

# POWER TO HURT

---

THE ROLE OF  
WEALTHY PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS  
IN UNDERMINING CONGRESSIONAL POLICY  
ON THE NATIONAL FORESTS

---

SUPPLEMENT TO THE BOOK  
*UNDUE INFLUENCE*

---

A REPORT BY  
THE CENTER FOR THE DEFENSE OF  
FREE ENTERPRISE

# Power to Hurt: Introduction

In October of 1999, the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise placed into pre-release Ron Arnold's book-length study, *Undue Influence: Wealthy Foundations, Grant-Driven Environmental Groups, and Zealous Bureaucrats That Control Your Future*.

The book's central point was: big foundations give billions in grants to elitist organizations that have privileged access to government agencies with an environmental agenda that requires the elimination of all resource extraction industries, first from federal lands, then from other government and private lands. Their combined power to hurt is overwhelming.

*Undue Influence* provided documentation. The three-cornered power center of foundations, environmental groups and government employees works in concert to:

- cut off the flow of natural resources from America's federal lands, ending the supply of water, timber, minerals, food and fiber that citizens use every day.
- tighten their regulatory grip on private property so owners can't use what they own—and can't get compensation for what they lose.
- increase the size of government by taking more and more private land for nature preserves, greenways, "heritage" sites, and "growth management" areas—even though *government already owns nearly half the nation*.
- widen the rural-urban prosperity gap. While cities enjoy a booming economy, rural communities suffer severe economic pain brought on by the "iron triangle" through bans on logging, mining, ranching, farming, and all forms of natural resource production.
- sway the media that Americans rely on, influencing readers and viewers to believe what the "iron triangle" wants them to believe.
- dismantle industrial civilization piece by piece.

However, as *Undue Influence* went into major release in February 2000, the few months since it emerged from the printer had seen one outrage after another emerge from the iron triangle of foundations, environmental groups and government officials.

Wealthy foundations created projects to foreclose all development of 60 million acres of federal land, funded environmental groups to do their political advocacy, and manipulated the White House with insider influence to administratively declare the coveted lands beyond any human habitation, tourist facilities, vehicular access or resource development.

Wealthy foundations created an electioneering machine in the form of a new group that will enhance the mailing lists of major environmental groups by adding voter records, legislative districts, demographic information, party preferences and other election-oriented data designed to forward a strictly political agenda.

New national monuments were created by presidential proclamation in areas long advocated for wilderness status by foundation-funded environmental groups with insider access to the Secretary of the Interior, who recommended to the President a lengthy list of areas for administrative designation as national monuments, regardless of the communities and natural resource industries that would be damaged.

All this was done in a way that avoided Congressional approval, foreclosed public debate, and excluded those hurt by the administrative actions, a most undemocratic method.

Therefore, the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise compiled the information in this White Paper as a report to Congress that will supplement and confirm the findings in the book *Undue Influence*.

Updates may be tracked on the Web at <http://www.undueinfluence.com>.

This report was produced by the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise in the public interest. Permission to reproduce portions of this report is granted.

# Power to Hurt: Contents

Introduction	2
<b>The Hidden Power</b>	
Foundations are manipulating public policy	4
Example: The Heritage Forest Campaign	5
Example: The Partnership Project	6
Example: The Northern Forest Alliance	7
Example: The Southwest Forest Alliance	8
Lumber reductions and closed mills	9
<b>Documentation</b>	
Heritage Forest Campaign	11
Partnership Project	11
Northern Forest Alliance	13
Pew Grant Application - Southwest Forest Alliance	15
<b>Targets of Hurt: Comments from around the nation</b>	
Maine	23
New Hampshire	23
Massachusetts	23
Rhode Island	23
Tennessee	24
Florida	24
Ohio	24
Arkansas	25
Colorado	25
New Mexico	25
Arizona	26
Utah	26
Montana	28
California	28

## **WEALTHY FOUNDATIONS ARE MANIPULATING PUBLIC POLICY**

**POINT:** TAX-EXEMPT AND SUPPOSEDLY CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS ARE GIVING MONEY AND MARCHING ORDERS TO MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS THAT HAVE SPECIAL ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN ORDER TO SHAPE NATIONAL POLICY AGAINST RESOURCE INDUSTRIES AND PRIVATE PROPERTY.

**POINT:** THE \$4.7 BILLION PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM OFFICER TOM WATHEN HELPED PREPARE A REPORT CONTAINING THE LANGUAGE, “*FOR CONSIDERABLE SUMS OF MONEY, PUBLIC OPINION CAN BE MOLDED, CONSTITUENTS MOBILIZED, ISSUES RESEARCHED, AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS BUTTON-HOLED, ALL IN A SYMPHONIC ARRANGEMENT.*” PEW’S ENVIRONMENT DIRECTOR JOSHUA REICHERT WAS INVOLVED IN FUNDING ENVIRONMENTAL STRATEGIES, NOW CALLED THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST, A MEDIA GROUP RUN BY REICHERT’S FORMER PEW ASSISTANT, TOM WATHEN.

AMERICANS HAVE NO IDEA HOW MUCH THEIR MINDS HAVE BEEN REARRANGED BY THIS FOUNDATION-MADE PROJECT.

### **SEE MARK DOWIE MISATTRIBUTION ON PAGE 29**

**POINT:** FOUNDATIONS CREATE LARGE-SCALE INITIATIVES USING A SINGLE GROUP AS A “FISCAL AGENT” TO FUNNEL THE MONEY TO NUMEROUS GROUPS, WHICH DISGUISES THE SOURCE OF THE INITIATIVE AND GIVES THE APPEARANCE OF POPULAR SUPPORT.

**POINT:** CONCENTRATIONS OF WEALTH AND POWER THAT RESTRAIN ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OR EXERCISE UNDUE INFLUENCE OVER PUBLIC POLICY HAVE LONG BEEN SUBJECT TO GOVERNMENT REGULATION. YET THERE IS NO SPECIFIC REGULATION OF THE TRIANGLE OF PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS, GRANT-DRIVEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS AND ACTIVIST FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHICH ACTS IN CONCERT TO DESTROY RURAL GOODS-PRODUCING ECONOMIES AND UNDULY INFLUENCE PUBLIC POLICY. THEY WERE NOT ELECTED. THEY ARE NOT ACCOUNTABLE.

## **EXAMPLE: THE HERITAGE FOREST CAMPAIGN**

**POINT:** THE PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS CREATED THE “HERITAGE FOREST CAMPAIGN” TO PUSH FOR DECLARING “ROADLESS” STUDY AREAS AS “WILDERNESS,” TO SHUT OUT ALL VEHICULAR TOURISM, HUMAN COMMUNITIES AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT.

**POINT:** SINCE SEPTEMBER, 1998, PEW HAS GIVEN THE NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY \$3,565,000 IN TAX-FREE GRANTS TO SERVE AS FISCAL AGENT OF THE CAMPAIGN, FUNNELING MONEY TO 12 OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS UNDER ITS SUPERVISION.

**POINT:** THE 12 SUPERVISED GROUPS ARE: 1) NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, 2) EARTHJUSTICE LEGAL DEFENSE FUND, 3) THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY, 4) OREGON NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL, 5) AMERICAN LANDS ALLIANCE, 6) US PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP, 7) NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST, 8) ALASKA RAINFOREST CAMPAIGN, 9) SOUTHWEST FOREST ALLIANCE, 10) SOUTHERN APPALACHIAN FOREST COALITION, 11) SIERRA NEVADA FOREST PROTECTION CAMPAIGN AND 12) FORESTWATER ALLIANCE.

