

WEST VIRGINIA
POSTAL SERVICE
PERMIT NO. 26309



Published Monthly By The West Virginia Highlands Conservancy

the Highlands Voice

Second-class postage paid at Glenville, WV 26351 and at additional mailing offices under the postal act of March 3, 1879. Re-entry at Webster Springs with additional entry at Glenville, WV 26351. Main

business offices are located at 206 Union Street, Webster Springs, WV 26288. Executive editor, Ron Hardway, 206 Union Street, Webster Springs. Managing editor, Gilmer Graphics, Inc. 209 E. Main Street,

Glenville, WV. Postmasters address forms 3579 to 206 Union Street Webster Springs, WV 26288.

January, 1975

Vol. 7 No. 1

Wilderness Bill Passes

After more than five years of frustrating postponement, compromise and revision, the Conservancy's efforts on behalf of the eastern wilderness bore fruit on December 18 with Congressional passage of S. 3433, the Eastern Wilderness Act. The Act created sixteen "instant" wilderness areas, two of which were Dolly Sods and Otter Creek.

The third area which the Conservancy has proposed for wilderness designation, the controversial Cranberry Back Country, was included in the bill as one of seventeen Wilderness Study Areas. A fourth area in which the Conservancy had an interest, the Laurel Fork unit of the George Washington National Forest, was not included in the bill.

One important management provision of the act will make future protection for Study Areas much easier. The Study Areas are to be managed during their study period "so as to maintain their presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System until Congress has determined otherwise." This key provision of S. 3433 eliminates the problem of proving that certain activities harm the "potential" wilderness character of a Study area. Instead it is now necessary to prove only that a certain activity will "diminish" presently existing wilderness character of an area.

Passage of the Eastern Wilderness Act has also removed a persistent obstacle to eastern wilderness - the "pristine pure" concept of wilderness envisioned by the U.S. Forest Service. The language of S. 3433 unconditionally rejects the Forest Service definition of wilderness.



Dolly Sods (Photo by Helen McGinnis)



The Fork of Laurel, Cranberry Back Country (Photo by Dave Lammou)



Otter Creek (Photo by Susan Bodman)



Overlook

By Bob Burrell

This month we are overlooking ourselves, that is the Highlands Conservancy and other conservation organizations. We have been pretty free in criticizing others, but now that we have enjoyed a certain amount of success, we have become the target of criticism from others. In order to achieve a stronger Conservancy, some introspective critique of ourselves might serve an important purpose since we, unlike the Department of Highways and others infallible governmental organizations, do make mistakes. Helping us perform this critique will be one Gerald Schneider who wrote a two-part article entitled "Why Conservation Organizations Fail to Educate" that appeared in the April and December issues of *American Forests*. Since an important function of ours is indeed education, we should listen to what Mr. Schneider has to say.

He begins his article with a quote from a 1970 issue of Audubon magazine: "The scene is the annual meeting of a state conservation organization. Sitting, with various degrees of attention, on camp chairs set up in the meeting room of an aging, but newly gilded hotel are the people we expect to find there - a few assistant professors of biology, the owner of a hunting camp, a cluster of ladies from the local garden club, a television announcer (hoping to tape a brief interview with one of the guest speakers) a doctor, assorted birdwatchers, hikers, schoolteachers, nature photographers, and perhaps a couple of retired businessmen who live in the hotel and who have slipped into the meeting room in the hope of finding an hour or so of free entertainment. Various papers have been read, applauded and forgotten. The usual topics have been trotted out for the disapproval of the usual people - strip-mining, road-building, air pollution, etc."

Sound familiar? Mr. Schneider felt that it resembled most of the conservation meetings he has attended - talks given to canned audiences who don't need to be influenced with very little being done to attempt to influence others not present.

Schneider then lists seven educational failures of conservation organizations and suggested corrective strategies. These may be summarized with appropriate reference to our own affairs as follows:

1) Educational efforts have failed by concentration on content and neglect of educational processes. Instead of canned presentations and guide books that we have prepared and have spent a good deal of time with, Schneider suggests that these in themselves are not enough, that we should be involved also with the process of education rather than mere instruction. He suggests that our speakers should ask evocative questions, encourage discussion in the audiences we address, anticipate controversies and point them out ourselves, and be sensitive to the criticisms of others. In this way the audience has become actively involved in the issue and just hasn't heard

how you feel about it. Conservation organizations according to Schneider fail to encourage critical thought and resourcefulness.

2) Failure to recognize that facts alone will not change behavior or influence attitudes. Schneider points out that many conservation organizations feel that once they have published their "fact sheets," everyone will see the light and change their ways. If this naive belief were really true, no one would be stupid enough to smoke cigarettes. We must do more than present the facts; we must get people to reflect more on their own behavior and this will require more than simply submitting articles to the "Voice." More face-to-face encounters with the uncommitted and the opposed are essential in Schneider's view. You would be surprised how many so-called conservationists we have in the Conservancy who don't attend any meetings we try to arrange, but believe all they have to do is hike over the trail and send us the latest outrage they have found.

3) Failure to distinguish between education and propaganda. The former deals with getting people to examine issues on merits while the latter deals with selling a point of view. It is very difficult to avoid propagandizing since we are all committed to a point of view. We can however strive to avoid presenting strictly hard sells and help people see points of view not presented by J. Peter Grace, Western Maryland and Vepco, else we are no better than they.

4) Failure to distinguish between conflicts of special interests and public problems. This is closely related to failure #3 and happens when we get too self-righteous. We think because we like to seek solace in Otter Creek, that the entire public does too. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, if you think closely about it, a good segment of the public doesn't belong in Otter Creek. As spelunkers trying to protect Germany Valley caves, some conservationists wound up in the peculiar position of demanding public protection for a cave that they would in turn call off limits to the general public in order to protect delicate formations and the like. This sort of stance we must avoid at all costs. In preparing position papers or testimony for a hearing, try to take in the entire view of the issue, not just that of the hiker or canoeist. Just how good or bad is the Davis Project for the public?

5) Failure to reveal their concern for people as well as things because of an impersonal approach to the public. Again, this involves an over-dependence of getting the message to the public by written means only. How many of us seek friendly contact with the enemy or even the people with no axe to grind? How much effort do we really spend trying to learn how the public really feels about Snowshoe? The Conservancy probably does a little better in this category than most in issues such as the Rowlesburg Dam and strip mining, but we were too immature to recognize this at the time the

Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area controversy erupted.

