be "appropriate" for a timber speculator; it is not responsible, low-impact forestry of the sort that public and private conservation funds should underwrite.

Sustainable Herbiciding

Permitted forest management activities include spraying toxins on natural systems with applicable statutes and regulations herbicides, pesticides, fungicides, rodenticides, insecticides, and fertilizers..." (p. 4) Of course, it is not what the drive with the tires and pedestrians. But overnight camping is prohibited. The dealmakers also ignored warnings that paying millions of dollars to guarantee public access to lands that the public already pays for access via low current use property tax assessments sets a dangerous, and potentially very expensive precedent. What are other large, corporate landowners going to think when they read that Lyme and IP held up the public for access guarantees? Will Throack and Moid opt to be public benefactors or from the temptation to close off their lands until they secure their payoffs?

- Sustainable Forestry is assured, if our politicians follow through promised by the Easement. But, as we read through the sections that spell out how the sustainable forestry will be practiced, we discover that the easement actually contains that many of the worst excesses of industrial forestry will be perpetuated.

- Public access is guaranteed on the entire tract for snowmobiles, but, fortunately, not for ATVs. Access is also guaran...
Conserving & Creating Connection to the Land


L ast fall, the Trust for Public Land (TPL) published Peter Forbes’s provocative small book The Great Remembering: Further Thoughts on Land, Soul, and Society. Forbes, a long-time Environmentalist, challenges conservationists to view their work as a call to build relationships between land and people, and not just advocacy that is measured in political victories.

He describes many conservation campaigns he’s been involved with, and the local people whose love for a particular place played a significant role in ensuring successful action. He has concluded that conservation can and must create a new kind of people. Conservation work, he argues, must lead in meeting our moral challenge to develop a healthy, respectful land ethic. “To save the land, we must save the people.” [It is evident how we are entering into that relationship with the land,” he writes. “It is equally clear how many weakesses as a culture grow from our inability to develop a connection with place.” (page 57)

This book offers a very useful, but firm, challenge to prevailing social, political, and economic assumptions of society, politicians, conservationists, and industry, and mainstream conservation. The line that divides good and bad relationships with the land, Forbes suggests, “is defined by self-interest, or exploitation. One begins a relationship when one begins to think beyond one's own needs and wants.” (p. 69)

Examples concludes his essay with the statement that conservation success will be measured by “how much love and respect for the land we can engender in the greatest number of people.” This is a nice re-working of Pinchot’s tired utilitarian doctrine.

I heartily recommend this short work. I do, however, have two concerns.

Most of the case studies deal with development pressures in urban and suburban settings. There is very little about appropriate conservation strategies for undeveloped land such as northern New England’s paper company lands that have flooded the market in the past fifteen years. I would welcome a more explicit treatment of these land sales. Forbes repeatedly speaks of the importance of preserving wilderness - usually not an option in suburban conservation deals. How should this be accomplished? Easements and certification? Or public land acquisition? It is essential that articulate voices like Forbes clearly distinguish between conservation issues of southern and northern New England. The solutions to these are not identical, and I would welcome his clear thoughts on the differences.

At the very end of the book, he offers a list of ways we can gauge successful conservation deals below is a sampling. A successful conservation land deal:
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If we measure the Connecticut Lakes deal by these standards, one must wonder if the TPL dealmakers bothered to read Forbes’s fine tone. Indeed, the easement, the wilderness, and reserves, and the hostility to public lands displayed by this deal orchestrated by the Trust for Public Land reads almost like an intentional mockery of Forbes’s checklist. One Trust for Public Land are we dealing with? -Jd

Problems Unaddressed

Senator Dzhovity would applaud the dealmakers’ commitment to helping the local economy. So would I, if this deal helped it. By perpetuating a landlord-ship pattern that has failed—and failed the natural and human communities of northern New Hampshire—the dealmakres have played politics skillfully, but, in the process, contributed to the foreclosure of our poor country’s hope of escaping poverty, disfratation, and control of the economy by absentee investors. In perpetuating the status quo of timber ownership and forest industry practices, this deal will help perpetuate other aspects of the status quo (that dealmakers are somewhat more reticent to acknowledge):

• Median per capita income in Pittsburg (the town that contains about 85 percent of the land for sale) is 39 percent of the national average.
• Pulp and paper mills in Berlin and Gorham, NH have closed since July, and hopes are not high that they will reopen. There just aren’t many markets for wood except for low value and log (and jobs) export to Quebec.
• Local loggers know the game is just about up. A friend who operates a feller-buncher on industrial lands up here tells me that he and his fellow loggers will be out of work in two years because there’s nothing but pulp wood to log.

The road in the middle distance is the assumed spillway boundary of this hardwood job in the 3rd Connecticut Lake area. Photo © Alex MacLean, Landlinks.
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ATV Use in New Hampshire's Nash Stream Forest: Opponents Call for State to Stand by Its Plan; Supporters Say Give Us a Try

The following excerpts of public commentary on the Nash Stream forest plan were taken from the New Hampshire Department of Forests and Lands (Wildlife Division), where the comments may be viewed in their entirety.

Comments addressed three areas, generally—whether ATV use on the state-owned lands should be allowed; whether camp leases should be extended past the present sunset date; and whether the current forest plan should be opened for revision.

These commentaries are worthwhile reading, for they help prick this myth that the rural areas of northern New England speak with one monoculturally oriented voice. Rather, we hear here many local voices for a conservation ethic, as well as down-country lobbyists for greater machine access.

Democratic tolerance is a virtue, but we are also reminded of someone observing, at a legislative hearing on Vermont's state lands, that "memorabilia are fun if you are on one but not so fun otherwise. We have yet to hear from the Governor's Snowboard Council on this topic, and we were surprised to learn that such a body may not even exist: no one knows who it is. How could this be so, given the existence of an official snowmobiling council, it is hard to imagine."