**POINT:** THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST RECEIVED MORE THAN \$12.2 MILLION IN PEW GRANTS FROM 1996-1999. SOUTHWEST FOREST ALLIANCE WAS CREATED BY \$750,000 IN PEW GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY. PEW ALSO GAVE \$1.5 MILLION IN GRANTS FOR THE “ROADLESS” INITIATIVE DIRECTLY TO OTHER MEMBERS OF THE HERITAGE FOREST CAMPAIGN.

**POINT:** AUDUBON USED THE ENTRÉE OF THEIR POLICY DIRECTOR, FORMER CLINTON ADMINISTRATION BUREAU OF RECLAMATION HEAD DAN BEARD, TO PLACE A PRO-WILDERNESS PUBLIC OPINION POLL WITH THE WHITE HOUSE CHIEF OF STAFF TO PERSUADE PRESIDENT CLINTON TO DECLARE 60 MILLION ACRES OF FEDERAL LAND PERMANENTLY “ROADLESS,” EFFECTIVELY “WILDERNESS.”

### **EXAMPLE: THE PARTNERSHIP PROJECT**

**POINT:** THE TURNER FOUNDATION APPROACHED A CLUSTER OF ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS EARLY IN 1999 TO PROPOSE THAT THEY JOIN FORCES IN A MEMBERSHIP LIST ENHANCEMENT PROJECT TO STRENGTHEN THEIR COLLECTIVE ABILITY TO INFLUENCE PUBLIC POLICY. THE TURNER FOUNDATION APPROVED A \$5 MILLION GRANT IN JULY, 1999 TO LAUNCH THIS INITIATIVE.

**POINT:** A NEW GROUP WAS FORMED FOR THE PURPOSE, CALLED THE PARTNERSHIP PROJECT. IT DOES NOT HAVE A MEMBERSHIP AND DOES NOT MARKET ITSELF AS A SEPARATE ENTITY. ITS PRIMARY PURPOSE IS TO ENHANCE THE MEMBERSHIP LISTS OF PARTICIPATING ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS WITH INFORMATION SUCH AS LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS, PHONE NUMBERS, E-MAIL ADDRESSES, VOTING HISTORY, AND DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES. (THESE ENHANCEMENTS WOULD BE PROHIBITIVELY EXPENSIVE WERE EACH ORGANIZATION TO ADD THEM INDEPENDENTLY.)

**POINT:** ELEVEN GROUPS PARTICIPATE: NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY; NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION; NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION; NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL; ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND; DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE; THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY; AMERICAN RIVERS; EARTHJUSTICE LEGAL DEFENSE FUND; UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS; AND THE ISAAC WALTON LEAGUE.

**POINT:** PARTICIPANTS AGREE TO JOIN IN 2 OF 3 TO 5 COLLABORATIVE CAMPAIGNS PER YEAR. THREE CAMPAIGNS HAVE BEGUN, INCLUDING ONE ON THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S "LANDS LEGACY INITIATIVE" AFFECTING FOREST SERVICE LANDS. THIS COMBINE FUNCTIONS AS A SUPERLOBBY WITH NO CLEAR REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.

## EXAMPLE: THE NORTHERN FOREST ALLIANCE

**POINT:** IN 1990, CHUCK CLUSEN OF LAURANCE ROCKEFELLER'S FOUNDATION, THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, BEGAN WORKING WITH MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS THAT CREATED THE NORTHERN FOREST ALLIANCE TO NATIONALIZE 26 MILLION ACRES OF PRIVATE LAND IN 4 STATES INTO FEDERAL OWNERSHIP FOR NATURE PRESERVES. THE APPALACHIAN MOUNTAIN CLUB WAS THE FISCAL AGENT.

**POINT:** 32 GROUPS ARE PART OF THE NORTHERN FOREST ALLIANCE:

1) THE ADIRONDACK COUNCIL; 2) APPALACHIAN MOUNTAIN CLUB; 3) APPALACHIAN TRAIL CONFERENCE; 4) ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE ADIRONDACKS; 5) CONSERVATION LAW FOUNDATION; 6) DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE; 7) GARDEN CLUB OF AMERICA; 8) GOOD WOOD ALLIANCE; 9) GREEN MOUNTAIN CLUB; 10) GREEN MOUNTAIN FOREST WATCH; 11) MAINE AUDUBON SOCIETY; 12) NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY; 13) NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION; 14) NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL OF MAINE; 15) NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL; 16) NEW ENGLAND FORESTRY FOUNDATION; 17) NEW HAMPSHIRE RIVERS COUNCIL; 18) NEW HAMPSHIRE WILDLIFE FEDERATION; 19) NEW YORK LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS; 20) NEW YORK RIVERS UNITED; 21) RESIDENTS' COMMITTEE TO PROTECT THE ADIRONDACKS; 22) SIERRA CLUB; 23) SIERRA STUDENT COALITION; 24) STUDENT ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION COALITION; 25) TROUT UNLIMITED—BASIL WOODS JR. CHAPTER; 26) TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND; 27) VERMONT ALLIANCE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS; 28) VERMONT AUDUBON COUNCIL; 29) VERMONT LAND TRUST; 30) VERMONT NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL; 31) THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY; 32) WORLD WILDLIFE FUND.

**POINT:** THE AMERICAN CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION HAS GIVEN \$50,000 FOR THE ALLIANCE; JESSIE B. COX CHARITABLE TRUST \$525,000; SURDNA FOUNDATION \$200,000; JOHN MERCK FUND \$325,000; GERALDINE ROCKEFELLER DODGE FOUNDATION \$65,000; PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS \$750,000; MORIAH FUND \$135,000; RICHARD KING MELLON FOUNDATION \$100,000; WEEDEN FOUNDATION \$20,000. THE SOLE PURPOSE OF THIS TAX-EXEMPT MONEY WAS TO NATIONALIZE PRIVATE PROPERTY.

**POINT:** THE ALLIANCE STRATEGY OF "TAKE IT ALL BACK" BY FEDERAL DESIGNATION CAUSED A HUGE BACKLASH AND FAILED. NOW CONSERVATION EASEMENTS ARE THEIR MAIN FOCUS, PERMANENTLY HAMPERING USE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY. ONLY GOVERNMENT OR ITS LAND TRUST SURROGATES WILL BUY SUCH LAND, ULTIMATELY PRODUCING THE SAME RESULT: NATIONALIZATION OF RURAL PRIVATE LANDS.

### **EXAMPLE: THE SOUTHWEST FOREST ALLIANCE**

**POINT:** IN 1994, THE NEW MEXICO STATE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY SUBMITTED A GRANT PROPOSAL TO THE PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS, RECEIVING \$750,000 TO CREATE A POWERFUL COALITION OF NEARLY 50 GROUPS THAT COULD ELIMINATE RESOURCE EXTRACTION INDUSTRIES FROM FEDERAL LANDS IN THE SOUTHWEST. AUDUBON WAS THE FISCAL AGENT.

**POINT:** THE 50-GROUP COALITION, ORIGINALLY CALLED THE “DESERT FORESTS CAMPAIGN” AND LATER RENAMED SOUTHWEST FOREST ALLIANCE, WAS DELIBERATELY DESIGNED TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE POVERTY AND SPARSE POPULATION OF RURAL AREAS SO URBAN VALUES COULD BE IMPOSED ON SURROUNDING FEDERAL LANDS.

**POINT:** THE GRANT PROPOSAL STATED: “NINETY PERCENT OF SOUTHWEST FORESTS ARE MANAGED BY THE U.S. PARK OR FOREST SERVICE THE REST IS MANAGED BY THREE NATIVE AMERICAN NATIONS. WITH SO FEW AGENCIES INVOLVED, ALL THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANDATES, STRATEGIZING AND COORDINATION WILL BE MADE EASIER.”