6) Failure to distinguish between superficial public relations and genuinely educational activities. I think we in the Conservancy haven't fallen into this trap that frustrates so many of our larger competitors. Competition amongst ourselves does indeed exist for money and members and some organizations spend an excessive amount of time dragooning minions to its banners. Schneider has little interest in magazines like *National Wildlife* which he feels is biased towards the prejudices of its members and is designed to attract more of the same. Such magazines give their members what the organizations think the members want instead of getting them to think critically. Such organizations loudly shout for protection of Kirtland's warbler (who could be against that?) or announce they are in favor of cleaner air, things which are not controversial among their members because their members are not financially affected by them but such organizations are too apt to avoid things like strip mining or at least take some middle of the road, non-committal stance that says nothing. What conservation organization that you know of has really gotten down to tackling such really basic problems as free enterprise versus government control, public versus private property rights, planned versus unplanned development, etc.?

7) Failure to involve a broad cross section of Americans in the conservation movement and thereby failing to influence society. This is our biggest failure. We are primarily white, leisured, and educated, but we have no appeal to blacks, farmers, laborers, and many other groups of large numbers of people who make up the bulk of our population. How many of us have tried to contact a labor organization to discuss their position and thinking on construction projects? Why should the great number of people who live in the slums and ghettos of Washington, Chicago, and New York give a damn about what happens in the Cranberry Backcountry or on the New River? What does the average blue collar worker in West Virginia really care about Corridor H or Snowshoe? Until an organization like ours can really provide a meaningful answer or alternative to the bulldozer operator who spoke at a recent strip mining hearing in southern West Virginia "to hell with the environment, I've got to feed my kids!", we will merely be talking to ourselves.

Of course the above criticisms are controversial, but just how effective are we in education? And don't take credit for the Conservancy's accomplishments if the limit of your activities consists of only paying your dues. What can you do to be a more effective member of the Conservancy? Above all, what other points of view to these criticisms are there? We invite your thoughts by way of "letters to the editor." Get involved.

TWO WINS, ONE LOSS, ONE TIC

by **RON HARDWAY**

The creation of the Dolly Sods National Wilderness Area and the Otter Creek National Wilderness Area brings to a close one of the most entertaining chapters of Conservancy history. For over five years the Conservancy has cussed and discussed, been cussed and discussed, investigated and been investigated, sued and not yet been sued, earned respect and enmity, finally emerging with a record of two wins, one loss and one tie.

We won, of course, Dolly Sods and Otter Creek, overcoming strong objections from the Forest Service, the timbering industry, the road builders and the ORV freaks. We lost Laurel Fork (for the time being), largely to the Forest Service and the loggers. We have tied the coal industry for Cranberry. The Back Country is in limbo for the present. It is not a wilderness area, but it will be managed as one just the same while it is being studied for possible inclusion in the Wilderness Preservation System. We may yet lose it, or win not enough of it to have made the effort worthwhile.

But this fight is yet to come. For the moment (and I do mean no longer than that) let us sit down and take a deep breath, perhaps a sigh of relief, an reflect on what has gone before.

The Conservancy has gained many things from this bitter wilderness fight besides two wilderness areas. We have come of age as an organization, leaving behind us the days of a handful of letter writers and an occasional group picnic or hike.

We are now recognized as the leading environmental organization in West Virginia.



the Editor

by every major environmental group beyond our crabby borders. Within the state government agencies and politicians with whom we must deal now realize that the Conservancy is not an idle group of do-gooders, but is an organization of active, intelligent and informed environmentalists.

We are not unrecognized by the people of West Virginia either. The last of THE HIGHLANDS VOICE mailed in 1972 went out to less than 400 members. The last issue of THE VOICE in 1974 went to more than 900 members. 800 members does not look like much on paper, but remember that the

Conservancy does not solicit membership. Prospective members must come to us (we are not elitists -- no one has the time to plug membership).

Our interests have remained concentrated in the highlands. But as more and more people from the lowlands join the Conservancy our interests are beginning to spread out over a broader area.

As 1975 begins the Conservancy has earned the right to sit down and relax for a minute. But, hurry up and rest. A new game begins at Hawks Nest on January 24. There will be no time for relaxation after that.

the Readers' Voice

Congressman Ken Hechler
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Ken Hechler:
The Congress certainly handed West Virginia a most welcome Christmas present when it enacted the

WE HIGHWAY DOWN SHAVERS FORK WILL CONNECT THE CRANBERRY COAL MINES WITH YOUR RUTLESBURG RESERVOIR. NOW YOU AND THE COLONEL HERE FIGURE OUT HOW TO GET A BARGE DOWN THE CHEAT CANYON TO PITTSBURGH!

INCREDIBLE! THAT GIVES OUR BOYS IN THE CORPS ANOTHER 50 YEARS OF PORK.

GOOD THINKING, JENNINGS, BUT WE MUST ACT FAST BEFORE ARCH GIVES ALL OF THE STATE AWAY!



Outstanding proposals for West Virginia are Col. Brent Smith, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Market Springs, West Virginia, U.S. Sen. Robert C. Byrd, right, and U.S. Sen. Jennings Randolph, right.

Eastern Wilderness Bill thereby culminating work initiated by the West Virginia Highlands Conservancy several years ago. A very large part of the success is enacting this legislation must be awarded to you, West Virginia's most environmentally concerned legislator, for your perseverance and hard work through these years watching this most important bill.

Under Tom King's initial leadership and with the untiring work of such thoughtful people as Helen McGinnis, George Langford, and Vic Schmidt, the Highlands Conservancy presented the public with three very special areas of West Virginia that should receive permanent protection and management plans for the preservation of these areas. Under the guidance and counsel of Art Wright and Ernie Dickerman of the Wilderness Society, the Conservancy was always able to make the appropriate moves.

Helen, Don Good, Herb Eckert, and Ron Hardway were instrumental in providing programs to educate the public as to the magnificent assets found in these areas.

But all of this would have been unavailing if we had not been able to convince the Congress of the forgotten fact that there are many places in the East worthy of such Wilderness protection and now, more than ever, was the time to achieve protection in these areas. Indeed, the Conservancy reluctantly found itself in legal proceedings to protect the Otter Creek Basin from industrial ravishment before this legislation could be achieved. Throughout these past few years your voice has been one of several Eastern Congressmen who have recognized the worth of these areas and accorded groups like our every courtesy. Your gift to the Nation is an unselfish one because often position was an unpopular one and it has been interesting to see how newspaper editorial opinion has changed over these past three years in favor of Wilderness protection. But more than that, you have given generations of West Virginians yet unborn, people who will never have the choice or chance to vote for people like Ken Hechler, a permanent legacy - Dolly Sods, Otter Creek, and the Cranberry Back Country.

