



The Upper Peninsula *Environment*

Newsletter of the Upper Peninsula Environmental Coalition • February 1991

Survey finds majority in U.P. favors restoring wolves

The latest Timber Wolf Alliance (TWA) quarterly newsletter featured an article explaining a study that was conducted last summer in the U.P. to try to determine public attitudes, knowledge, and behavioral relations in regard to wolves and their possible restoration to Upper Michigan. The survey was done by the International Wolf Center in Ely, Minnesota, with support of the U.S. Forest Service, Michigan DNR, National Park Service, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and the TWA. A 22-page survey was mailed randomly to the general public, and a special sample of deer hunters, trappers, and farmers was taken. Results showed that 64% of the U.P. respondents supported wolf restoration, while 15% were opposed. Seventy-six percent of the hunters and 66% of the trappers also supported restoration. The farmers demonstrated more concern: only 37% supported restoration, though 23% indicated they would be willing to help establish a wild population of wolves in the U.P.

Most of the groups surveyed supported the view that they would be "proud to live in a state that had restored wolves." Also, the public sample group agreed that "it would be wonderful to hear a wolf howl in the wild." The deer hunters that were surveyed consistently and strongly expressed the greatest sympathy, concern, ecological appreciation, and outdoor recreational interest in the wolf of any group examined. On the opposing side, the public expressed resistance to the restriction of human development or economic activities to assist the wolf's recovery. Also, the belief was expressed that the government should do all it can to assure the wolf's exis-

tence in Michigan, but limit wolf numbers should they become abundant.

On the weekend of January 19 and 20, about 60 members of the TWA Speakers' Bureau attended a workshop at the University of Wisconsin's Treehaven center near Tomahawk to learn more about wolf biology, the wolf's current status in Wisconsin and the U.P., and the recovery project in Wisconsin. Wisconsin DNR biologist in charge of the wolf recovery project, Adrian Weydeven, gave an informative talk on his work with the packs now established in Wisconsin. A session on delivering better presentations was also held, and information on materials available from the TWA for speaker's presentations was explained. On Saturday night, the group had the chance to go "howling" in areas where tracks of two wolves had been spotted late in the week. Although unable to hear returning howls, participants were shown the tracks and other wolf sign.

For a free brochure on the TWA's work, write: TWA, Sigurd Olson Environmental Institute, Northland College, Ashland, WI 54806.

—Sue Schenk Drobny

ENVIRO CALENDAR

UPCOMING UPEC MEETINGS

- Sunday, March 10, 1 pm ET, L'Anse Township Hall, downtown L'Anse
- GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING: Saturday, April 20, 5 pm ET, Marquette (exact location TBA)
- Tuesday, May 14, 7 pm ET, Portage Lake United Church, Houghton
- Tuesday, June 11, 7 pm ET, L'Anse Twp. Hall

ALL UPEC MEMBERS WELCOME!

UPCOMING EVENTS

Week of March 17: Zero Discharge Alliance kick-off. See story at left.

March 1: Deadline for Board nominations. See p. 3.

minded people who share your passion for the U.P. environment. And you'll learn about the zero discharge campaign—one of the most exciting conservation ideas in our region. Please call Joanne Welsh at 228-7497 or Michael Huntly at 942-7767. A short-term commitment to this campaign could have long-term beneficial effects for Lake Superior and, down the line, the whole Great Lakes basin.

Short-term volunteers wanted for Zero Discharge kick-off

Have you ever wanted to get directly involved in helping the U.P. environment, but held off because you just didn't want to commit to an endless project? Well, now's your chance to be active in a campaign that has a defined beginning, middle, and end. We're looking for people to help us start the zero discharge campaign in the U.P. The official kick-off to the Zero Discharge Alliance is the week of March 17. We'd like to get some UPECers to volunteer a few hours for various projects related to the kick-off. We need people interested in working during the weeks leading up to and following the kick-off week. Of course, you can tailor your involvement to your schedule. You'll meet friendly, like-

Suing to protect biodiversity in National Forests

by Walter Kuhlmann

second of two parts

Excerpted from the Fall 1990 *Horizons*, newsletter of the Sigurd Olson Environmental Institute, Northland College, Ashland, WI 54806. Used by permission.

The external stresses on a biological population or community increase dramatically when management fragments the forest into small patches of mature vegetation isolated in a matrix of younger forest. The small size of mature stands of trees (area effects), the increased edge-to-area ratio (edge effects), and the distance from other similar habitats (isolation effects) all lead to deterioration of the biotic community in the remaining "islands" of forest.