What is easy to imagine, with commercial culture now virtually synonymous with crime, is that the mushrooiming of ATV use, dealerships, and even the size of the machines, has resulted in an osmotic pressure for the expansion of their use across the state. At the heart of many of the ATV enthusiasts' and a native political culture ready to accommodate anything to make a cash register ring, is a rare recipe for expanded use. With guest users and users making far less of a stop, perhaps it is time they began to make more noise.

Yes: With Resignation

Although my initial reaction was to say "no!" to ATVs, with the increase in popularity of ATVs, the economic growth of the North Country and the support of North Country legislators, I now realize that ATVs will most likely be allowed in the forest whether I like it or not. Therefore, I am changing my opinion to an unthematical "yes," but, as a camp owner, I am opposed to ATV use overall. I feel that the points of the proposed routes that were displayed at the public hearings.

Further, I am opposed to year round use of the trails for ATV use if the trails for ATVs will be the same as the snowmobile trails. I also opposed to ATV use during mud season. I support the camps maintaining their trails as well as policing the areas for rule breakers and transgressors. I would also hope the Fish and Game and Trails Bureau of DRED will have enough resources and interest to enforce the rules. If the policy is passed allowing ATVs to use the forest, I would like to see the policy reassessed after so many years, say 3 to 5, to determine the impact on the environment and on other modes or recreation. —

BETHEL-LFIELD CONSERVATION COMMISSION (BCC) is concerned about the use of ATVs in the state of NH. The BCC believes there should be a statewide policy rather than a piecemeal plan, which addresses one issue or one state-owned area at a time. BCC urges you to consider potential damage to trails by ATVs during snowmobile season, including beginning and end of season when snow cover is thin and gets soft during the day. You should be regulating/restrictions during a thaw. Allowing ATVs on some sort of constructed road system would do less damage to the land. State should consider environmental impact of ATV trails. During spring many wildlife species are producing young, which appears to be "mud holes" could be well be warm pools or at least small ponds with amphibian reproduction. The Bureau should also consider the impact of allowing ATVs on trails used by hikers especially with small children and/or dogs, who want an outdoor experience complete with bird watching. The Bureau of Trails should continue to aid ATV clubs with education courses so they will be aware of environmental impact. BCC believes state-wide policies including location of future trails is crucial—perhaps regulations that restrict use in certain weather conditions. Allowing state-issued permits for such trails such as for hunting only on a clastic basis. State must enforce regulations. This will require more money, resources, and people. Perhaps ATV registration fees should be increased.

I totalize that politics and political pressure are going to play a big part in your decision. And hopefully the majority of comments you receive are against any use of ATVs in Nash Stream and they will not be allowed. If ATVs are to be allowed I feel they should be contained to hardened trails only as far from water sources as possible to prevent rogue riders from mimicking the "mud run" they have at their rodeo. Use should be monitored, and rules, regulations and laws enforced. If the ATV clubs and law enforcement cannot, [or] do not control rogue riders then whatever trails opened to ATVs should be taken away from them. If ATV use of Nash Stream is allowed it should be the minimal land available with no expectations that more trails may become available in the future. —

ADVERTISERS OF ATVs sensationalize the wild side of speed and "leaping off from cliffs" which gives public the impression all ATVs are like James bond movies instead of the actual responsible and courteous greater majority.

FEATURES WE had problems in 60s and 70s with snowmobiles, but we worked through the problems. Feet that ATV's should have a window of time to try out ATV trails in Nash Stream, give them a chance. Fees help do as much damage and that club can fix any trail problems.

RATHER THAN CODIFY the individual uses, I would prefer a special use permitting function be created, once revision was made at the state level of the future forest plan. We need to do some brainstorm work on the issue of ATV use. I submit that self policing is a nice idea, but very difficult to practice. DRED needs to have in hand some measure of compliance now— I regularly see ATV trails on places they are not supposed to be. I also have witnessed ATV damage in increased erosion at Stratford Bog Pond, including joy-riding on the dam. You will need to provide a contract to the claims of the ATV enthusiasts before giving the decision over to the public for input.

Yes: With Conviction

I Am a Firm Believer that the sport of trailriding on ATVs is certainly growing in this area as it is all over the State of NH. To me, this is a natural process based on how the snowmobiling industry grew. It is inevitable that we will follow suit with this business. I am one of the people who have fallen in love with four wheeled trail riding due to my age - I am over 50 and look forward to joining a group of riders heading to the top of a mountain to enjoy the scenery. ... I cannot walk the mountain trails any more due to health problems - I see this sport becoming more and more desirable to folks of this age group in particular. For you to stop the use of these trails would be a very sad message to the aging population as well as the handicapped folks. I am urging you to please consider us when making these decisions, we need State trails all over the state. I have been on rides to Nash Stream and the folks in the camps asked us to stop and visit - which we did. I feel it is not a correct statement that the camp owners don't want ATVs as many have their own. This business is growing and especially here in the North Country where we are becoming more and more dependent on tourism for a living... If there are rogue riders, they can be dealt with appropriately— the average riders only want their own trails. Please take time to learn what strict rules are in place with the clubs and you will see this sport and the riders respect the forest and the environment. There is a place for us, please vote to have the trails open in Nash Stream. —

STATE of NH has obligation to thousands of registered ATV owners and you must be working towards opening more of the land. Woodstock area have no legal trails to ride on either state or national forest. It creates problems all around. Many of us track our ATVs to Groveton and N. Stratford and many of us belong to our club but more trails are needed in the area where better than Nash Stream! You took our money, told us to form some clubs, get organized and would talk to us. We will have done those things with many many clubs and many are members of the Granite State ATV Assoc. Show us you are willing to work with us on getting some trails opened. So many negatives could become positives if there was ample riding. Our club has close to 100 members, many senior citizens who would not be able to get into the forest without ATVs. —

WE Reg ATVs throughout the year. We register our ATVs in NH where we own a vacation home in Woodstock. We belong to White Mt ATV club, the Ammonoosuc Valley ATV club, and the Granite State ATV Assoc. We pay to register our ATVs and spend a great deal of time and money and we deserve more trails to be open and to enjoy. —