We know that much work remains to be done, particularly in the Cranberry, but we are willing to go on with such encouragement. Again, we thank you for your efforts and those of your very able staff Ned Helen and Dick Leonard. Best wishes for the Holidays Season and the New Year.

Bob Burroff
Martinsburg, WV

SWISS PROJECT NEARS DECISION

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has announced that a technical study of a new dam on the Gauley River at Swiss is nearing completion.

Don Steiner, chief of water resources planning at the Huntington USACE office, said on January 10 that a technical report on physical and economic assessments of the project should be completed by mid-February. The report will then be considered by divisional officers of the Corps, and an announcement should be forthcoming in March on the fate of the project.

The Swiss project has been in the hopper for several years. The dam would be located near Swiss, approximately fifteen miles below the existing Summersville Dam, also on the Gauley. The dam would serve a variety of purposes according to the Corps, mainly power generation, recreation, flood control and low augmentation.

Steiner said that if the Corps decides to pursue the project formal public meetings on the proposal will be held this fall. Steiner added that one alternative which will be discussed at the divisional level in February will consider the potential effects of not building any new dam on the Gauley River.

LEGISLATURE WILL WORK ON TIMBERING REGULATIONS

A legislative subcommittee has recommended that the state of West Virginia enact timbering standards which would regulate environmental effects of timbering. The proposed bill is modeled after the 1972 West Virginia Forest Practice Standards developed by the timber industry itself.

Legislative action was suggested when the subcommittee studying the proposal concluded that the timber industry was not moving quickly enough nor efficiently to police its own activities.

Subcommittee co-chairman Sen. Si Galperin and Del A. L. Sommersville announced that the bill would be referred to the Joint Committee on Government and Finance. The proposed bill would be enforced by the DNR Division of Forestry.

The timbering proposal was developed as a result of legislative concern over siltation in Elk River. Investigations by state geologist Robert Erwin

concluded that timbering was a major producer of silt in the affected stream.

Erwin's investigations also pointed out the desirability for a multiple-level intake structure on Sutton Dam. Earlier the legislative subcommittee had passed a resolution based on Erwin's recommendations to request the legislature to seek the cooperation of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in constructing a multiple-level intake device at Sutton.

SALEM CHURCH DAM SCRAPPED

Last October the Corps announced that it was dropping its plan to build the \$130 million Salem Church Dam on Virginia's famous Rappahannock River and urged that the river be protected in a scenic rivers system. The Corps' about face on the Salem Church Dam is the result of tremendous and enduring opposition put up by conservationists over the years. Particular expressions of appreciation are due to George Newman and the Rappahannock Defense Committee which worked to show that the alleged benefits of the project were a hoax and helped convince the Virginia State Water Control Board to oppose the project.

The Rappahannock River flows east out of the Virginia mountains, is joined by the Rapidan River, passes through the city of Fredericksburg and into the Chesapeake Bay. The proposed dam would have inundated 20,000 acres of land rich in fish and habitat, would have destroyed significant historical sites, and eliminated over 50 miles of the Rappahannock and Rapidan which merit inclusion in a state or national scenic rivers system.

The Rapidan and Rappahannock offer beautiful whitewater canoeing opportunities and were a favorite of the late Randy Carter, pioneer canoeist who for many years was a solitary voice speaking out against the dam. Inventory of the Randy Carter system for determining the depth and canoeability of streams and author of *Canoeing White Water*, he summed up the Corps' purpose in these words: "They are ready to flood out our most beautiful river sections in order to build a great concrete monument to themselves. And right behind them are the Fast Buck Real Estate boys and the fellows waiting to sell the material for the dam, and right behind them are the politicians ready to pour the tax payers money down the drain if it drains into their supporters' backyards."

The task ahead is to insure that the great Rappahannock is protected by scenic river status.

-American Rivers Conservation Council

1975 CALENDAR OF NATURE EVENTS

Sponsored or Co-sponsored by

West Virginia Department of Natural Resources

April 25-26-27: West Virginia Youth Environmental Conference Ramada Inn, Beckley
April 25-26-27: Hawks Nest Nature Tour, Hawks Nest State Park, Ansted
April 27: Garden Club Show Me Hike, Greenbrier State Forest, Caldwell
May 2-3-4: Webster County Nature Tour, Camp Caesar, Webster Springs.

May 8-9-10-11: 14th Annual Wildflower Pilgrimage Blackwater Falls State Park, Davis.
May 10: Richwood Spring Cranberry Nature Tour, Richwood
May 17: West Virginia Youth Conservation Day, Holly River State Park, Hacker Valley.

June 12: Family Trails Day, Camp Creek State Forest, Camp Creek
July 12: DNR Cranberry Tour, Cranberry Mountain Visitor Center
September 5-6-7: West Virginia Fall Nature Tour, Lost River State Park, Mathias

September 20: 8th Annual Little Kanawha Regional Nature Wonder Weekend, North Bend State Park, Calto

September 26-27-28: 17th Annual Junior Conservation Workshop Oeding, Pipestem State Park, Pipestem
October 11: 8th Annual Cranberry Mountain Autumn Nature Tour, Richwood.

For additional information write:

Mrs. Maxine Scarbro, Administrative Assistant
in Charge of Women's and Youth Activities
West Virginia Department of Natural Resources
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Telephone: [304] 348-3370 or 348-4004

Information is available on the various nature events about one month prior to the date event is to be held.

Over 7,500 persons representing fourteen states attended the 1974 nature events. You are invited to be a participant this year in any of the events listed above.

The Highlands Voice

page 4

by Jane S. Henley Regulation of

In 1958 the American public was introduced to a new word - and a new concept from the container industries - the word was "throwaway" and the concept was "no return." In 1974, the polite word is now "convenience packaging."

Both the bottlers and the can manufacturers mobilized all their advertising expertise to sell the American people on the "throwaway" idea. The idea took hold rapidly. I'm ashamed to say. Many Americans became hooked on toss away containers - no one was concerned about what would become of these cans and bottles after they hit the trash can - everybody forgot that cans and bottles don't deteriorate - they don't burn - they just take up space in a dump.

No one was concerned then about the 11,200 jobs lost from 1958 - 1967 in the beer industry as returnables were exchanged for throwaways, and the big firm got bigger and drove the small bottlers out of business.

No one was concerned then about the natural resources which were being wasted in the extra energy used to manufacture the throwaway containers, and the waste of precious metals and elements which were being depleted with no thought of recycling and reuse.

No one considered the visual effects of cans and bottles and boxes which would begin littering our countryside.

No one thought about the huge removal problem of collecting these cans and bottles and cartons and getting them to a dump - and the dumps got bigger and bigger - and the countryside became more and more littered.