**POINT:** THE GRANT PROPOSAL STATED: “THE TIMBER INDUSTRY IS A MINOR ECONOMIC FORCE IN THE SOUTHWEST. ITS CONTINUED AND INEVITABLE DECLINE WILL NOT CAUSE THE KIND OF UPHEAVAL EVIDENT IN THE NORTHWEST.”

**POINT:** ELEVEN GROUPS, NOT 50, WERE THE ORIGINAL ORGANIZERS. MARICOPA AUDUBON, LED BY CHARLES BABBITT, BROTHER OF INTERIOR SECRETARY BRUCE BABBITT, WAS ONE OF THE ORIGINAL ORGANIZERS. THE ADDITIONAL GROUPS OF THE COALITION WERE ADDED LATER BY PAID RECRUITERS. THEIR IMPACT ON LOCAL FOREST COMMUNITIES HAS BEEN DEVASTATING (SEE PAGE 9).

## LUMBER PRODUCTION BY SOUTHWEST STATES

## Million Board Feet

STATE	1990	1992	1994
ARIZONA	388	274	191
NEW MEXICO	208	167	176
COLORADO	132	123	113
UTAH	69	54	37
TOAL	797	618	517

## CLOSED ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO MILLS, 1992-1998

YEAR CLOSED	COMPANY	CITY
1998	PRECISION PINE & TIMBER INC.	WINSLOW
1998	STONE	EAGER
1996	PRECISION PINE & TIMBER INC.	EAGER
1996	PRECISION PINE & TIMBER INC.	HEBER
1995	KAIBAB INDUSTRIES	FREDONIA
1995	PRECISION PINE & TIMBER INC.	PAYSON
1994	PRECISION PINE & TIMBER INC.	WILLIAMS
1993	STONE FOREST INDUSTRIES	FLAGSTAFF
1995	MEDITE OF NEW MEXICO	LAS VEGAS
1995	MARSHALL LUMBER CO.	GRANTS
1994	NAVAJO FOREST PRODUCTS INDUSTRIES	NAVAJO
1993	BATES LUMBER COMPANY INC.	ALBUQUERQUE
1993	STONE FOREST INDUSTRIES	RESERVE

Source: Paul F. Ehinger and Associates, Eugene, Oregon

## SOURCES

### **HERITAGE FOREST CAMPAIGN:**

**The Minutes of the National Audubon Society Board Meeting, held at Brewster Massachusetts on September 17-18, 1999, contain the following passage:**

#### **Conservation Update from Dan Beard:**

#### **Heritage Forest Campaign:**

There are 60 million acres of 1000 acre-plus plots in our National Forests that are still roadless. There is no hope of congressional action to preserve them as wilderness. Administrative protection *is* possible. We have raised the issue's visibility in the White House, but it's not enough. So we did a poll, using the president's pollster. He sent results to White House chief of staff. The poll shows that Americans, strongly, care about wilderness to the extent of favoring it over jobs. Even Republican men in intermountain states support it at the 50% level. The administration has said they will take some kind of action. We hope for an announcement from the president of some kind of administrative protection. We probably won't get all 60 million acres, but if we did it would represent the biggest chunk of land protection since the Alaska Lands Act.

The Pew Trust is pleased with the campaign so far. 2nd year funding will take it to January 2001: \$2.2 million for about 12 organizations under our supervision. Outside Magazine this month has a good cover article. Our visibility and credibility among fellow forest protection organizations has been raised. (comment from John Flicker - this grant came to us because of Dan Beard's reputation and good name.)

We had an email and letter writing campaign: there were about 200,000 responses; about 170K came from banners placed on services such as Juno; 25K came direct from environmental groups; NAS sent in 3K.

On this issue there is a lot of looking for leadership: I like it but let someone else go first. In Congress reaction we got a letter of support signed by 170 members; there is some senate support [40?]. The leadership knows roadless vote would now win, so they won't bring it to a vote.

### **PARTNERSHIP PROJECT:**

**The Minutes of the National Audubon Society Board Meeting, held at Brewster Massachusetts on September 17-18, 1999, contain the following passage:**

#### **Partnership Project:**

The Partnership Project is a coalition effort of 11 national conservation organizations. The Project was founded with a grant from the Turner Foundation to facilitate the compilation of national conservation organization's membership lists, enhance those lists with publicly available demographic information, and use them in 3-5 collaborative campaigns per year. Other participating organizations include: National Wildlife Federation; National Parks and Conservation Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Environmental Defense Fund; Defenders of Wildlife; The Wilderness Society; American Rivers; Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund; Union of Concerned Scientists; and the Isaac Walton League. World Wildlife Fund is also expected to join this effort.

The Partnership Project has launched three campaigns, including ones on the Clinton Administration's Lands Legacy initiative, the anti-environmental riders attached to appropriations bills, and global warming. Although each campaign is developed according to the particular issue and congressional targets, the communication methods generally involve print and radio advertisements in Washington, D.C. and congressional targets' home districts, phone banking and constituent "patch-throughs" to congressional offices, and direct mail with postcards to return to the administration. Response rates have been high. So far, President Clinton has received nearly 58,000 postcards urging him to veto legislation that contains anti-environmental riders. In addition, the patch-through phone calls have had a 40 percent response rate, translating into thousands of calls from our members to their elected officials.

## **PARTNERSHIP PROJECT (continued):**

### **Advantages of List Enhancement to Audubon**

List enhancement is the process of taking a membership list, matching it against information-rich sources such as state voter files and motor vehicle registration files, and “enhancing” the list with new data. These data could include: address and phone number updates; e-mail addresses; federal and state legislative districts; political party affiliation; demographic information such as age and gender; and, in the case of a joint list enhancement project with other organizations, how many members are common to multiple organizations.

### **Why Participate in a List Enhancement Project?**

1. **Increased ability to communicate with supporters** Address and phone number updates, and in particular the addition of e-mail addresses to our membership files, will ensure that we have available a range of ways to communicate with our members and supporters.
2. **Better targeting for advocacy and fundraising** Members who vote consistently in primary and general elections tend to be more motivated and educated on issues, and hence are often the best targets when soliciting donors or recruiting volunteers.
3. **Greater understanding of your membership** Through list enhancement, an organization can gain important information about its membership, such as average age, geographic distribution, gender ratio, and in a joint list enhancement project, how many of its members belong to other organizations.

### **How is an Enhanced List Used?**

#### **Advocacy:**

- Identify constituents of key legislators for grassroots lobbying purposes
- Target action alerts based on geography and voting frequency
- Recruit grassroots leaders based on their congressional district and voting frequency
- Turn out members in a particular county to a town meeting or legislative hearing
- Inform lawmakers of exactly how many of the organization’s members are voting constituents

#### **Fundraising:**

- Focus fundraising efforts on high-frequency voters
- Develop prospecting lists based on group demographics

#### **Membership:**

Conduct membership appeals based on gender or age

To: Public Policy Committee

From: Dan Beard and Valerie Cook

Date: September 2, 1999

Re: Green Group List Project

This spring, the Turner Foundation approached the Green Group to propose that national conservation organizations join forces in a list project to strengthen our collective ability to advocate for environmental protection. The Turner Foundation approved a \$5 million grant in July to launch this initiative.

#### **Project Specifics**

A new nonprofit organization called the Partnership Project has been formed to implement the grant. A two-person staff will coordinate the list project and future fundraising efforts, but the Partnership Project will differ from a traditional organization in that it will not have a membership, nor will it attempt to market itself as a separate entity. Instead, the Partnership Project will work to accomplish the following:

1. Create momentum around overarching issues of national importance (“campaigns”); and
2. Enhance the membership lists of conservation organizations with information such as legislative districts, phone numbers, e-mail addresses, voting history, and demographic profiles. (These enhancements would be prohibitively expensive were each organization to add them independently.)