I would like to go on record as favoring ATV use in the NSSF. My constituents and I believe in a true multi-use plan of public access. If the state is to be a true steward of the lands, it must be ready to accept new uses in a regulated manner. I would also like to see these changes and other necessary changes as they come up acted on in a timely fashion. —

PUBLIC LAND MEANS multiple use. Snowmachines paved way, ATVs are here. State collects registration money so state should provide place on public land. Much more ATVs being made vs. snowmachines. Commissioner Bold needs to decide now; 3 years is too long. Public obligation to decide this and provide it. [Governor's Council member Raymond] Burt strongly in favor of allowing them. 18,000 reg. ATVs in all, 60,000 reg. snowmachines. —

No! —

We are not in favor of ATV use in Nash Stream. As horse riders we have ridden in the Nash Stream area for several years and have already seen evidence where ATVs have been coming into the area even though it is posted against their use. The damage that they are causing by their tactics of spinning around and tearing up the trails is obvious. If this number of machines will come in when it is posted against their use, we can only wonder the damage that will be inflicted if it were open to their use. —

There are already many miles of ATV trails in Coos County. It is well established that ATV use, particularly on small or wet and muddy trails cause extensive erosion and vegetation damage. —

I feel quite strongly that ATVs do not belong there! They are noisy, pollute, contribute to land erosion and quite often when misused (as they frequently are) contribute to wetland and water source degradation. I do not feel that recreational use is enough. It is the ATV and requires it that the State has an obligation to provide trails for them. No one puts a gun to their heads and tells them they have to buy these things. —

Have seen marked increase in fuel, vehicle and snowmobile use since purchase; increase in trash, camp breaks and more pressure on game & fish. Adding another group to mix will magnify all these last three problems not to mention damage these vehicles can do certain times of the year when conditions are soft. Damage happens whether they are driving responsi-
Who? People do not realize what happens the next time it summons to has stated thet they few riders that spoil it for the rest. My suggestion is to they are issued a summons). Erosion caused by the town roads (not locals) miles from the nearest trail (yes unfortunately not so for ATVs. We have workable method in place to monitor & control unworkable method in place to control the nature of the machines (much like a small skidder), as there are wonderful gated roads and trails to walk IT WOULD BE A GRAVE mistake to allow ATV use. I I DON'T LIKE sharing the woods with ATVs. For us non-riders, they only detract from our experience. I will avoid going to areas of wilderness where they have access. In a sense, I see giving them access as taking it away from people like me. They track up, if not tear up the trails. They are noisy and generally unpleasant to be in the woods with. We already share the woods with the snow machines all winter. Let's keep the woods quiet in the spring, summer and fall for those of us who don't need a machine to enjoy the environment. - I D'LIKE TO CHIP IN my opposition to allowing ATV use on Nash Stream. ATVs cause erosion, severely disturbe wildlife, pollute the air, conflict with other, more benign uses (like hiking or mountain biking) are not consistent with the original intent of Nash Stream. I do think a trail system should be established for ATVs in NH, but not on Nash Stream, or any other state holding with such tremendous ecological value.

Our opposition is twofold, one of concern for the safety of our property when it's unoccupied but more importantly concern for our safety when. This past summer was dry. We own the second camp from end of road and we are concerned we would have no escape should a forest fire start below us. We know there is overnight camping going on now, opening the area to ATV use will only encourage more and the thought of what a careless campfire will do is chilling. That being said, we understand the probability of some form of ATV use will be allowed. If the state feels it must open NS to ATV use, there must be another place in the whole other than on the Nash Stream road itself! Improvements to the main road this past year would have been wasted if ATV use are allowed on the main road. Another concern is campers/hikers. Make NS main road the ATV trail and you will have to find another place for our unique visiters teenagers. Our last concern is the most frightening. Do you honestly propose to both on road and off road vehicles on the nash stream road? The section that runs by the camp is narrow. Many of us have to park our cars on the road which makes it even narrower. Please re-consider this trail proposal. -

ATVs inherently damaging to the soil as opposed to snowmobiles running over frozen ground and snow. ATVers don't stay on the trail as example east side of Androscoggin River called the "red barn area" along Stearns brook. A huge bridge was built but ATVers don't stay on trail. Fish & Game co Graterski said be puts up signs and patrols but cant control it he would have to spend half his time on that area to control 4-wheelers. There is no workable method in place to control the existing situation. No additional areas should be opened to ATVers until this problem is addressed & there is a workable method in place to monitor & control ATV use.

The ecological values and the wilderness beauty of the forest is greatly diminished when this motorized vehicles are allowed. you only have to look at other areas where ATVs are allowed to see the negative impact on wildlife and damage to the forest. please keep this forest wild and free from noisy ATVs. Against ATVs, hiker, biker, wants to use Nash Stream in summer When do hikers, bikers get to use trails, will noise scare wildlife? Worried about policing, stand behind plan. -