I don't feel I have to say any more about the problem - all each of you has to do is to look out your car window as you go back and forth to work.

But today the American public is concerned about all of these problems which have been brought onto us under the name of progress. Senator Galperin says that he has gotten more mail concerning the Oregon Bottle Bill than any other single issue with the exception of strip mining - conservatives, liberal men women - all ages and all types are concerned and sick to death of the boondoggle called "Throwaways."

The industry will say - but somebody has to be doing the littering, and what about the people who are buying - the beer and the soft drink.

My answer is - yes - we are a messy people - the messiest people in the world, and we are also lazy - and don't want to bother to return those bottles and cans. . . Also - many stores have cut back their supply of returnable bottles - so that there is often no choice for the consumer.

Industry says it's a people problem - and partly it is - industry has very carefully educated us to be irresponsible and industry continues to push for more and more throwaways. The goal for 1980 is to double the number of sales of throwaways from 1974 sales. Now what can be done to stop this boondoggle - certainly you know the container industry will never admit it was wrong - you can't count on them to solve the problem. It's up to our public officials to stop this flagrant disregard of our country's limited resources. That's what this committee's job is all about. How do we clean up our mess. In a way our citizens and communities can afford financially.

I understand that Mr. Nooney of the Brewers Assoc. suggests a large pick up campaign - with trash containers everywhere - and public education, especially with school children - and I say that is great. Any efforts toward teaching responsibility for your neighbors' property is commendable.

But clean-up campaigns do not stop natural resources from being used up so fast that "brown outs" - "gasoline shortages" and high prices are a reality - not a threat - the container industry has so many resources to use - throwaway pop bottles by the millions, why can't they come up with some mason jars for canning. Obvious industrial priorities are not in the area of conservation and quality glass containers such as those used for reusable bottles - but they are forcing the "cheap to manufacture but more expensive to buy" throwaway bottles down the throat of the bottling companies - Coca Cola, Pepsi, R.C. and many other bottlers have realized for years that the smart thing to do was to sell reusable containers.

There is a solution - and it's one the public wants

Throwaways Essential

and can understand. It requires no new taxes and yet it will not reduce jobs, although there will be cut backs in some areas but new jobs in other areas. In fact there is nothing new about it at all.

The plan of course is the one outlined last year in House Bill 823 and Senate Bill 50. The plan is a bill to regulate beverage container waste . . . usually referred to as The Oregon Bottle Bill. This plan is working in other states - and especially well in Oregon. I'm sure you are aware of the general features of the bill. It basically requires refunds and reusable containers.

It says you can get at least 5 cents back for every bottle, can, or carton returned.

It encourages the production of interchangeable bottles by reducing the refund to 2 cents and also the cost to the consumer on such bottles. The stubby brown beer bottle is an example.

It bans that new fangled flip top - can - but not a push in can.

As we all know - too well - the container people have unleashed an enormous campaign against this bill.

First they said it was unconstitutional. In December 1973, this bill was finally ruled constitutional by the Oregon Supreme Court. When appealed to the Supreme Court of U.S., it refused to consider, in other words ruled in favor of, the lower court decision. That is now a dead issue.

Secondly, they said it was not a significant amount of our solid waste problem. They are using weight figures. We maintain that the visual effects of lettered containers make up for the weight difference. And we certainly don't want trash from a non-necessity, such as pop and beer - to become greater than trash from necessities, such as food and household goods and transportation. Solid waste from these sources is an enormous problem - so let's get this smaller problem under control so we can concentrate on disposing of more important things.

Thirdly, the container and beverage industry says that this refund on all containers will drive prices up so high that they will lose business to other states.

This has not been the case in Oregon. Their bill has been in operation for two years now and Oregon's experiences are very valid. According to an independent study released by Oregon State University in March, 1974, the net cost to Oregon consumer of beer and soft drinks in 1973 was not significantly different from what it would have been given pre-Bottle Bill conditions.

Fourthly . . . Labor has cried out that there will be a terrific job loss. Their estimated figures were phenomenal. . . But all their estimates were based on conjecture - not real experience. . . And then don't forget how many jobs were lost after the 1958 throwaway campaign began - why weren't AFL-CIO screaming then - maybe because they had no control over the situation - no laws - no restraints on industry were even considered.

This new report answers the questions of job loss. It documents the fact that jobs were lost in both bottle and can production. However, soft drink bottlers and brewers have increased production employment due to increases in washing and sterilizing, and because bottling is more labor intensive than canning. Increases in transportation and delivery costs have added to truck driver employment. The increased handling, sorting, and storing of returned containers has added to ware house and handling employment.

Actual increase and decrease figures come out with a 365 total employment increase in Oregon by the end of 1973. The tremendous fears of the industries involved in this effort have been unfounded. The objections are dropping away.

A fifth concern, and one your legislators particularly raised - was the problem of cost to the state - Oregon's litter control figures are similar to the state of West Virginia. It is true they had some kids working in the summer to clean up, but this program was funded by the sale of special custom made license plates.

No one is saying that by encouraging adoption of this bill there would not be adjustments within the industries involved. But every time a new product is created there are adjustments. We have proof from the Oregon experience that the bill works and the state and people profit.

WEST VIRGINIA HIGHLANDS CONSERVANCY

MID WINTER WORKSHOP

FEATURES NEW RIVER

The ancient grandeur of the New River will be the setting for the Conservancy's 1975 Mid-Winter Workshop, January 24-25-26, at Hawk's Nest State Park.

The New River, actually American's oldest river, has been a center of controversy for over a decade. The most critical issue is a complicated environmental situation in the Blue Ridge Mountains of North Carolina, the source of the New River. It is here that American Electric Power has proposed a giant electrical power generating dam.

While the immediate effects of the proposed Blue Ridge Project on Virginia and North Carolina farmland are obvious, the effects downstream from Blue Ridge in West Virginia are subject to much debate. The Mid-Winter Workshop will focus on this issue, asking questions and, hopefully, receiving answers on this vital problem.

Also on the agenda for the weekend will be discussion of attempts to protect, preserve and enhance the New River and its uncompromising personality. Among the items scheduled for discussion are scenic river designation for the New River, a proposed national park for the New River Gorge, and a scenic railroad envisioned for the canyon. The nearby Swiss Project on the Gauley River will also be included for discussion.

On hand to initiate discussion and stir curiosity in the New River will be members of the U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Also participating in various programs in addition to Conservancy members will be representatives from the W.Va. Department of Natural Resources, the W.Va. Wildwater Association and the Izaak Walton League.