## **PARTNERSHIP PROJECT (continued):**

### **Organizational Structure**

A board of up to 20 directors will govern the Partnership Project, and a subset of these directors will form an executive committee. Nomination to the board of directors and executive committee will be based primarily on the size of the membership list an organization lends to the project. Representatives from the six organizations contributing the largest lists will form the initial executive committee, which will then appoint up to four other organizations to the committee.

Participating organizations agree to use their enhanced lists in at least two collaborative campaigns per year, although an organization can elect not to participate in any campaign. Should an organization bow out of two or more campaigns in a year, it must reimburse the Partnership Project for the cost of the enhancements to its list during the previous 24 months, although the executive committee may vote to waive this penalty. An organization also can leave the Partnership Project by submitting written notice 30 days in advance.

The following protocols have been established to protect the membership lists:

1. Triplex Systems Corporation, which warehouses lists for several participating organizations, will be the only entity with access to all of the organizations' lists. For example, only National Audubon and Triplex will have access to Audubon's list, and the only information we will learn from other organizations' lists will be the number of members that we have in common.
2. No fundraising or membership development will be done by the Partnership Project from the lists. The lists will be used exclusively for advocacy purposes.

### **Campaign Development**

The board of directors will determine the topics and strategies for the campaigns. Selection of the campaigns will be by three-quarters of the executive committee and a simple majority of the board of directors. At least three collaborative campaigns will be launched each calendar year, and ad-hoc working groups will develop the campaign strategies.

The campaigns may take a number of different forms. Communications could be largely electronic, or regular mailings or phone banks could predominate. Furthermore, one communication could be sent out on stationary listing all of the participating groups, while another communication may be sent out on individual groups' letterhead to their subsets of members. The effectiveness of different techniques will inform future campaign strategies.

Campaign topics under consideration include land conservation, anti-environmental legislative riders, global warming, and voter participation. Two campaigns will be launched this fall.

### **What Does This Mean for Audubon?**

1. Audubon would receive enhancements to our membership and donor lists, including address and phone number updates, e-mail addresses, voting frequency, and demographic information. This information could be used for our own advocacy, fundraising, and membership development efforts.
2. We already are involved in many of the issues likely to become Partnership Project campaigns. Collaborating with the Partnership Project on these issues will allow us to activate our membership more frequently. In addition, the Partnership Project's efforts may have more impact than our individual efforts could.

### **Next Steps**

We have tentatively decided to participate in this effort. However, because this project could be controversial with some members, we are seeking support from the board in the form of a resolution. A draft resolution is attached for your review.

To date, we have contributed a portion of our membership and donor lists to the initial list merge/purge for the project, from which a combined list will emerge. The size of Audubon's list—approximately 441,000 members and donors—has earned Audubon a seat on both the board of directors and the executive committee. Audubon and Triplex signed a confidentiality agreement for the initial list merge/purge. An additional confidentiality agreement would be signed for any future list usage that Audubon participates in.

### **Partnership Project**

The Partnership Project is a coalition effort of 11 national conservation organizations. The Project was founded with a grant from the Turner Foundation to facilitate the compilation of national conservation organization's membership lists, enhance those lists with publicly available demographic information, and use them in 3-5 collaborative campaigns per year. Other participating organizations include: National Wildlife Federation; National Parks and Conservation Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Environmental Defense Fund; Defenders of Wildlife; The Wilderness Society; American Rivers;

**PARTNERSHIP PROJECT (continued):**

Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund; Union of Concerned Scientists; and the Isaac Walton League. World Wildlife Fund is also expected to join this effort.

The Partnership Project has launched three campaigns, including ones on the Clinton Administration's Lands Legacy initiative, the anti-environmental riders attached to appropriations bills, and global warming. Although each campaign is developed according to the particular issue and congressional targets, the communication methods generally involve print and radio advertisements in Washington, D.C. and congressional targets' home districts, phone banking and constituent "patch-throughs" to congressional offices, and direct mail with postcards to return to the administration. Response rates have been high. So far, President Clinton has received nearly 58,000 postcards urging him to veto legislation that contains anti-environmental riders. In addition, the patch-through phone calls have had a 40 percent response rate, translating into thousands of calls from our members to their elected officials.

**Northern Forest Alliance Funders: from Foundation Center database.**

- 1990 **Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust** gave \$60,000 "To develop site-specific strategy for long-term protection of New England's northern forests."
- 1991 **American Conservation Association, Inc.** gave \$35,000 "For protection of northern forest lands of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York."  
**Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust** gave \$50,000 "For second-year support of Northern Forest Lands Project, effort to develop site-specific strategy for long-term protection of New England's northern forests."
- 1992 **Surdna Foundation, Inc.** gave \$100,000 "For continued support of Northern Forest Alliance, collaboration of leading New England and national conservation organizations to preserve northern forest lands."  
**American Conservation Association, Inc.** gave \$15,000 "For protection of northern forest lands of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York."  
**Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust** gave \$40,000 "For final grant for Northern Forest Lands Project, effort to develop site specific strategy for long-term protection of New England's northern forests."  
**The John Merck Fund** gave \$65,000 "For Grassroots Action Project which assists environmental organizations in northern New England in developing more effective alliances with local communities and with interest groups outside traditional environmental movement."
- 1993 **Geraldine Rockefeller Dodge Foundation, Inc.** gave \$25,000 "To help coordinate and provide direction for newly founded Northern Forest Alliance, coalition of conservation organizations seeking to create sustainable management plan for Northern Forest."  
**Richard King Mellon Foundation** gave \$50,000 "To create system of protecting wildlands, promoting sustainable forests and supporting local economies while insuring ecological sustainability."  
**The John Merck Fund** gave \$135,000 "For continued support of Grassroots Action Project, which helps environmental organizations in northern New England develop more effective alliances with local constituencies."
- 1994 **The Pew Charitable Trusts** gave \$350,000 "For matching grant for Campaign for the Northern Forests to establish forest reserves in northern New England and New York."  
**Compton Foundation, Inc.** gave \$25,000 for unspecified support.  
**Moriah Fund** gave \$70,000 "For data gathering and analyses of biodiversity and land use in U.S. Northern Forests and for Northern Forest Alliance to protect natural resources and strengthen community economies."  
**The John Merck Fund** gave \$50,000 "For continued support of Grassroots Action Project, which helps environmental organizations in northern New England develop more effective alliances with other organizations."
- 1994 **Surdna Foundation, Inc.** gave \$100,000 "For coordination of campaign by Northern Forest Alliance to preserve Northern Forest Lands."  
**Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust** gave \$100,000 "For central office operations and for outreach program. Grant made through Appalachian Mountain Club."

## Northern Forest Alliance Funders: from Foundation Center database.

- 1995 **The John Merck Fund** gave \$25,000 “To evaluate involvement with communities in Upper Androscoggin River area of Maine and New Hampshire to develop strategies for stabilizing local economy and protecting high-quality forest and water resources.”
- The John Merck Fund** gave \$50,000 “Toward launching Androscoggin Valley Project, which is aimed at increasing community involvement in local conservation projects and at assisting communities in developing strategies for sustainable economic diversification and job creation.”
- Richard King Mellon Foundation** gave \$50,000 “Toward Northern Forest Land Project to protect ecological resources.”
- Geraldine Rockefeller Dodge Foundation, Inc.** gave \$25,000 “To continue grassroots and education efforts to protect natural and human communities of Northern Forest.”
- Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust** gave \$150,000 “For continued support of central office operations and state caucus outreach and organizing activities. Grant made through Appalachian Mountain Club.”
- 1996 **Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust** gave \$125,000 “For final grant for outreach, organizing and communications activities of Alliance state caucuses in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont and for central office. Grant made through Appalachian Mountain Club.”
- Moriah Fund** gave \$65,000 “To promote protection and sustainable use of Northern Forests and for Northern Forest Alliance.”
- The Pew Charitable Trusts** gave \$400,000 “For campaign to establish public forest reserves in northern New England and New York.”
- The John Merck Fund** gave \$50,000 “For Androscoggin Valley Project, which seeks to increase community involvement in local conservation projects and to assist communities in rural area along Maine-New Hampshire border in developing strategies for sustainable economic diversification and job creation.”
- Weeden Foundation** gave \$10,000 “For continued support for protection of Northern Forest of New England.”
- 1997 **Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, Inc.** gave \$15,000 “For general support for Northern Forest Alliance, coalition of conservation organizations creating sustainable management plan for 26-million-acre Northern Forest.”
- Weeden Foundation** gave \$10,000 “For continued support for overall coordination and implementation of Campaign for the Northern Forest.”