Our initial thoughts on ATV trail development are that it is premature to discuss this issue until the legislature's ATV Study Committee has made recommendations and DRED has adopted an overall state policy. We recommend withholding any consideration of revising the NSF plan until this process is completed. DRED has publicly committed to no new trail development on public lands until the ATV Study Committee releases its recommendations. Even if the ATV Study Committee decides ATVs are an appropriate use on state lands, we will continue to believe the NSF plan should not be revised to allow ATV use. The best guide to informing this issue is the Management Vision that was adopted for NSF (NSF Management Plan, pages 61-64). The following are rele vant passages from the Management Vision: 1. "The management of Nash Stream Forest will be a model of environmentally sound public land stewardship." 2. "We will strive to protect the natural qualities and integrity of the land, natural communities, native species and ecological processes." 3. "Manage the land with as little interference as possible with natural ecological functions." 4. "Continue to offer public access for traditional, low impact, dispersed recreation." 5. "Recreation management will feature the natural beauty of Nash Stream Forest and fit naturally, with minimal development, on the landscape." 6. "Water quality protection will be of the highest priority throughout." 7. "Recreation management decisions will be consistent with the guiding philosophy of protecting the environmental integrity of the land." 8. "Protection of the natural resources and environmental quality will be of primary concern in recreation management." In furtherance of this vision, non-winter public motorized use of the property was limited to two roads (Main Road and Fourteen and a Half Road), and no new permanent roads were planned. The purpose of this policy was so that "motor vehicle traffic disturbances to wildlife and wildlife habitat will be minimized, low impact and remote recreational activities will be available, and road maintenance costs will be reduced." The AMC does not believe that allowing the use of ATVs on the Nash Stream Forest greatly diminishes the quality of this vision. In order to adequately protect soil and water resources from degradation, an ATV trail system would have to be constructed to the high level appropriative permanent roads (hardened surfaces, bridges, culverts, etc.). Even given level of construction, ATVs pose a greater risk to both natural resources and existing recreational experiences than other currently allowed recreational uses. The construction of such trails and their use for motorized recreation outside of snow-covered roads is consistent with what we believe it is inappropriate to open the Vision to revision after such a short time. Although AMC does not support ATV trails in NSF at this time and feels that considering it contradicts the Management Vision for the property, we recognize that DRED may decide to move forward with consideration of this issue during plan revision. In light of that, we offer the Nash Stream Advisory Committee the following recommendations for addressing the issue of new ATV trails in NSF: 1. As it is yet unclear what direction the USDA Forest Service will take in respect to the use of ATVs on lands purchased through the Forest Legacy Program, it is first important to determine whether or not ATV use is legal under the terms of the easement. 2. If the ATV study Committee determines it is comfortable ending all-terrain vehicle use on state lands, an open public process is needed for the wilderness area. Nash Stream Forest should host a trial system for these vehicles. The public process should follow recommendations by the Committee. 3. Before the NSF management plan is reopened for amendment, the Nash Stream Advisory Committee should vote on whether or not they support amending the six-year-old plan, and what issues should be considered for revision. - I would like to take this opportunity to write that I am opposed to ATV use in the Nash Stream Forest. The existing roads in the NSF are not sufficient for ATV traffic to take place in a safe and environmentally sound manner during the warmer months. As for winter use in conjunction with snowmobiles, the trails of ATV's would wreak havoc with the trail left by snow mobiles. To simply construct a new trail system would not be minimizing impact on this beautiful region, but increasing it! If the use of ATVs is definitely on the rise, serious consideration must be given to create safer lands for them.... However, Nash Stream Forest must not be considered an option. - Because of the unique way in which Nash Stream was protected and is managed, ATVs are not a compatible form of recreation for this site. We do not believe that Nash Stream Forest is suitable for the potential development of an ATV trail system for the following reasons: 1. It is unclear whether ATVs are even an allowable use under the provisions of a Conservation Easement held

Continued Next Page
ATV Use in New Hampshire’s Nash Stream Forest: Opponents Call for State to Stand by Its Plan

on the Nash Stream Forest by the United States of America.

2. The management plan states that “Management will strive for levels of recreation use that uphold the vision and that are sensitive to and respectful of the natural values of Nash Stream Forest.” Allowing ATV use on Nash Stream Forest will impact these natural values, processes, and functions.

3. Public access for Nash Stream is to be provided for “traditional, low impact, dispersed recreation” as specified by the management plan. We believe that ATVs and their necessary trail development are not traditional, low impact, or dispersed.

There has never been a “tradition” of legal ATV use on Nash Stream, and it was prohibited by the previous owner, ATV use, even under the best circumstances, is a high impact recreation use, which tends to be concentrated.

4. We believe that because of safety and compatibility concerns, the existing road system is insufficient and incompatible to handle ATVs. This would necessitate the construction of a new trail system. The management plan states that “Management area planning will minimize fragmentation of the forest by management activities including for example, roads, and developed recreation...” The plan further states the “Recreation...”

management will feature the natural beauty of Nash Stream Forest and fit naturally, with minimal development on the landscape.” Construction of an ATV trail system would fragment the forest by management activities including for example, roads, and developed recreation...”

5. Issues of compliance and enforcement are a major concern. As abutting landowners of the 18,680 acre Bunnell Tract, where ATVs are not an allowed use, we are concerned that we will see an increase in trespass and resource damage by ATVs. We are also concerned about the State’s commitment and ability to effectively monitor, enforce, and adaptively manage ATV use on Nash Stream.

6. We believe there are serious problems of education, enforcement, and trail standards on both public and private land. These issues must be addressed in order to assure that ATV use on public or private land is conducted in legal, responsible recreation use that upholds the vision and that are sensitive to and respectful of property rights, other recreation users and our natural resources. The Nature Conservancy supports the development of a comprehensive state policy that examines the ATV trail needs based on current and predicted use levels, and evaluates which state lands may be suitable for the potential development of an ATV trail system. We do not, however, believe that Nash Stream is one of the state lands suitable for this use.

7. We believe that there is sufficient motorized recreational access into Nash Stream through the allowance of snowmobiles and limited vehicular traffic. There should be a period of time when the non-motorized public such as hikers and walkers can enjoy this public treasure as it stands today - a true multiple use forest for compatible, appropriate recreation as a natural resource.

Percy Peaks on a beautiful summer day, seeing and hearing 100s of birds along the way. When I got to the top I picked enough wild blueberries to fill my water bottle and make a pie that night.

With the handful of other people who had a trail or ride a road to the top, and with only the noise of the wind in my ears, I sat on the top of that mountain and took in the stunning view that spreads out in all directions from Percy Peaks.

When fall rolled around, on one of those perfect fall days, I thought, “this would be a great day to go bike riding in Nash Stream”. But that day I learned another lesson. You don’t go to Nash Stream in the fall unless you have a gun. But again, I thought to myself, “Dana, it’s a State property, you have to share. The people on the machines get it in the winter, the people with guns get it in the fall, and you get it in the summer.”