Headquarters for the weekend will be at Hawk's Nest State Park near Ansted. Various tours into the New River area will be arranged from the Hawk's Nest Lodge.

The lodge has thirty-one rooms. For those desiring accommodations at the lodge it is advisable to reserve rooms immediately. The phone number is 658-5212, and the address is Hawk's Nest State Park, Ansted, WV 25812.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

HAWK'S NEST STATE PARK

Friday, January 24, 1975 - Informal gathering for those persons arriving that evening. This is a good time to get together and prepare any resolutions, etc.

Saturday - January 25, 1975

10:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M.

(1) Report of what has taken place in past and the current status of the Blue Ridge Project on New River - Peter E. Zurbuch, Assistant Chief of Research.

(2) Report on current work and status of New River George National Park - Eric Finstick, Study Team Leader, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

(3) What has happened and is happening on the Swiss Project on Gauley River - Robert H. Dayfield, Fishery Planner.

12:00 P.M. break for lunch

1:30 P.M. Field trips to some of the places told about in the morning session (there will be more trips on Sunday so your discussion will be easier).

(1) Gauley River Gorge - hike down railroad from Swiss. There are some evesores, but this canyon is really beautiful - Leader Bob Dayfield.

(2) New River-Gorge - Itinerary to be decided - Leaders - members of BOR Study Team.

6:00 P.M. Dinner - use this opportunity to compare notes.

7:30 P.M. Board Meeting -

Minutes

Treasurer Report

Membership Secretary's Report

Committee Reports

Election of Officers

Old Business

New Business

Sunday - January 26, 1975

8:30 A.M. Wind up any leftover board business.

9:00 A.M. Repeat of field trips. Weather permitting the Gauley River Gorge will be descended at the mouth of Meadow River. This will give you another perspective. If possible the return trip to the New River Gorge will also cover additional points of interest.

CONSERVANCY OFFICERS

And Other Stumbling Blocks

President:

Joe Rieffenberger, Rt. 1 Box 252, Elkins, WV 26241

Vice Presidents:

Highlands:

Cliff Carpenter, Rt. 2, Box A-22
Webster Springs, WV 26288

Charleston:

Nick Lozano, 1020 Grosscup Ave, Dunbar, WV 26054

Pittsburgh: Sayre Rodman, 32 Crystal Dr.,
Oakmont, PA 15139

Washington:

Margaret Spahitz, 2400 41st St., NW,
Washington, DC 20007

Secretary for Membership:

Carolyn Killoran, 5202 Division Rd.,
Huntington, WV 25705

Committee for Publicity:

Stauffer Miller, Box 568 Moorefield WV 26288

Voice Editor:

Ron Hardway, 206 Union St., Webster Springs
WV 26288

Chairman for Rivers:

Bob Burrell, 1412 Western Ave., Morgantown
WV 26505

Environmental Merger Pushed

by SKIP JOHNSON

The Highlands Voice

page 6

An environmental consolidation bill patterned after the Oklahoma act is being drafted and will be introduced in the 1975 legislative session, Sen. Carl Gainer, D-Nicholas, said Wednesday.

Gainer, who is chairman of a subcommittee that is studying environmental consolidation, said: "The consensus of the committee is to recommend it."

Under the Oklahoma act, all state agencies dealing with the environment were placed under a department of pollution control. The department is administered by a board composed of the chiefs of the various agencies.

In Oklahoma, the board names the director of the pollution control department and fixes his salary.

Although details of the bill being drafted by legislative services weren't disclosed, it presumably will closely follow the Oklahoma act.

State agencies expected to be included in the West Virginia bill are Department of Natural Resources, Department of Health, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Soil Conservation Service and Air Pollution Control Commission.

If the Oklahoma act is followed closely, the Department of Natural Resources would likely be fragmented by the creation of separate departments of water resources, wildlife conservation and industrial development and parks.

Heads of the affected state agencies attended Wednesday's subcommittee meeting, and most of

them didn't voice any strenuous objections to the proposed consolidation.

AGRICULTURE commissioner Gus Douglass said he greatly prefers the "board of regents" or administrative board approach as opposed to a total consolidation of environmental agencies.

Natural resources director Ira Latimer Jr. said he believes the Oklahoma approach "could present problems in West Virginia" because it "would add two additional layers of responsibility" above what the state currently has. He referred to the pollution control department and coordinating board.

Latimer also said the make-up of the board, which would include the head of agencies with pollution control responsibility, might be duplicative.

Health director Dr. N.H. Dyer generally recommended the Oklahoma approach. He said the act is similar in many respects to a proposal he made to an interim committee in 1972.

Carroll Green, executive secretary of the Soil Conservation Committee, said the proposal "appeals to me more than any that I have had knowledge of as far as West Virginia is concerned."

An environmental consolidation bill was introduced in the 1974 session of the legislature, and the House passed it. However, it was rejected by the Senate in the closing days of the session.

The Oklahoma plan currently being readied differs substantially from the 1974 bill, in that it doesn't involve total consolidation but rather a "board of regents" approach.

New Organization Formed in New Creek Valley

by LOWELL MARKEY

A new organization has been formed to protect the New Creek Valley in Mineral and Grant Counties from insensitive encroachment by highways and other forms of molestation.

The West Virginians for Meaningful Progress and Restraining Governmental and Group Encroachment, a group of over 100 property owners and residents of the New Creek Valley, recently received its charter as a non-profit corporation from the West Virginia Secretary of State. The organization's main concern at this time is one of the routes proposed for Corridor H from the intersection of Route 93 and U.S. Route 50 to Scherr, following the valley floor.

The overall purpose of the group is "to protect in any legal, honorable way possible, the interests, property rights, community life and patterns, historical and traditional values, precious physical isolation, wildlife habitat, and the agricultural and ecological aspects of the region from unreasonable, insensitive, and unmeaningful encroachment and molestation, particularly Corridor H."

The group has begun its efforts by writing to elected officials who may be influential in shaping the final

routing for Corridor H, over 60% of the water supply for the city of Keyser comes from 13 pure water springs located in the upper New Creek Valley. Much of the supply is impounded in a flood control lake, known as Dam Site #14, located near the Grant-Mineral county line. The organization has pointed out that the problems that occurred with disturbance of underground water sources near the Bowden Fish Hatchery (resulting in a large fish kill) may reoccur if Corridor H is routed through the valley, with the exception that people as well as trout would be endangered.

The isolated, but inhabited valley, is served by state route 93, which is seen by the new organization as adequate for the valley's residents. If necessary, it could be widened to accommodate greater number of trucks. Beauty and scenic values are not yet greatly marred or altered. On the eastern border of the valley is New Creek Mountain, marked by the famous "saddle," visible from several other high points in the area including a scenic overlook on U.S. 50.