The pernicious effects of external threats are difficult to perceive in the brief glimpse of a national forest planning cycle. Organisms will persist in an area for varying periods of time even after conditions necessary for their long-term maintenance are gone and the population is doomed. Forest Service planners may mistakenly believe they are providing for "old-growth" conditions in 10, 50, or several hundred-acre plots because they can still see living adults in these areas.

Simply counting adults, however, is not an adequate measure of regeneration in the community. If that regeneration is not examined, then no account is taken of population trends in the ecosystem, and cumulative effects have not been meaningfully assessed. Even when regeneration problems in certain species are acknowledged by the Forest Service, their answer is to actively try to restore the particular species, rather than learn from the indicator that the community is out of balance.

While particular species are sometimes rescued by such active manipulation, others that are not inventoried or currently popular continue to suffer from the dysfunctional ecosystem. In the Great Lakes region, for example, white-tailed deer herbivory is boosted by game management techniques and the logging-disturbed landscape. Population levels of white-tailed deer are currently many times higher than occurred historically in the region and researchers have shown that overbrowsing is interfering with the regeneration of many plant species. Forest management has also reduced breeding populations of migratory songbirds in the region due to increased nest predation and parasitism by birds and mammals that are favored in disturbed areas.

Adding to the effects of human manipulation, large-scale natural disturbances such as fires or blowdowns have a much more devastating effect if there are no surrounding sources of re-colonization for interior species. A minimum sustainable area must provide internal sources for re-colonization if it is to weather any of these threats.

The loss of biological diversity promoted by the forest plans for the Wisconsin National Forests extends beyond currently identified threatened or endangered plants or animals. Botanists have identified a range of forest types (mature hemlock/hardwood, white cedar swamps) and individual species jeopardized by the loss of interior and/or old-growth forest conditions. The growing list includes Canada yew, eastern hemlock, northern white cedar, calypso orchid, ram's head ladyslipper, showy ladyslipper, Hooker's orchid, round-leaved orchid, foamflower, Braun's holly fern, yellow-bellied flycatcher, Blackburnian warbler, and Canada warbler. . . .

. . . [E]ven though the Wisconsin National Forests have begun to heal from the severe disturbance by heavy logging and wildfires during the great logging era at the turn of the century (casualties of which were the elk, woodland cari-

bou, wolverine, and, likely, unassessed plant species and invertebrates), we can now expect continued losses unless fragmentation is reduced.

Yet, from the outset of the planning process, Nicolet and Chequamegon planners failed to properly define and consider biological diversity. Scientific concepts of diversity (such as recognizing the importance of total diversity, and the importance of considering communities, not just individual species) compare well with the legal definition of diversity for forest planning purposes found in Forest Service regulations. . . . [Y]et the list of Nicolet and Chequamegon failures is extensive:

- No treatment of natural population dynamics in a fragmented landscape;
- No discussion of natural patch and successional dynamics;
- No indication that re-colonization or regeneration problems were considered;
- No identification of future extirpation-prone species and necessary steps to protect them (i.e., beyond those already listed as threatened or endangered);
- No recognition of edge effects (either generally or in the Great Lakes forests); and so on.

In short, the two Wisconsin National Forest Plans baldly asserted that certain planning alternatives would foster increased diversity and that all alternatives would maintain viable populations of native vertebrates. Yet the agency has not even begun to analyze the effects these intensive management problems will have in reducing the species richness of the lands under their care. . . .

In its responsive statements to the Chequamegon and Nicolet appeals, the Forest Service could advance no scientific evidence to rebut the appellants, and no staff member was willing or able to attempt a rebuttal of the need for large blocks of mature forest to preserve overall diversity. The decisions from the [Forest Service] Chief, as recently as January of 1990, did not even attempt to address the concerns of the leading scientists participating in the record of appeals. . . .

More than 20 years after the first Earth Day, the most fundamental notions of "ecology" and "ecosystems" remain foreign to the thinking of the Washington Office of the Forest Service. The formal agency position continues to be that we can choose those species that are of concern to us and then manage specifically for those species that we are lucky enough to identify as such before extirpation. . . . Twelve years after the passage of the National Forest Management Act, the Forest Service still contends that the principal concern of the NFMA diversity language is tree species diversity, and the agency staunchly refuses to heed its charge from Congress to care for all plant and animal communities and species in the forest.