# PEW GRANT APPLICATION - THE STRATEGIC ATTACK PLAN

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ACTUAL GRANT APPLICATION FROM THE NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY TO THE PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS REQUESTING HALF A MILLION DOLLARS TO FORM A POWERFUL COALITION WITH THE PURPOSE OF ERADICATING THE GOODS PRODUCING ECONOMY ON FEDERAL LANDS IN ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO

Please attach a copy of this completed form to the front of you proposal (Fill out parts 5 and 6 only if they apply to your request.) The Trusts require only one copy of your proposal.

*Note: because of the volume of materials submitted to the Trusts, we cannot return anything submitted as part of a proposal.*

1. TAX NAME OF ORGANIZATION

NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY

2. ORGANIZATION ADDRESS:

700 BROADWAY  
NEW YORK, NY 10003-9510

3. ORGANIZATION TELEPHONE (202)979-3000

4. NAME AND TITLE OF HEAD OF ORGANIZATION (*Include degrees*)

MR. PETER A. A. BERLE  
PRESIDENT

5. NAME OF PROGRAM/SUBUNIT TO BE FUNDED:

THE DESERT FORESTS CAMPAIGN

6. NAME AND TITLE OF HEAD OF PROGRAM/SUBUNIT (*Include degrees*)

MR. DAVID HENDERSON  
NEW MEXICO STATE DIRECTOR - NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY

7. GRANT REQUEST:

(*amount*) \$225,000/yr. (*duration*) TWO YEARS

(*purpose*) To build a campaign that will lead to the permanent protection of the Southwest forest ecosystem through a series of legislative and administrative forest reserves and citizen sponsored forest management plans.

Proposal received and complete.

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_ Program/staff initials.

For office use only

\_\_\_\_\_ Log Number

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

## **The Desert Forests Campaign**

*Protecting the Bio-Economic Diversity of Southwest Forest Ecosystems*

A proposal before the Pew Charitable Trusts

October, 1994

The Desert Forests Campaign seeks a two year \$225,000 per year funding commitment from Pew Charitable Trusts to secure permanent protection for the native biological, economic and cultural diversity supported by the Southwest's forest ecosystems. This will be accomplished through a series of legislative and administrative reserve proposals and management plans. The campaign will also influence agency-driven forest planning initiatives. Strategic administrative appeals and litigation will be used to maintain political pressure and preserve endangered forests and species. The Campaign is being jointly organized by every major forest advocacy group in Arizona and New Mexico. It represents the first attempt to systematically, pro-actively and permanently protect forests of the Southwest.

### 1. BACKGROUND THREATS AND OPPORTUNITIES

*Significance of Southwestern forests*

#### Biological Diversity

The Southwest is typically associated with redrock canyons and desert vistas, yet naturalists in this century and the last have been astounded by the diversity and size of our forests. Bailey's classic studies of forest mammals took place in New Mexico which has more ponderosa pine forest than any other state. Leopold's groundbreaking wildlife

# PEW GRANT APPLICATION - THE STRATEGIC ATTACK PLAN

management essays were based on the Mogollon Plateau - the world's largest contiguous ponderosa pine forest. Merriam developed the theory of life-zones here because Southwestern forests rise from desert to alpine tundra, encompassing more elevational/vegetative communities than any other area in North America.

Southwest forests are lush "sky islands" rising up from a vast desert landscape to offer precious shade, water and food to thousands of resident and migratory species. Because of their unique biogeography, Southwest forests are extremely diverse and sensitive to disturbance. Each of the 20 island forests of our ecological provinces has been isolated for over twelve thousands years, and has evolved to support and depend upon its own endemic flora and fauna. The Southwest, in fact, supports the greatest number of endemic forest species in North America. Endemism among plants, mammals, reptiles, amphibians and fish is particularly high. Mammal evolution is astounding. The Southwest has evolved its own grizzly bear, wolf, jaguar, coati, elk and river otter, as well as many species of bats, squirrels, chipmunks, voles, shrews and mice. Southwestern forests are also a crucial haven for endangered migratory songbirds. The Tonto National Forest contains the highest density of breeding songbirds in North America while Arizona supports the greatest avian diversity north of Mexico.

Linking the Sierra Madre Occidental, the Rocky Mountains and the Great Basin Ranges, the forests of the Southwest are not only a national concern, they are an international treasure. They are one of North America's keystone biodiversity hotspots.

## Economic/Cultural Diversity

Native tribes of the Southwest have an ancient tradition of carefully using forest resources. Though some ruins are over 40,000 years old and sites like Sky City on the Acoma Reservation have been continuously occupied for over 7,000 years, the forests of the Southwest remained in excellent ecological health up to the late 19th century. Traditionals still depend upon the dwindling high elevation forests for spiritual practices and to gather herbs and natural dyes.

Spanish culture has been a part of the Southwest for over 400 years. Small, historic, Spanish speaking communities like Vallecitos, Chimayo and Canon Plaza still dominate the mountains of northern New Mexico. Fire wood, latilla cutting, and small lumber mills have long been central part of these communities, they have come to depend upon the forests for their economic and cultural independence. Encroachment of industrial logging, especially in places, like the Vallecitos Sustained Yield Unit on the Carson National Forest threatens to destroy the economic base and independence of these communities.

## *Ecosystem Threats*

Massive overgrazing of the Southwest began in the 18th century when Padre Kino brought Spanish cattle and sheep to southern Arizona via Mexico. These non-desert adapted species quickly took to the highlands where they proliferated and decimated native watersheds which had not evolved under intense grazing pressure. By the late 1880's, cattle numbers were ten times what they are today. Many rivers had already dried up by 1884 when a drought left over 500,000 dead cattle scattered across the badly eroded landscape.

Industrial logging entered the Southwest in the 1860's with the building of the transcontinental railroad. With the exception of the Kaibab Plateau which was too remote and the Greater Gila Ecosystem which was still largely controlled by the Apaches, the Southwest's forests were highgraded for railroad ties and mining timber. Logging was focused on high grade trees between 250 and 500 years old. Such trees are nonexistent today.

The Forest Reserve System was created in the late 1880's to limit grazing abuse and systematize timber harvest. Selective highgrading continued up to the 1960's when new mill operators demanded more timber. Use of the shelterwood system from the 1960's up to the early 1990's massively increased timber production and road construction. Over half of the timber ever cut in the Southwest was cut in the last 30 years.

Historic photographs show enormous old growth ponderosa pine forests, trout streams tumbling through dense Douglas white fir forests, and snowy expanses of massive spruce. Over a hundred years of industrial forestry and overgrazing, however, have liquidated eighty-five percent of the total old growth and ninety-five percent of the ponderosa pine old growth. What remains is highly fragmented. Because so many of Southwest's forest species are

# PEW GRANT APPLICATION - THE STRATEGIC ATTACK PLAN

endemics with no place to retreat, they have suffered a wave of extinction unparalleled by any other North American forest system.