So the question becomes, if you open Nash Stream to ATV use, when do you open the rest of the land? If you don’t care to navigate Nash Stream on the back of a machine, when do we get OUR turn to use the property?

Will there be a time of year that I can walk a trail or ride a road at Nash Stream that I won’t have to worry about a machine that might come around a corner too quickly and run me down? That’s why I don’t go there now in winter.

Will I be able to observe and listen to the birds? Will the birds continue to return to Nash Stream Forest with all the noise and commotion that is ATVs? Will I be able to sit at the top of Percy Peaks and hear nothing but the wind, or will the whine of ATVs come floating up from below?

Are those first signs of spring that I hold so dear, the tiny, delicate Trout Lily, Will it be there, or will it have been smashed under 100s of ATV tires? —

The current Nash Stream Management Plan provides for machines in Nash Stream. Those machines are snowmobiles, snowmobiles, and they’re allowed in the winter when both the damage they can do to the physical environment and the effect they have on wildlife is minimized. While I admire the local ATV club for believing they can police themselves, I think they’re being a bit unrealistic. This is a 39,000 acre piece of property. We all know it doesn’t take dozens of people on dozens of machines acting irresponsibly to do a lot of damage. It only takes one person on one machine acting irresponsibly to do a tremendous amount of damage in a very short amount of time. Sometimes, that damage is irreversible. It’s time for the State to stand behind the plan that was 7 years in the making. It’s time to say NO. Nash Stream is not an appropriate place for ATV use.—

I STRONGLY OPPOSE the use of ATVs on the Nash Stream State Forest. The fact that more of these eroding machines have been sold in recent years is irrelevant. Buying a machine does not entitle a buyer to operate the machine on public land. The State of New Hampshire should not be encouraging in any way the use of these machines. DRED has a sorry record in the control of machines on public land. Its bias in favor of machines is obvious and without merit. You want to increase State income, without doing any comparative economic studies with non-machine (pedestrian) enjoyment? I learned of the opportunity to comment on Nash Stream only through a conversation with a friend. —

I AM SURE that there are many responsible users of ATVs. However, there are others who are not responsible for the people who go off trail cause damage to the environment that cannot be repaired. Many places out West are now trying to limit the use of ATVs that have destroyed miles of desert land. Why add something to this area that is already prohibited?

Let the ATV users use private property for their riding. The vehicles are noisy and disturbing to the wildlife that inhabit the forests and to people who enjoy hiking, camping, for the peaceful quiet of the mountain wilderness. They are also dangerous to wildlife that cross trails. They pollute. Please do not change the management plan of this area to include ATV use. Hunters will be riding their ATVs to hunt instead of walking among the wildlife. It is not open Nash Stream to ATV use, when do you open the rest of the land? If you don’t care to navigate Nash Stream on the back of a machine, when do we get OUR turn to use the property?

AVI USE MAY REQUIRE revision (to the Nash Stream forest management plan), but I would offer a different approach to determine what is needed.

Prior to opening up the revision process, I would ask the ATV enthusiasts (most likely the North Stratford ATV club) to prepare a prospectus on how they intend to perform their policing and stewardship functions should their request for use be granted. Provide that prospectus to the public and weigh public feedback before deciding to open up the revision process. The public needs to see much more detail from the ATV club on how they intend to perform before I would recommend that design support to the expensive and time-consuming task of revising the plan. Rather than codify the individual uses, I would prefer a special use permitting function be created, once revision was opened. A special use permit granted to the ATV club, or a special use permit granted to those who wanted to bait bears, would be easier to administer than continually having to respond to the ATV club. —

[Exit hurriedly pursued by BEAR BAITING: Open NS to bear bating to help control the over population in the starr/groveton area.]
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Dueling Aquaculture Industry Reform Bills Before Maine Legislature

Industry-backed aquaculture legislation would reduce local control, deemitalize finfish farms while citizen-backed bill would increase public participation and fishery environmental standards.

By Ron Huber

AUGUSTA, While conservationists and coastal communities promote a small and significant change to state aquaculture public hearing and ecology review requirements, representatives of the multinational salmon farming industry are busy urging Maine legislators to pass a very complicated package of legislation brought forward by the Maine Department of Marine Resources, that:

(1) Makes state law supercede all local municipal law or regulations, (violators would no longer prosecute for violations but be merely assessed civil penalties for violations of state law governing the international commercial of salmon or eggs or zoids)

(2) Decriminalizes all violations of aquaculture laws and regulations, (violators would no longer prosecuted for most fishing laws and regulations, and would be merely assessed civil penalties for violations of laws governing the international commercial of salmon or eggs or zoids)

(3) Ends the requirement that aquaculture leases be registered with the Commissioner of Marine Resources or the Commissioner of Environmental Protection, or that the Commissioner of Marine Resources delegate the signing of fisheries lease agreements to any DMR staff member or he or she chooses,

(4) Broadens a state dedicated fund for aquaculture; and

(5) Proposes setting up an Aquaculture Advisory Council drawn solely from the state government and the aquaculture industry.

Gains for Maine public lands protection under Bush Administration

By Ron Huber

Since President George Bush relaxed 1978 ocean wilderness advocates last year by re-authorizing and funding President Bill Clinton's Executive Order on Marine Protected Areas, the notion of establishing natural areas in the sea and rugged public lands expanded laying just off our shoresides has gathered a tremendous head of steam. The Executive Order creates a funded management agency for the extraordinary intertidal forests that lay between high tide and low tide along the New England coast. The order on Marine Protected Areas anywhere within America's thousands of square miles of public marine lands: Maryland eastern shore Republican Congressman Wayne Gilchrest - one of Congress' strongest proponents of healthy, commercial wild fisheries - funded off Alaskan Don Young's rider at the federal executive order on Marine Protected Areas' definition of "marine protected area": "Marine protected area" means any area of the marine environment that has been reserved by Federal, State, territorial, or local laws or regulations to provide lasting protection for part or all of the natural and cultural resources therein. The National Ocean Service is set to post a federal register notice requesting proposals for changes to the definitions that are used by the federal Executive Order on Marine Protected Areas. Industry would like to do away with the word "lasting" from the definition, as it can then argue that the temporary overfishing closures that are enacted throughout much of the Gulf of Maine as the situation warrants, are themselves sufficient "marine protected areas" to obviate the need for any future protected places.