Conservancy members wishing more information on the new group may write the President: James Amtower, Box 194, New Creek, WV 26743.

JOIN THE WEST VIRGINIA HIGHLANDS CONSERVANCY

For those who think the West Virginia Highlands Conservancy is a waste of time and money, here is a message for you:

"The basic division on this problem today is between those who see the future as an extension of the past and those who see the future as fundamentally different from the past. Many disturbing signposts indicate that we cannot keep going on our present course. We are pushing past the limits of our finite resource base... We have breezed past the environmental crisis, and we are racing through the energy crisis. Our lights flicker. Our air smells foul. Our streets are choked with traffic. Our land is jammed with buildings. No matter. Full speed ahead.

A day will come when we shall rue our recklessness. A day will come when we shall look back in wonder that we didn't use more care... We may be heading for national disaster, but that isn't in our minds right now... Speeding past the danger signs, the American Joy Ride rolls on."

*—John R. Quarles, Jr.
Deputy Administrator, EPA
October 22, 1974*

- \$5.00 Individual regular
- \$10.00 Individual associate
- \$25.00 Individual sustaining
- \$20.00 Organizational regular
- \$30.00 Organizational associate
- \$50.00 Organizational sustaining

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

ZIP: _____

Make checks payable to "West Virginia Highlands Conservancy."

Mail membership form and dues to:

Carolyn Killoran, Membership Chairman,
5202 Division Rd.,
Huntington, WV 25705



Greenland Gap, one feature of the New Creek Valley.

The Energy Crisis and the Law of Diminishing Returns

by **GORDON T. MAMRICK**

In the November 1974 issue of the Voice, Dr. Bob Burrell, in "Overlook," wrote an excellent article drawing an analogy between growth in a bacteria colony and growth in the human world. Dr. Burrell's main theme was that exponential growth in a bacteria colony continues until nutrients have been exhausted; until wastes accumulate to the point where they become toxic; and until the number of cells dying exceeds the number of new cells being "born."

Dr. Burrell goes on to make the point that the world economy has enjoyed a period of unparalleled growth over the past half-century or so (two World Wars notwithstanding); that we have explored every nook and cranny of the finite world in search of natural resources; and that growth is now being slowed by depletion of natural resources (akin to exhaustion of nutrients in a bacteria colony).

Dr. Burrell's view is not entirely new; it was first expressed in a somewhat different form by Thomas Malthus in the late 1700's and early 1800's and later was further developed by the classical economists. The now famous "Malthusian Doctrine" holds that population growth proceeds at a geometric rate while food supplies (wheat, energy supplies, since Malthus wrote before the advent of the Industrial Age) increase at an arithmetic rate. Thus, eventually population will outstrip the means of subsistence (energy sources). Malthus went on to outline the forces that would prevent population from outstripping the means of subsistence.

Implicit in Malthusian Economics, but not expressly stated, is the idea of the "Law of Diminishing Returns," which was later developed by the classical economists. The "Law of Diminishing Returns," in non-technical language, states that in any economic system there is a certain point beyond which additional inputs of units of production will result in a less than proportional, and a steadily declining, return in output.

Civilization is based upon the land, the land, in this case, being a catch-all term covering the earth and including the waters of the earth. Land is a major factor in food production and is a source of raw materials for other economic activity. Social scientists have long held that three items were essential for human survival: food, shelter, and clothing, in that order. Man must have food before he can undertake any other form of economic activity; food is therefore an energy source and the primary energy source. It is perhaps ironical that America, in an era when approximately one-half of the world population goes to bed hungry each night and when millions in Africa and Asia are dying of starvation, is blithely putting millions of acres of her best farm lands into parking lots, highways, and reservoirs, and is currently proposing to lay waste to vast acreages with bulldozers and power shovels in search for "energy" supplies.

Today we are faced with an energy crisis - not only a shortage of energy to power the machines of our industrial complex - but also a shortage of food; energy to support the vital spark of life. The current energy crisis is not a short-term event brought on by the actions of the oil-producing nations, but results from the centuries-old practice of first using the best and most readily available resources of whatever nature. The problem is compounded by the simple fact that it takes energy to get energy; that one must expend a certain amount of energy - animal or otherwise - in order to obtain alternate sources of energy.

At the lowest level, this means that the farmer must labor in order to produce the food which enables him to labor. The fact that the farmer produces a surplus of food beyond his immediate needs means that there has been a net addition to the available energy sources. At the other end of the scale is the nuclear reactor which consumes enormous quantities of energy without adding appreciably to energy supplies (it is estimated that a nuclear-powered generating plant will produce approximately two percent more power than it consumes).

Thus, since the best sources of energy have already been exploited, marginal sources must now be tapped, and this means that for each unit of energy expended, the net additional return will be smaller and smaller, until quite possibly the return may become negative.

To illustrate the latter point, consider the western coal fields which are to be strip-mined to provide fuel for production of electrical power. Each ton of coal will produce so many btu's or calories of energy. However, to get that potential energy, petroleum products are required to power the machinery that mines the coal and powers the trains that will carry the coal to the generating facility. Energy was expended to locate, produce, and distill the petroleum products that powers the machinery. Energy was expended to produce the metals, rubber, and other components of the machinery used in mining and transporting the coal. Energy was expended to produce and lay the railroad tracks that carry the coal. Energy, in the form of food, powers the men who operate the machinery. The list is endless, but the idea should be clear. If one could add the total energy expenditures involved and compare that total with the net addition in energy output to be small indeed. What is involved is an exchange of several types of energy for a different form of energy. Quite possibly a careful analysis would show that it would be more economical to fire the generating facility with the petroleum products expended than it would be to utilize the coal that eventually arrives at the facility. A more practical solution would be to carefully

analyze the energy expenditures involved in producing all the steel, fuel, rubber, aluminum, etc., that go into making of the equipment that will mine and haul the coal and transfer that energy to other uses. This means not building a new generating facility and not strip-mining the western lands. Such a solution is politically and socially unacceptable in an economy based upon the concept of ever-increasing growth - a concept that is based upon the principle of infinite natural resources.

The spectre of a human population crash looms heavily over us, yet government is committed to the concept of an ever growing economy; government, in fact, at all levels, must have an ever-increasing economy if it is to fund all the programs now on the books. Future programs must be funded - somehow - and, up to this point, that future funding has been based upon the principle of infinite natural resources that will permit unlimited growth.