- The Southwest grizzly bear, Merriam's elk, and the Southwest river otter are extinct.
- The Mexican gray wolf, jaguar, thick-billed parrot, condor and Tarahumara leopard frog are extirpated.
- The Mount Graham red squirrel, Obscura Mountains least chipmunk, Chuska Mountains tassel-eared squirrel, Arizona water shrew, New Mexico meadow jumping mouse, spotted bat, occult bat, Mexican spotted owl, Apache goshawk, Northern goshawk, Southwestern willow flycatcher, Gould's turkey, Jemez Mountain salamander, Chiricahua leopard frog, and New Mexico ridge-nosed rattlesnake are just a few of the imperiled native species.
- All of the Southwest's native trout, chubs and minnows are already listed as threatened or endangered.
- Eighty percent of all birds and one hundred percent of neotropical songbirds dependent upon Southwest ponderosa pine forests have suffered serious declines in the last 30 years.

Due to a massive appeal effort and Mexican spotted owl conservation measures, logging has decreased dramatically on the Southwest's eleven National Forests in the last five years. The Forest Service is now proposing a number of large scale "ecosystem management" plans in order to get the timber program back on track. Under the guise of "restoring forest health" and goshawk "habitat improvement," the Forest Service is setting its sights on the very last of the Southwest's mature forest. "Ecosystem management" in the Southwest has come to mean abolishing Forest standards and guidelines, and increasing salvage logging, and intensive livestock development and/or logging in roadless areas, wilderness areas, goshawk territories and even spotted owl territories. Logging on Native American lands (especially Navajo, Mescalero Apache and White River Apache lands) is even more intense.

Timber appeals have been successful in the past because the Forest Service has been quite random and unsophisticated in its approach. A series of new quasi-scientific initiatives, however, will make sale-by-sale battles much more difficult. It will also systematically increase logging levels.

- 1) All eleven National Forest Plans are being amended in 1995 to incorporate spotted owl and Northern goshawk management guidelines. The amendments will prescribe increased cutting levels in ponderosa pine across the region to "improve" goshawk foraging habitat.
- 2) A region wide Forest Health Initiative is being developed which will mandate aggressive salvage logging of windthrow, mistletoe and beetle infested forests. As happened in the Northwest salvage timber sales have increased dramatically since the listing of the spotted owl as a threatened species.
- 3) "Ecosystem projects" are being developed on every National Forest to restore the ponderosa pine community to a mythical "park-like savanna" which the Forest Service claims existed prior to the European invasion. This mistaken vision, more than any other, will massively increase logging throughout the Southwest, converting the vast majority of our forests to monoculture rangelands.
- 4) In response to pressure to remove cattle from riparian areas, the National Forests are proposing massive upland water developments which will increase upper watershed degradation.
- 5) The Bureau of Indian Affairs has massively expanded its timber program during the last decade, so much so that its 10 year timber supply is exhausted. It is now proposing to increase cutting levels in the Chuska Mountains beyond the ten year limitation.
- 6) The desecration of Mt. Graham by the University of Arizona's international observatory complex is but one assault on Native American cultural values. A proposed coal mine in the Cibola National Forest threatens to drain a lake sacred to the Zuni People, while recreational developments continually encroach on Native American sacred sites throughout the region.
- 7) The encroachment of internationally owned Duke City Lumber on the Vallecitos Sustained Yield Unit in northern New Mexico is threatening Hispanic communities which have depended upon the forest for four hundred years. Because Vallecitos was supposed to be reserved for community operators, local loggers have joined forces with environmentalists to stop the cutting. Timber sales are still being planned and cut, however.

## *Opportunities*

It is readily apparent that this new level of threats is a response to successful, if less than systematic, environmental activism. The Forest Service has adopted our language, coopted our concepts, and become more sophisticated in its management and justification. It is now time for the environmental movement to evolve as well. The next five years offers an excellent opportunity for the environmental community to come together in a systematic pro-active campaign to attain permanent forest protection through the legislation of a network of forest reserves and conservation biology based management plans.

# PEW GRANT APPLICATION - THE STRATEGIC ATTACK PLAN

Structurally, the Southwest is in an excellent position to attain this goal.

- An informal network of all the major forest activists already exists. We are remarkably unified in our vision and are well poised to organize a major campaign. In the last few years we have worked together on numerous lawsuits, petitions, and appeals. Most recently, we worked together to produce a comprehensive critique of the Kaibab National Forest's proposed Forest Plan amendment.
- Because clearcutting has not been the predominant method of logging. Southwest forests have not been converted to tree farms. Significant, unprotected roadless areas and mature forest still exists.
- Because Southwest forests are so diverse and support so many endemic species, they are uniquely suited to a biodiversity based forest campaign.
- The Southwest is unique in that virtually all its water originates on National Forest land. Clean, abundant water is far and away the most valuable resource in this arid region and is in direct conflict with excessive logging.
- Ninety percent of Southwest forests are managed by the U S Park or Forest Service. The rest is managed by three Native American Nations. With so few agencies involved, all with federal environmental mandates, strategizing and coordination will be made easier.
- The timber industry is a minor economic force in the Southwest. Its continued and inevitable decline will not cause the kind of upheavals evident in the Northwest.
- Tourism is the Southwest's largest industry. Arizona is the most popular destination birding area in the country. Permanently protecting our forests will increase and diversify the region's economy.
- The Southwest is one of the most urbanized regions in the Country. Seventy-five percent of its population lives in Albuquerque, Tucson or Phoenix. The other twenty-five percent is largely concentrated in a handful of smaller cities. This population is recreationally oriented and can be reached very efficiently.
- Native American and traditional Hispanic cultures continue to thrive and are recognized as integral parts Southwestern culture. These communities and the values they represent are dependent upon healthy forest ecosystems.

Temporarily, a systematic forest campaign must come together and make significant achievements in the next five years. A short window of opportunity is currently present. Researchers in the last decade have produced a host of scientific studies documenting the decline of biodiversity and ecological integrity in Southwestern forests. The current democratic Presidency and Congress offers a unique and possibly limited opportunity for legislative reform. The appointment of biologist, Jack Ward Thomas, as Forest Service Chief increases the chances of positive, proactive administrative relief.

The last Southwest Regional Forester retired after the environmental community unanimously called for his resignation. He was recently replaced by Charles Cartwright, assistant head of Ecosystem Management for the Forest Service. Cartwright's background and interests may make him more open to true ecosystem management. Having a supportive Regional Forester is a significant opportunity.

As required by the National Forest Management Act, all eleven National Forests will revise their Forest Plans in the next five years which will guide Forest management for the next decade. Forest planning offers an excellent opportunity for environmentalists to formulate independent, science based Forest Plan proposals and promote comprehensive regional planning. Regional Forest Plan amendments to include Mexican spotted owl and Northern goshawk management plans will offer the first opportunity for citizen review and challenge of the Southwest's guiding conservation plans. A successful challenge to the plans would entirely change forestry in the Southwest.

Finally, other regions such as the Southern Appalachians and Northern Rockies are currently organizing or proposing similar campaigns. These efforts will lend credibility to one another, creating a favorable climate for systematic regional and national forest protection.

# PEW GRANT APPLICATION - THE STRATEGIC ATTACK PLAN

## II. THE DESERT FORESTS CAMPAIGN

### *Campaign Strategy*

#### Forest Proposals

Ecologically based forest management proposals will be developed for each ecosystem including every National Forest and Native American Nation which choose to participate. The proposals will form the core of the legislative and Forest Plan proposals. They will also be used for multi-species conservation plans, public education and administrative resistance.

Forest proposals will include detailed maps, management prescriptions, and strategies to protect economic and cultural resources. Proposals will be tailored to the unique biological and cultural character of each ecosystem (see Table 1). Diversity and local planning will be the keystone of the legislative and Forest Plan proposals. Maps will include ecological communities, habitat conditions, reserves, buffers, corridors, sustainable use zones, and critical watersheds and wildlife areas. Management prescriptions will be based on ecological communities, indicator species and endangered species. They will include detailed species viability assessments. Economic protection strategies will include restoration initiatives such as stream enhancement, riparian recovery, and road closure, as well as sustainable use area to be managed for small scale mills and ranches. They will include detailed economic profile and impact analyses. Cultural protection strategies will preserve historic and sacred Native American sites and ensure traditional uses.