Looming on the MPA horizon for the federal agency from spending any money on conservation is the MPA bill LD 1428 "An Act to Amend the Aquaculture Law", raising the penalty cap, which in the DMR bill is no more than $1000", to "no less than $1000." Industry reform bills Before Maine Legislature

The Maine Department of Marine Resources has hired an Aquaculture Coordinator to shepherd the bill through the legislature. Interestingly, the new Aquaculture Coordinator Andrew Fisk has a degree in forestry, and no background at all in aquaculture or marine biology.

Fisk is, however, a recent graduate of a Leadership Maine school set up in 1993 by the Maine Development Fund to bring forward the notion of establishing "marine conservation" in Maine with a "statewide perspective of the economy." Graduates of Maine's "leadership school" are well steeped in group process, fluent in bland resource agency management work, applicable to any sort of government agency process.

Its troubling, said Ron Huber of Penobscot Bay Watch, "that the state doesn't require its aquaculture coordinator to have any technical background at all in aquaculture or marine biology training." Huber noted that under the legislation Fisk is promoting, Fisk would be given the power to decide on aquaculture leases instead of the commissioner of Marine Resources.

(2) Do we really want people with no experience of training in marine resource issues to make those decisions?" Huber said. "I don't think so. The DMR should not delegate its power to the legislature. They would have no background at all in Maine fisheries or aquaculture such a position of responsibility over Maine's coastal waters.

Concerned about the growing encroachment of aquaculture into local coves and fishing grounds, members of coastal communities across the state are alarmed at DMR's corporate aquaculture agenda as promoted by Coordinator Fisk, and are working to assure the legislators that the department's bill (which as yet has no LD #) bill should be rejected, if not in its entirety, then certainly with major excisions made in its body. These changes to the DMR bill include:

- Discarding all the 'supercede' language in the bill, removing any change that the Attorney General's Office concludes as a change to aquaculture law, reducing the penalty cap, which in the DMR bill is "no more than $1000", to "no less than $1000." Increasing public participation in the aquaculture licensing process by adding "nothing hearing notification" to the list of those mailed notices by the DMR of aquaculture applications. (currently only riparian owners within 1,000 feet and local town governments are notified directly by the state)

- Modifying the make up and purpose of the Aquaculture Advisory Council. Rather than having it limited to aquaculture representatives, citizens recommend changing to reflect the impacted communities as well as the aquaculture industry.

- Under the proposed changes, the Advisory Council will include one member of the fishery industry, one from the shellfish aquaculture industry, one from the commercial fishery representing one from the commercial shellfishing industry, one from the lobster industry and one member from a conservation or environmental organization.

- There would also be one non-voting representative of the state government and of the federal government. They also support increasing the Aquaculture Advisory Council's section to include the review of proposed aquaculture applications, and putting those applications to a vote before the council.

Their legislative process is moving along merely on a separate simpler track as well. As noted above, the Maine Legislature's Marine Resources committee already has before it a much simpler bill introduced in the last session and now processor. That bill LD 1428 "An Act to Amend the Aquaculture Leasing Law" if passed would
Controversy over aquaculture industry influence on Maine state government deepens

With local and national lines drawn over the publishing of DMR's proposed rule on aquaculture reform bills, a recent federal action to subsidize that industry with a disaster bailout and with ongoing crop disaster insurance coverage, is undergoing close scrutiny. The decision to subsidize absentee corporate fishpen operations in state waters is going to make American coastal waters from Maine to Oregon to Washington to Alaska very attractive to very big absentee salmon farming investors. The investors are eager to carry off a submerged public lands grab carrying off a submerged public lands grab.

At least one of the companies' own greed and operational slovenliness may get it booted from the public trough. While details are sketchy, the very day the federal government upped the bailout by awarding three foreign fishpen companies an additional eight million dollars, one of the contractors, who at the same time, only give them in early January, the state of Maine issued a warrant charging one of the companies with its hand out, a (The present comment period is zero days); At the end of any aquaculture hearing, a stay tuned.

Vermont as a study, she explains how the landscapes of today are the result of decisions of yesterday. Though they each have their limitations, this trio more than justified transforming some perfectly good trees into the printed word.

Albers, Jan. Hands on the Land: A History of the Vermont Landscape. 2000. The MIT Press. $40. Using Vermont as a case study, the critiques of today are the result of decisions of yesterday. Stolt, Emily. The Wilderness from Chamberlain Farm. Though they each have their limitations, this trio more than justified transforming some perfectly good trees into the printed word.

http://janus.state.me.us/legis/bills/billtexts/LD142801-1.asp

Which bill shall prevail before the legislature remains to be seen. Supporter's of LD 1428 say the ten day comment period is vital to participative democracy in decisions affecting our inshore marine public lands, with granting of public lands grants, they also say that the diminishment of public and civic involvement in aquaculture decisions as proposed by the Department of marine resources goes in the opposite direction.
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Alders. Jan. Hands on the Land: A History of the Vermont Landscape. 2000. The MIT Press. $40. Using Vermont as a case study, the critiques of today are the result of decisions of yesterday. Stolt, Emily. The Wilderness from Chamberlain Farm. Though they each have their limitations, this trio more than justified transforming some perfectly good trees into the printed word.


Bennett, Dean B. The Wilderness from Chamberlain Farm: A Story of Hope for the American Wild. 2000 Island Press. $30. A detailed history of the struggle to endlessly save the Allagash and a hopeful apologia for wilderness further afield.