Dr. Howard T. Odum, of the University of Florida, has developed an energy-flow system in which a dollar value - in terms of calories (large calories or kilo-calories) - is placed on each energy source, whether animal power, natural sources (wind and sun), or from fossil fuels. In other terms, the dollar will buy work equivalent to some mechanical labor, represented by fossil fuels categories, and work done by natural system, such as winds and solar energy. Inflation, according to Dr. Odum's concepts, results from the pursuit of high economic growth with ever more-costly fossil fuels and other energy sources. Dr. Odum's work may thus lead to practical applications by indicating directions in which our nation can make best use of energy resources and environmental planning. Unfortunately, Dr. Odum's concepts also lead toward a steady-state economy, a condition unacceptable to modern day politicians and economists.

Scott Replaces Mc Manigle

Ronald E. Scott, a district ranger on Michigan's Huron - Manistee National Forest, has been named to replace Merle McManigle as ranger on the Gauley District of The Monongahela National Forest. McManigle was transferred in December to a district post on The Superior National Forest in Michigan.

Scott, a Michigan native, is a fourteen year veteran with the Forest Service and has served on the Huron - Manistee since 1967.

The Highlands Conservancy extends a cordial welcome to Ranger Scott and best wishes for successful management of the Gauley District.

MERRY CHRISTMAS

From the DNR

- Webster County, 50 acres, Peaker Run Coal Company.
- Preston County, 50 acres, C.I. Langensfelder & Son, Inc.
- Upshur County, 28 acres, B & B Coal Co.

AND A HAPPY NEW YEAR FROM THE WEST VIRGINIA SURFACE MINE ASSOCIATION

- #1306, Harrison County, Udonia Dist., 28 acres, Paul Marzold, Inc.
- #1308, Monongahela County, Udonia Dist., 58 acres, Valley Enterprises, Inc.
- #1307, Raleigh County, Richmond Dist., 64 acres, White Sulphur Coal Co.
- #1309, Mingo County, Sandy River Dist., 60 acres, Oswald Coal, Inc.

- #1309, Barbour County, Phillip Dist., 54 acres, Grafon Coal Co.

- #1300, Fayette County, Plateau Dist., 200 acres, Indian Coal Land Co.
- #1301, Webster County, Glade Dist., 19 acres, Salsgates Bros. Coal Co.
- #1302, Upshur County, Udonia Dist., 52 acres, Utilitas, Inc.
- #1303, Upshur County, Washington Dist., 45 acres, D.L.M. Coal Corp.
- #1304, Nicholas County, Jefferson Dist., 60 acres, Black Lake Coal Co.
- #1305, Mingo County, Stafford Dist., 280 acres, Energy Development Corp.
- #1306, Mingo County, Stafford Dist., 75 acres, Energy Development Corp.

Anyone wishing to decline the above members' greetings may do so by writing to:

- Santa Claus
- Box 322
- 5000 Washington St. E.
- Charleston, WV 25308

CONSERVANCY PUBLICATIONS

A new edition of the Monongahela National Forest trail guide is now available. Users will be pleased to know that the format of the guide has been altered, and it will now fit conveniently in a large pocket or an outside pocket on a pack. The new guide measures 5 1/2" x 9". It cost \$2 and can be ordered from the address below:

1. Other Creek Trail Guide & Management Plan. 75 cents.
 2. Dolly Soda Trail Guide & Management Plan - \$1.25.
 3. Cranberry Backcountry Trail Guide & Management Plan - \$1.00.
 4. Hiking Guide to the Monongahela National Forest - \$2.00.
- These may be ordered from:

Mrs. J.C. Kleinfelder
Route 1, Box 253
Elkins, West Virginia 26241

Copies available at 1-3 discount to stores and clubs. Address inquiries concerning wholesale orders to Bruce Sandquist, 218 College Park Drive, Hancock, Pennsylvania 15146. Prices as of January, 1974.

A Professional Forester Speaks Out on Forest Management

by G. R. Trimble, Jr.

When Stauffer Miller asked me to write an article for *The Highlands Voice* explaining a professional forester's viewpoint in the controversy over how our forest land, particularly our public forest land, should be managed, I agreed to try. I wrote this article not from the conviction that I was ordained to reconcile all my many conflicting viewpoints on this subject but because I believe that the gulf that has recently separated so many foresters from so many lay conservationists is an artificial one, created in the main by misunderstanding but also fueled by the extremists on both sides. From the start, I wish to disassociate myself from these two classes of people: the timber beasts who believe that all forests exist only for producing wood, and the fanatic preservationists who consider it a sin to cut a tree.

In recent years, two areas in particular have been battlegrounds where conservation and forestry organizations have slugged it out with, in my opinion, little benefit to either and some loss to both. I refer to the controversies over wilderness areas and timber harvesting practices.

The wilderness area controversy in West Virginia began several years ago with the request by the West Virginia Highland Conservancy that Otter Creek, which is a part of the Monongahela National Forest, be classified as wilderness. Local lumber companies opposed this on the basis that such action would result in an appreciable loss of jobs and needed lumber. The U.S. Forest Service, convinced that Otter Creek, having been completely logged many decades ago, could not meet the requirements under the Wilderness Act, offered to give essentially wilderness protection to about half of the area but to permit roads and carefully controlled logging in the other half. This did not satisfy the Conservancy, which countered by requesting not only all of Otter Creek as wilderness but Dolly Sods and the Cranberry Back Country as well. This action convinced most of the foresters and lumbermen who had been sympathetic to wilderness status for Otter Creek (and there were a number of them) that one could not trust the conservation organizations; that if they got a foot in the door, they would demand all public forest land be preserved as the domain of the backpackers.

And now where do we stand on this issue?

Right now we are awaiting the fate in the Congress of the eastern wilderness bill. Dolly Sods and Otter Creek are included under the bill for instant wilderness status, but the Cranberry Area is not even covered as a study area. I do not know how the majority of foresters feel about this situation, but I know some at least feel as I do. I believe that Dolly Sods should be given wilderness status and I believe that Otter Creek, excluding Shavers Lick, should also be classified as wilderness. In my mind, the inclusion of Shavers Lick cannot be justified. It is not part of Otter Creek and adds nothing to it as a wilderness area. It makes the whole area much harder to protect and police as wilderness, and it is an excellent timber producing area, needed for lumber and jobs.

In my opinion, the Cranberry Back Country needs no additional study as a candidate area for wilderness. It does not merit wilderness status. As it is now, it offers an outstanding locale for hunting, fishing, hiking, and camping. It is well-roaded but the roads are gated to motorized public use. It will be managed as a back country recreation area, but at the same time it will be subjected to carefully controlled logging. It is an excellent timber-producing area and badly needed as such.