Table 1. FOREST PROPOSAL ISSUES FOR SELECTED SOUTHWEST ECOSYSTEMS

ECOSYSTEM/ MANAGEMENT EMPHASIS	BIOLOGICAL ISSUES
<i>Kaibab Plateau</i>  Biological/cultural reserve	Extensive residual old growth, highly fragmented continental Southwest's source for Northern goshawk population. Mississippi spotted owl already extirpated
<i>Mogollon Plateau</i>  Restoration, water quality, recreation	Little old growth or roadless produces most of Arizona's only corridor between southern New Mexico and northern Arizona/Utah
<i>Sky Island Ecosystem</i>  Biodiversity Conservation area	Extreme diversity and endemism many endangered species reintroduction, surrounding conservation areas
<i>Greater Gila Ecosystem</i>  Old growth, wilderness, wildlife	Extensive roadless, wild old growth, densest Mexican spotted owl population, jaguar and condor reintroduction endemic trout
<i>Southern Rockies</i>  Sustainable use	Wilderness, roadless, recreation old growth, native trout, condor Southern Rockies

# PEW GRANT APPLICATION - THE STRATEGIC ATTACK PLAN

Forest proposal development will be coordinated by Forest Conservation Council in conjunction with local grassroots activists, biodiversity activists and the scientific community. As the Sky Island and Northern New Mexico proposals are largely developed, they will be completed first and serve as prototypes for the rest of the region.

Congressman Bill Richardson of New Mexico has expressed great interest in the legislative proposal and will likely introduce our legislative package. He previously introduced and lobbied for the successful Jemez Mountains National Recreation Area which eliminated pumice mining in Northern New Mexico.

## Biodiversity Advocacy

National Forest Management Act and Endangered Species Act petitions, appeal and litigation have provided the environmental movement its strongest tools. They have been used less than strategically, however, when focused on single species. Activists in the Southwest have petitioned for 32 endangered species and have thus far been very successful in strategically using these laws to obtain permanent ecosystem protection, create administrative legal tools, and create acute pressure points in need of immediate conservation resolution. They have used the laws proactively to administratively petition for million acres of critical habitat, including 16 entire watersheds, for the endangered Gila Trout.

Because of its extreme diversity and endemism, the Southwest is particularly well suited to biodiversity activism. More forest species are listed as endangered in the Southwest than any other region. More than a dozen species need to be added to the list including Gooding's onion, Hess's fleabane, Blumer's dock, Arizona water shrew, Chuska Mountains tassel eared squirrel, Obscura Mountains least chipmunk, spotted bat, occult bat, Apache goshawk, Northern goshawk, western yellow-billed cuckoo, Rio Grande cutthroat trout, and Chiricahua leopard frog.

Listed species will be used in strategic multi-species litigation and administrative appeals to protect critical forest stands and watersheds. Unlisted species will be subjects of Endangered Species Act petitions. Multi-species, ecosystem based recovery plans and critical habitat petitions will be developed and incorporated as integral parts of the forest plan proposals.

Formatted species summaries will be used by activists around the region for use in administrative appeals. White papers documenting the biodiversity crisis in the Southwest will be developed for widespread use in public education, media, litigation, and appeals. White paper topics will include Impact of Cattle Grazing and Logging on Native Southwest Trout, The Neotropical Songbird Crisis in Southwestern Forests, Decline of Native Southwest Amphibians, Status of Old Growth Forests in the Southwest, Impacts of Cattle Grazing on Southwestern Forests, and Mistletoe, Bark Beetles, Fire Suppression and the "Forest Health" Crisis.

A Scientific Panel will be convened and jointly funded by the Campaign and the Forest Service to assess current forest conditions and biodiversity needs. Such panels have been highly successful in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. They are currently being pursued in the Sierra Nevada and the Southern Appalachians. In addition, the Campaign will work closely with biologists and ecologists from state and tribal agencies to develop working relationships that can add credibility to our Biodiversity Advocacy component in the media and influencing public opinion.

A Biodiversity Initiative petition will be filed with the Forest Service Chief in Washington, D.C. in order to draw attention to the biodiversity management crisis in the Southwest. It will seek administrative review and be used as a media and public education tool.

Finally, the Biodiversity component will include extensive work with grassroots coordinators and grassroots activists to implement an aggressive administrative resistance program. In the Southwest, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs are currently proposing logging, roadbuilding, mining, water developments and recreational facilities in biologically critical roadless, old growth and wilderness areas. The Forest Service is also dramatically increasing salvage and "forest health" timber sales throughout the region. These projects continue to degrade Southwest forest ecosystems and jeopardize the integrity of the forest reserve proposals. Within the Biodiversity component, the Campaign will monitor, comment on and appeal projects throughout the region which threaten Forest ecosystem integrity.

# PEW GRANT APPLICATION - THE STRATEGIC ATTACK PLAN

Appeals will be filed in coordination with and on behalf of local grassroots groups. In the event that local groups choose to file their own appeals, the Campaign will provide biological, silvicultural and legal support.

The Campaign will also work to assure appropriate budget allocations for the Southwest Region of the Forest Service. Misdirected appropriations ensure misplaced emphasis on resource extraction, while making restoration virtually impossible.

The Biodiversity component of the Campaign will be coordinated by the Greater Gila Biodiversity Project, the Southwest Center for Biological Diversity and Earthlaw.

## *Urban Mobilization and Media/Public Education*

Because the Southwest populace is largely concentrated in less than a dozen urban centers, with 75% in Phoenix, Tucson and Albuquerque, it can be efficiently reached by a directed urban mobilization campaign. Mobilizing public support will be crucial to effectively reach the legislature and create widespread interest in forest reform.

In year one we will conduct strategic planning sessions with professional consultants to develop a compelling message best suited to the unique geographical and cultural conditions of the Southwest. We anticipate the first years design work to include:

1. - An analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT), to determine (a) what successful/unsuccessful media messages Southwest forest activists have utilized; (b) how well we are packaging the meaning of our activism; (c) what our strengths and weaknesses as a movement are, (d) what resources are available within our coalition; (e) what resources need to be brought in from outside.
2. Polling and/or focus groups to gauge current public sentiment and knowledge, determine how well our message has gotten across, how well the industry and. The anti-environmental movement's message has gotten across, and assess how much desert-dwelling urbanites know about Southwest forests and their plight; development of a compelling vision and a messages targeted at specific audiences at specific times.
3. Design of an outreach program capable of transmitting and selling the vision and messages.
4. A public relations professional in Phoenix has agreed to work pro-bono to develop an initial vision, message and communications plan.

We expect to begin the outreach education campaign in earnest by year two. An urban canvass will begin operating in year two as part of the outreach program. New Mexico PIRG has expressed interest in contracting canvass work in New Mexico.

## *Grassroots Support Network*

Developing an effective grassroots network is critical. Grassroots activists will be instrumental in developing and lobbying for local forest proposals. They will also file administrative appeals and provide on the ground knowledge to all facets of the campaign.

Grassroots activists will be teched-up and tied into an electronic network which includes computers, faxes, modems, a Desert Forest Conference on Econet, and a regular newsletter. Good communication among activists is necessary to develop consistent positions, quick, effective response, and timely, accurate information flow.

Media, mapping, forestry and appeals workshops will be regularly organized in each of the three eco-regions to create activist groups where they are needed to support existing activists. A forestry specialist will also be available to aid in on ground analysis.

Two grassroots activists will be hired to organize Northern New Mexico, Northern Arizona, and the Southern forests. The Sierra Club Plateau Group, which has experience organizing forest watch groups on the Mogollon Plateau will help develop the grassroots campaign.