Conservation biology is an effective weapon to pierce such public relations myths as "managing for old growth," "wildlife loves managed forests," and "multiple use." The false notion that periodic timber harvest can continue to be conducted throughout our forests without species loss, and without costs to the other purposes of the forests, can be firmly rebutted with the highest order of scientific support. The drive to protect and restore biological diversity is not just

**The Upper Peninsula
Environmental Coalition
P. O. Box 34
Houghton, Michigan 49931**

*dedicated to the preservation
and maintenance of the
unique environmental quality
of the Upper Peninsula*

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Gayle Coyer, President

Skandia

William Malmsten, Vice President

Ishpeming

Lynn Foss, Secretary

Houghton

Becky Bach, Treasurer

Atlantic Mine

Catherine Andrews	David Bach
<i>Herman</i>	<i>Atlantic Mine</i>
Robert Brown	Marilyn Cooper
<i>Houghton</i>	<i>Houghton</i>
Wendell Greek	David Harmon
<i>Keweenaw Co.</i>	<i>Atlantic Mine</i>
Terry Kinzel	Kraig Klungness
<i>Hancock</i>	<i>Houghton</i>
Richard Selfe	Scot Stewart
<i>Houghton</i>	<i>Marquette</i>
Rolf Swanson	Douglas Welker
<i>Alston</i>	<i>Pelkie</i>
Joanne Welsh	
<i>Marquette</i>	

**SUPPORTING & MEMBER
ORGANIZATIONS**

- Bay de Noc Audubon Society & Naturalists' Club
- Copper Country Audubon Society
 - Copper Country Citizens for Recycling
 - Copper Country League of Women Voters
- Copper Country Peace Alliance
- Dickinson Citizens for Clean Air
 - FOCUS
- Friends of the Land of Keweenaw (FOLK)
 - Ottawa National Forest, Kenton Ranger District
 - Recycle!Marquette

UPEC is a member of Great Lakes United, HONOR, the Michigan Environmental Council, and the Northwoods, Timber Wolf, and Zero Discharge Alliances

*printed with
vegetable-based ink on recycled,
unbleached paper*

a concern for the tropics or the ancient forests of the Pacific Northwest; it is a necessary component of every critique and appeal of national forest plans if we are to stave off institutional acceptance of fragmentation and the resulting degradation of native biological communities.

**We're looking for activists to join
the UPEC Board of Directors!**

UPEC is currently soliciting nominations for ALL Board of Directors positions for a one-year term, May 1, 1991, to April 30, 1992.

The elected UPEC Board of Directors consists of the President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, and 10 members at large. These persons, along with organizational representatives, provide the core of the environmental activists who translate our concerns and visions into action and reality.

The duties of the four officers are fairly consistent with their titles. The duties of the members-at-large are to chair or be actively involved in at least one issues committee, represent the interests of the general membership, and attend the monthly meetings.

If you would like to be actively involved in UPEC on a regular basis, please contact Bill Malmsten, Ishpeming (485-5909), Joanne Welsh, Marquette (228-7497), or Dave Bach, Houghton (482-6543). The deadline is March 1.

Afterthought: As a present member at large, I find myself spending about 8-10 hours per month writing letters, studying issues, and talking on the phone, in addition to attending the monthly Board meeting which usually lasts 3-4 hours. I do not like giving testimony at public hearings or being in the public eye, but will attend hearings and lend emotional support to other more courageous souls. Working on the UPEC Board has been one of my most rewarding experiences. It has allowed me, a perpetual cynic, to convert a strong environmental ethic into real life positive action, and in the process I have made enduring friendships. I think I have "gotten" more from this involvement than I have "given." It has changed my "they should do" to a "we can do" attitude.

—Dave Bach

News & Notes

Annual dues now payable By now you should have received the annual renewal notice letter. We hope you'll take a few moments to renew with UPEC, if you haven't already. Nowhere else can you keep tabs on what's happening with (and to!) Upper Michigan's environment. We also hope you'll consider adding an extra contribution over and above the \$10 we ask of regular members. What with the new postal rates (bulk rates went up nearly 50% for nonprofits), higher costs for paper, printing, and so forth, it now costs us close to \$10 per year per member just to send you this newsletter. We rely on our members' generosity to cover all other UPEC expenses. The renewal letter contains a form you can use to specify what you want your extra donation spent for. So please renew! Give a friend a gift membership! Write letters to the powers that be! Volunteer for a project! Help us fight for the best of the U.P.! And to those who have already renewed, please accept our thanks—we really appreciate your support.