The misconceptions about clearcutting and selection cutting as timber harvesting or forest regeneration practices are legion. And, although hundreds of articles and several books have been written on the subject, I suspect that the average lay conservationist is still somewhat confused by the terms, particularly as to how they fit into the various silvicultural systems. Foresters are largely to blame for this confusion for rarely have we bothered to interpret our technical jargon in plain English. I hope those of you to whom the terms are already clearly understood will excuse my following deviation into terminology.

"Even-aged management means growing and managing a stand of trees all of which are about the same age; as contrasted to uneven-aged management, where trees of several ages are grown in the same stand.

"Clearcutting is the usual final harvesting method in stands managed under the even-aged system. That

cutting takes place when the trees are mature in terms of the owner's objectives in practicing forestry. Before that time, the immature stands are selectively cleaned and thinned to salvage surplus trees and to improve and speed up the growth of the final crop. At the removal of this final crop, a new stand is started—either naturally (normally the case in the Appalachians) or by man. Although the mature stand is usually removed by clearcutting in one operation, it may be removed in two or three cuts made over a span of several years. The latter procedure could be either a shelterwood or seed tree cutting, depending on the number of trees left standing after the first removal cut.

"Selection cutting in uneven-aged stands, on the other hand, entails removal, either singly or in small groups, of selected individual stems across a range of merchantable-sized trees. Each cutting is a combination of harvest or reproduction cut and improvement cut and thinning. Similar future cuts are scheduled periodically—for eastern hardwoods, usually between 10 and 20 years. Under this method, the ground is always occupied by a stand of trees. The trees in these stands are of several ages because, theoretically at least, a new crop starts following every cut."

To cover the controversial aspects of harvesting practices as thoroughly as possible in the space available, I have resorted to a series of questions and answers.

When did the controversy over clearcutting heat up?

About 10 years ago when the Monongahela National Forest changed from the practice of uneven-aged management with selection cutting to even-aged management with clearcut harvests.

Why did the Monongahela National Forest make this change?

Because experience and research showed even-aged management to be superior biologically and economically to uneven-aged management.

Many of our best hardwoods need full sunlight to develop and grow, but only a few shade-tolerant species can grow in the shade produced by even-aged (section cut) stands. In other words, clearcutting gives us better, faster-growing species and a greater variety. There is another angle also; our best mast-producing trees, such as the oaks and black cherry grow much better in even-aged stands, and we need these species to provide food for forest game. We also need clearcut areas to produce suitable habitat for grouse, rabbits, deer, song birds, and turkey broods.

Moreover, there is almost unanimous agreement among practicing foresters that over the long run management and the harvesting costs are lower under even-aged management. Where costs are less and net returns therefore greater, a more intensive type of forestry can be practiced and more wood grown per given unit of area.

Why has there been so much violent objection to clearcutting?

In the beginning, clearcuts were made of any size and in any location that the condition of the timber dictated. The large size, close spacing, and nearness of many clearcuts to streams and recreation areas offended the public's sense of esthetics. Moreover, some game people were concerned that large, closely-spaced clearcuts were detrimental to several species of game.

As the Monongahela National Forest changed its policy as a result of these objections?

The Monongahela National Forest has made a number of changes to meet the public's valid objections and at the same time retain the advantages of even-aged management for timber production and the enhancement of game habitat. Among the measures adopted to meet the demands for a better multiple use mix were:

1. Streambanks and roadsides, scenic, and recreational locations to remain uncut or to be logged by the selection method.

2. Improved cleanup of logged areas.

3. Wide spacing between clearcuts.

4. Clearcuts to be more carefully shaped and held to sizes less than 25 acres each, except in unusual circumstances, such as fire-killed or insect-killed timber.

5. Retainment of cull trees for den trees and areas of old growth for production of mast for game.

How much of the Monongahela National Forest is reserved for uses primarily other than timber production?

340,700 acres or 41 percent of the Monongahela is reserved in categories where no cutting will be permitted or only light selection cutting will be done. On 158,600 acres no cutting at all will take place, and on 182,100 acres only greatly modified cutting will be permitted.

If clearcutting is carried out on much of the remainder, won't the Monongahela National Forest soon be cut over?

At the planned rate of cutting on areas scheduled for clearcutting— $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 percent a year—it will take 100 to 200 years to complete one round of clearcutting. By that time, the areas cut first will have new stands of timber on them that are 100 to 200 years old.

But what about the "devastation," with the cessation of permanence, that we read so much about in connection with clearcutting?

Purely erroneous. At first a clearcut area does look bad, but in 3 to 5 years a new stand of vigorous young trees takes over. The brief ugliness is a small price to pay for the excellent new forest we get. I recently visited about 30 acres on the Monongahela National Forest that had been clearcut during the last 2 to 10 years and found all of them covered with very satisfactory new growth.

But won't selection cutting of several trees in a group—called group selection—provide enough light for sun-loving species to germinate and develop?

True, it will, and this method has some applicability on small woodlots. But it is like hand gardening a small flower bed compared to farming. In using this procedure on large forest areas, control of the amount of area regenerated and regulation of the rate of cutting for sustained yield are difficult and expensive; and the resultant many small stands of different ages make cultural and harvesting operations so complex that intensive forestry is precluded.

Why the emphasis on intensive forestry and high timber production?

Considering our mushrooming need for wood, this is important, particularly because wood substitutes come mostly from non-renewable resources (unlike forests) and are becoming scarce and expensive. Moreover, for many wood substitutes, we are increasingly dependent upon foreign sources. In addition, the extraction and processing of most wood substitutes uses more energy and creates more water and air pollution than does the processing of wood.

Another fact that should add emphasis to the importance of growing more wood per acre is that the more intensive our production on timber growing land, the less likely there is to be future pressure to harvest wood from wilderness areas, parks, and other forest land similarly reserved from cutting.

It seems to me that the basic aims of both foresters and lay conservationists are much the same, namely to protect and enhance the beauty and productivity of our forests. To accomplish this, we would do well to strive for better communications and mutual confidence. And when our points of view are really different, we can at least exercise forbearance and exhibit a spirit of compromise.

In conclusion, I should remind the readers of this article that the ideas I have expressed are my own, except where I have referred to Monongahela National Forest policy. Statements involving National Forest procedures have been checked with responsible personnel.

George Trimble is retired from the U.S. Forest Service. At the time of his retirement he was chief of the Parsons Timber and Watershed Laboratory. George has served on national forests from New England to the northern Rockies. He is a graduate of the University of Maine, and now lives in Illinois where he is active in the Illinois Hiking Club and the local Walton League.