Bennett, Dean B. The Wilderness from Chamberlain Farm: A Story of Hope for the American Wild. 2000 Island Press. $30. A detailed history of the struggle to endlessly save the Allagash and a hopeful apologia for wilderness further afield.


Bourque, Bruce J. Twelve Thousand Years: American Indians in Maine. 2001. University of Nebraska Press. $39.95. The story of Native peoples who for a dozen millennia have called this region home.

Brown, David. The Wilderness from Chamberlain Farm. Though they each have their limitations, this trio more than justified transforming some perfectly good trees into the printed word.
the Harvard Forest of succession in the woodlands of southern New England.


Gove, Bill. Railroads of the Saco River Valley. 2001. Bond Cliff Books. $24.95. A winter's worth of stories and pictures about how the iron horse opened up the virgin forests of northern New Hampshire for logging. J.E. Henry's Logging Railroads. 1998. Bond Cliff Books. $25.95. A history of the biggest logging operator in the White Mountains back when men were men and forests were merely trees going to waste.

Grant, Richard. Tex and Molly in the Afterlife. 1996. Avon. $24. This novel about tree-tuggers, wolves, and forestry companies—some dead, some alive—is such a shoot I keep giving copies to friends. I think I know the real people who inspired most of the characters.


Hardy, Fannie Pearson. Tales of the Maine Woods: Two Forest and Stream Essays (1891). 1999. Maine Folklife Center. $15. Collected articles by historian Fannie Hardy Eckstorm. One is a story about camping in eastern Maine, the other is a polemic against early hunting, foraging, and logging laws promoted by out-of-state settlers to curb the wasteful ways of locals.

Hennessey, Tom. Handy to Home: A Lifetime in the Maine Outdoors. 2000. Silver Quill. $24.95. Tom draws better pictures than conclusions, but there is no denying his devotion to Maine's outdoors.


Huey [Coleman, James]. Wilderness and Spirit: A Mountain Called Katahdin. 2002. [in prep]. Films by Huey. This feature length movie will be a portrait of the natural and human history of Maine's "Greatest Mountain."


Kensuke, Ted. Return of the Wild: The Future of Our Natural Lands. 2001. Pew Wilderness Center and Island Press. $15. Not strictly about our region, but it has good summary chapters on wilderness and fascinating maps of wildlands and roads in the U.S.

King, Stephen. The Girl Who Loved Tom Gordon. 1999. Scribner. $7.99. Lots of Steve King thrillers have been set in the Maine Woods. Here is a recent one.


Lansky, Mitch. Low-Impact Forestry: Forest as if the Future Mattered. 2001. Self-published. $25. Mitch Lansky. HC. Box 66, Wytopitlock, ME 04479. $15. We need many more forest preserves and much better stewardship on the surrounding harvested forests. This is an excellent introduction to the latter.


Livingston, Valerie. Beyond Description: Abstraction in the Oil Paintings of James Fitzgerald. 2001. Mon­tegan Museum. Fitzgerald was one of the top painters of Katahdin. His watercolors of the massif are splendid, but this exhibit catalog includes a pair of powerful oils.


Maccagall, Walter M. The Old Somerset Railroad: A Lifeline for Northern Maine. 2000. Down East Books. $19.95. Stories from the era (1800s-1940s) when the wild coun­try around Moosehead was opened up (fortunately) and tamed (unfortu­nately).


Manning, Samuel F. New England Mast and the King's Broad Arrow. 1999. Self-published. $10. Gigantic drawings and sparse text tell how in the 1600s the world ran on wood and England reserved the biggest pines here for ship masts.


Northern Forest Canoe Trail: Rangeley Lakes Region Map. 2000. This is the first section to be fully mapped of the proposed water trail from New York's Adirondacks to Fort Kent, Maine.

Peladeau, Marius B. John Francis Sprague: Chronicler of Maine History. 1998. L.C. Bates Museum, Hinckley, Maine. $10. Sprague was such an important figure in conservation, development, and history in Maine that he deserves a full biography. For now this booklet is a serviceable introduction.


Robert, Kenneth. Arnould. 1995. Down East Books $16.95. A reprint of the 1933 classic historical novel about Benedict Arnould's ill-fated expedition through the Maine Woods in 1775 to Quebec. I read it when I was eight and still vividly recall the excitement of the story more than two score years later.

Rohde, Neil. The Interrupted Forest: A History of Maine's Wildlands. 2001. Tilbury House. $20. With better footnoting this would have been a more useful work for serious historians, but it will be an important reference for years. Neil is too pessimistic about creating a national park in the Maine Woods. The revolution in ownership he describes happening there make it virtually inevitable.


Scott, Kathy. Moose in the Water/Bamboo on the Bench. 2000. Alder Creek Publishing. $18.95. One man's quest to build the perfect bamboo fly rod while immersed in wilderness splendor of the western edge of the Maine Woods.


Staber, David. The Art of Somerset County. 2001. L.C. Bates Museum. In recent years the Bates Museum in Hinckley, Maine, has put together some impressive exhibits on a shoestring. This show was uneven and the catalog, in black and white, lacks pizzazz, but they deserve an A for effort.


Ym Jm St. Pierre has been dealing books, with a focus on the Maine Woods, for over twenty years. In his spare time, he is Maine Director of RESTORE: The North Woods.

\[email] fjm_s_pierre@maine.net\]
Recently, I cut down a tree that someone had spiked.

It was a spruce tree 29 inches in diameter where the chainsaw severed the stem. The largest red spruce in the Boody Brook old growth area of Baxter State Park are around the same diameter at chest height. The tree I cut down, however, was not a red spruce. It also wasn’t the old growth. It was a white spruce (also called cut spruce or field spruce) that had grown on an abandoned field. I counted only 45 growth rings. The height, from stump to tip, was less than 50 feet. The taller Boody Brook red spruce are closer to 90 feet high. This tree had grown with no competition. There were branches to the ground. Old-growth red spruce might be branch free for a few dozen feet.