1991 Sourcebook Out You may recall that last year we touted the Island Press' environmental sourcebook catalogue. It is a mail-order collection of books and reference works on a wide variety of environmental topics. Well, the 1991 edition is now out, and it's good again! A sampling of titles of special interest to the U.P.: *Wetland Creation and Restoration, Beyond 40 Percent: Record-Setting Recycling and Composting Programs, Wildlife and Habitats in Managed Landscapes, and Wildlife, Forests, and Forestry: Principles of Managing Forests for Biological Diversity*. For a free copy of the sourcebook, call 1-800-828-1302, 8-5 Pacific Time.

"On average, pulp mills discharge around 35 tons of toxic organochlorines every single day. Even those mills that already have upgraded their process to reduce formation of the most notorious organochlorine, dioxin, will still discharge between 10 and 20 tons of other chlorinated poisons every single day."

—If You Think Whiter is Better, Greenpeace brochure

DNR promises revised RAPs for toxic hot spots; UPEC seeks Manistique coverage

UPEC was one of many Michigan groups in attendance at the DNR's early-December workshop on Remedial Action Plans (RAPs) for toxic Areas of Concern (AOC) indentified under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. Environmentalists were quite pleased with some of the commitments the DNR made to RAPs, which are supposed to be comprehensive clean-up and pollution prevention plans for each AOC. The DNR agreed that RAPs need to be made more effective and accessible to citizen input. Among the commitments: an endorsement of a statewide citizen RAP advisory council; an acknowledgement that pollution prevention and zero discharge will be the focus of the DNR's future efforts, not just more end-of-pipe standards; and a recognition of the importance of citizen involvement in identifying and carrying out clean-up strategies. Great Lakes United (GLU), which has been spearheading oversight of RAPs, is now following up to make sure the DNR sticks to these commitments.

The DNR has been roundly criticized for the inadequacy of some of the RAPs it produced, especially those that came out a few years ago. At the workshop, it agreed to revise these. GLU is now overseeing citizen-written "white papers" on some inadequate RAPs. These white papers will be brief reviews of the toxic hot spot and the problems with the initial RAP. They will be used as tools to push for expanded public input. Among the inadequate RAPs that will require white papers are three in Upper Michigan: Manistique (Schoolcraft County), Torch Lake (Houghton County), and Deer Lake (Marquette County). GLU also made these recommendations:

- (1) Each RAP should have a public advisory committee.
- (2) A formal RAP review process should be established which would include approval by the Water Resources Commission and the Natural Resources Commission.
- (3) RAPs should embody an ecosystem approach. To do this, the scope of the RAP can't be defined narrowly. GLU is concerned that circumscribing the Area of Concern is a ploy to delist the hot spot rather than truly cleaning it up.

UPEC members who attended the meeting (Gayle Coyer, Joanne Welsh, and Dave Bach) shared the enthusiasm of the other activists who met after the workshop. If the DNR follows through on its commitments, the RAP process—which many in Michigan saw as moribund—could have a new lease on life.

We in UPEC want to keep involved in the RAP revision. We already have pretty good coverage on Torch Lake and Deer Lake, but as far as we know the only person who is working on the Manistique RAP is a summer resident who lives downstate. We'd like to get a UPEC member from around Manistique (or anywhere in the southern U.P.) to help us keep tabs on the Manistique AOC. Don't worry if you're not familiar with RAPs or AOCs or whatever—all we ask is an interest in reducing toxic discharges into Lake Michigan. We've got plenty of information to help get you up to speed. If you're at all interested, please write to Dave Harmon at UPEC.

Changing address? To be sure to get the newsletter without interruption, please send us your new address using the form below. Thanks!

Yes! I want to protect the U.P.!

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

Phone _____ *Check here if this is a change of address.*

I would like to support the goals of UPEC by becoming a member. My annual dues are enclosed (check one): Individual Member (\$10); Low-Income person (\$5); Student (\$5); Senior Citizen (\$5). Additional contributions are, of course, greatly appreciated. Dues are good for the entire calendar year in which they are paid. Thank you!

I belong to or represent an organization whose goals support UPEC's goals, and would like to get information on possible membership. Dues for organizations are \$15 annually.

I want to get to know UPEC better. Please send me a free 3-month subscription to UPEC's newsletter, the *Upper Peninsula Environment*.

UPEC, P.O. Box 34, Houghton, MI 49931

Nonprofit Organization

U.S. POSTAGE

PAID

Permit No. 35
Houghton, Michigan

Upper Peninsula Environmental Coalition
P. O. Box 34
Houghton, Michigan 49931-0034

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

FOLK
P O BOX 168
L'ANSE MI

49946