I moved onto this land 28 years ago. At that time, the tree was only 17 years old. It was one of several field spruce growing around the site where I, and my wife Susan, built our first house. At that time I considered cutting down the trees. They were worthless for lumber, with so many branches and knots and the drastic taper of the stem. Local mills do not like to take such trees. Cutting down and disposing of a worthless tree was not high on my to-do list. Since the trees offered some shelter from wind and snow, I let them grow.

The farm onto which we moved had been abandoned for several decades. There were no buildings left, although there were a few piles of rubble where some buildings had once stood. Indeed, all the farms on my mile-long road had been abandoned. The fields were starting to grow back into forest. The new forest — white spruce and tamaracks — was not the same as the forest that grew before the land was farmed — predominantly mixed hardwoods and red spruce and balsam fir, with an occasional pine. Some pines were regenerating, but they were deformed by weevils.

During the spruce budworm outbreak of the 1970s and 1980s, I found that budworms like white spruce. Every spring I found budworm larvae in the terminal buds of the spruce surrounding our house. Apparently, there was a large number of budworm without dying. These trees can intensify budworm outbreaks and lead to higher mortality in nearby fir.

There was something else my family discovered about these field spruce. They are very easily climbed. With branches acting like 3-D ladder rungs, one can safely climb quite high without fear of falling. As you climb, you are inside the canopy. You are more aware of the tree than the ground.

Our children discovered this particular spruce tree as they grew big enough to climb. They found scrap boards and hauled them up the tree to make perchers and nests. They also found used nails which they pounded into the boards (using two little hands) to secure their perchers to the tree. The lowest perch, we discovered, looking at the downed tree, was 12 feet off the ground. The highest was 32 feet off the ground. Not just children, but even we parents would climb the tree to be alone or to sway in the wind in a storm.

The children have moved away to college. Our first house burned down a year and a half ago. The heat of the fire scorched the entire house. The new forest, that grew back into the field that grew our burnt house, was 32 feet off the ground. Not just children, but even we parents would climb the tree to be alone or to sway in the wind in a storm.

The children have moved away to college. Our first house burned down a year and a half ago. The heat of the fire scorched the entire house. The new forest, that grew back into the field that grew our burnt house, was 32 feet off the ground. Not just children, but even we parents would climb the tree to be alone or to sway in the wind in a storm.

The children have moved away to college. Our first house burned down a year and a half ago. The heat of the fire scorched the entire house. The new forest, that grew back into the field that grew our burnt house, was 32 feet off the ground. Not just children, but even we parents would climb the tree to be alone or to sway in the wind in a storm. We have seen the trees that grew over the old house. They are taller than us. Some are taller than our children. They are still young trees, but they are strong and healthy. They are a testament to the resilience of nature.
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Orwellian Conservation Deal Nearing Completion in NH
continued from page 22

Who benefits?
• International Paper would be lucky to get $125-150 per acre if it were to sell these lands on the free market. Here is a curious case of politicians and industry representatives who are gunning for free market capitalism, unless they can rass the public till.
• Lyme gets almost 150,000 acres for $80 an acre. Lyme holds land for a few years (probably less than ten) and then resells at a profit. In some circles this is called "speculative." It is legal, even if destructive to land and community. But is it appropriate for the public to subscribe private speculation? I asked Peter Stein, the Lyme partner who is handling the deal, if Lyme would share its profits with the public. Stein, who formerly worked for Trust for Public Land, declined and said "no."
• Politicians get to wrap themselves in a green mantle and proclaim their undying commitment to "conservation."
• Conservation groups get to approach funders and members with appeals for money, bragging that they have "permanently protected" 171,500 acres.

Who loses?
• Forests and critters that need wild places.
• Taxpayers who cherish wild places.
• Forests and critters that need wild places.
• Forests and critters that need wild places.
• Forests and critters that need wild places.
• Conservation groups get to approach funders and members with appeals for money, bragging that they have "permanently protected" 171,500 acres.

Note: On January 22, the New Hampshire House of Representitives passed a bill that will authorize the state to raise $24 million bond as part of its $12 million contribution to the purchase price. An uncritical lowvets, committee members failed in their responsibility to protect public interest by asking probing questions. Instead, they rubber-stamped a done deal, without grasping its basic elements. The same may be expected on the Senate side.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of effective conservation strategies. We need a mix of large reserves that ensure the local recovery of biodiversity of these lands (that are in about the same condition that the White Mountain National Forest lands were in a century ago) and low impact forestry on unmanaged. This deal thwarts both these hopes and substitutes empty rhetoric for enduring protections.

This deal seriously inflates the price to benefit an absentee paper company and a timber speculator by picking the pockets of the taxpayers of New Hampshire and the other 49 states.

It makes a felow think that Ambrose Bierce's sardonic definition of "politics" offered a century ago (as In The Devil's Dictionary) is the real New Hampshire Way.
DOWNHILL EXPANSION

Results in large tracts logged off hillside and top logs piled you see the stacks of bright butt ends from the valley.

I don't remember this from the EIS.

Gaps in the woods are missing pieces of the picture-puzzle world up to this day. Clouds descend to cover the hills, open and close like hands feeling the wound, how bad is it? Can't leave it alone. Keep returning to the empty space.

— Stephen Lewandowski
Bristol Mountain
the year two thousand

The Northern Appalachian Restoration Project . .

The Northern Appalachian Restoration Project (NARP) is the publication of the not-for-profit, 501-c-3 Northern Appalachian Restoration Project (NARP). The Restoration Project is committed to the promotion of grassroots activism on behalf of the environment across the region.

The Forum is but half of our effort! The Restoration Project supports a network of six activists who are engaged on a community level across Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, addressing sustainable forest practices, herbicide reduction, wildlands protections and restoration efforts.

You can help! By joining NARP, you are contributing financially to an effective grassroots effort for restoration of ecological health here in the Northern Forest. Your membership is also a strong signal of support for our efforts. Membership can be had for any amount you choose to contribute over the $15 subscription rate.

THANKS TO ALL OUR SUPPORTERS!
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