# PEW GRANT APPLICATION - THE STRATEGIC ATTACK PLAN

## III. CAMPAIGN STRUCTURE

The Desert Forests Campaign is being organized by Arizona Audubon Council, Carson Forest Watch, Earthlaw, Forest Conservation Council, Forest Guardians, Forest Trust, Greater Gila Biodiversity Project, Maricopa Audubon, Sierra Club Plateau Group, Southwest Center for Biological Diversity, and Southwest Audubon. National Audubon Society will act as the Campaign's fiscal sponsor.

The Campaign be overseen by an 11 member board representing the Campaign organizers. The Board will be responsible for setting overall campaign goals and priorities, fiscal oversight, hiring staff, awarding grants, electing a Steering Committee and establishing a scientific review panel.

An Advisory Board representing groups or individuals knowledgeable about and committed to protecting Southwest forest biodiversity will be established. The Advisory Board will provide input and advise to the Board from a variety of academic and activist orientations.

A Steering Committee of 5 people will act on behalf of the Board. The Steering Committee will ensure Campaign goals, strategies, and programs are implemented. They will also be responsible for fund raising,

A full time Campaign Administrator will manage campaign finances, inter-organization communication, coordinate fundraising, and act as a liaison between various program Elements. The Campaign Administrator will serve as the primary contact person for the media, foundations, agencies, and politicians. The Administrator will be supported with one half time staffer.

Forest Conservation Council will coordinate forest proposals with the aid of local activists. Staff requirements include 2.5 FTE and two consultants. The Southwest Center for Biological Diversity / Greater Gila Biodiversity Project will coordinate listing petitions, status reviews, conservation plans, and white papers. Staff requirements include 2.5 FTE and two consultants. Three full-time coordinators will manage the grassroots support network and administrative resistance components. Additional support will be allocated at the discretion of the Board of Directors.

## IV. PROJECT BUDGET AND REQUEST TO PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS

The Desert Forest Campaign seeks \$225,000 per year for two years from the Pew Charitable Trusts to implement The Desert- Forest Campaign in Arizona and New Mexico. The Campaign is a three year, \$1,514,100 commitment by a network of grassroots and national environmental organizations. National Audubon Society will serve as the fiscal sponsor for the Campaign, with participating organizations receiving contracts from NAS to implement specific Campaign components. The following budget narrative provides an explanation of revenues and expenditures depicted on the budget form attached, and discussed year by year changes in the allocation of project funds as they are adjusted to meet the changing emphasis of the campaign as it evolves over a three year period.

### Revenue

In year one, total project revenue is expected to be \$496,545 with Pew Charitable Trusts contributing \$225,000, or 45% of the total. Other foundations will contribute \$226,145. Existing commitments to individual groups implementing portions of the Campaign include the Turner Foundation, for biodiversity advocacy, grassroots mapping, litigation and appeals (\$50,000), the Harder Foundation for appeals and public education work (\$10,000), the Sierra Club (\$2,000) for mapping, the McCune Foundation (\$15,000) for economic and cultural resource effects analysis of Conservation Plans, and the Ruth Brown Foundation (\$5,000) for biodiversity advocacy. Other foundations being solicited by participating organizations for Campaign related work include the W. Alton Jones Foundation, the Ruth Mott Fund, Recreation Equipment Incorporated, the Santa Fe Community Foundation, the Surdna Foundation, the C S Fund, Foundation for Deep Ecology, [Temson(?)] Foundation and Fund for Wild Nature, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Florence Schumann Foundation, the Nathan Cummings Foundation and the Tides Foundation.

Additional revenues are expected from business sponsors (\$10,000), including the Business for Social Responsibility network in New Mexico, from individual members of Participating organizations (\$15,000), and direct funding of campaign costs and labor from participating organizations (\$20,400); [END OF AVAILABLE DOCUMENT]

# TARGETS OF HURT: COMMENTS FROM AROUND THE NATION

## **Bob Voight, Maine**

The environmentalists used the spotted owl to control the forest in the Northwest. Since 1988 the environmentalists have tried ruse after ruse to control the 16 million acres of forest in Maine. They all failed. Now they are using the salmon, under the Endangered Species Act, to attain forest control. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service are their weapons of choice to fulfill the Endangered Species Act listing, and thus control the entire watershed, most of the forest of Maine. Over the next decade fishing, fish farming and the forest industry will be shut down, with no recourse, no citizen choice. The major opponent of the Maine forest economy is the Northern Forest Alliance, a coalition of 34 state and national environmentalist groups with a budget of \$100 million, much of which comes from the John Merck Fund, Pew Charitable Trusts and Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust. The juggernaut of extreme environmentalism rolls on, squashing citizens beneath its weight.

## **Ted Miller, Pulp and Paperworkers Resource Council, Gorham, New Hampshire**

For the past one hundred years, Berlin and Gorham, NH have depended on their pulp and paper mills. Indeed, it has been shown that 70% of all jobs in Coos County (northern New Hampshire) depend on those mills.

In 1992 the local pulp and paper industry was in a deep recession. As a non-salaried worker in those mills I can testify they were in need of major investment in equipment upgrades and routine maintenance.

The hydro dams owned by the mill provide over 60% of their own power. The licenses to operate those dams on the Androscoggin River came up for renewal by FERC.

Without warning, an environmental coalition calling itself the Conservation Coalition emerged, consisting of the Appalachian Mountain Club, the Conservation Law Foundation, Trout Unlimited, American Rivers Inc., and American Whitewater Affiliation. They filed for intervention on the dam relicensing. Backed by a \$250,000 yearly grant from Pew Charitable Trusts over the next three years, this coalition cost the Berlin-Gorham mills millions of dollars at a time they truly could not afford it.

The Coalition demanded that the mill owners provide a buffer within 4000 feet of the shoreline, increased water flows over the existing dams resulting in less power generation, serious restrictions on use of the entire watershed, and a supplemental EIS.

It took three years for FERC to relicense the hydro dams. The Conservation Coalition had cost James River Corp. millions of dollars. Over three hundred jobs were lost. The Berlin-Gorham mills were more dilapidated. Funds badly needed for equipment upgrades were diverted to legal wrangling.

Environmental groups backed by foundations continue to injure the people of northern New Hampshire.

## **Erich Veyhl, Massachusetts**

Destruction of dams and the beginning of using Atlantic Salmon as a surrogate endangered species for Federal control of the watershed: The environmentalists have been harassing several dam operations in order to destabilize private industry in Maine, forcing them to sell their assets. They cost Bowater millions in the fight to relicense the Great Northern Paper Co. dams. They succeeded recently in forcing the Edwards dam to be demolished over the objections of its owner and have been openly harassing an existing dam operation at Basin Mills. The Federal government, with environmentalist pressure, is now threatening an Atlantic Salmon ESA listing.

The American Rivers Conservation Council, Inc. Washington, DC: \$20,000 Support towards a collaborative project of American Rivers, Natural Resources Council of Maine, and the Atlantic Salmon Federation to remove the Edwards Dam on the Kennebec River in Maine.

Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund \$25,000: To support legal costs of challenging the proposed Basin Mills Dam project on the Penobscot River.

A straightforward attempt to influence judges throughout New England: Massachusetts Bar Foundation / Flaschner Judicial Institute Boston, MA: \$46,500 To support a collaborative project of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, Environmental Law Institute, and Flaschner to develop and present an environmental program for judges throughout New England.

## **Brian Bishop, Rhode Island**

Residents of upstate New York and northern New England are threatened with emotional and financial ruin. I have literally seen foundation driven ideas bleed these communities dry.

The Appalachian Mountain Club has become a virtual clearing house for attacks on northern forest citizens, with the group receiving numerous grants on its own and in combination with other organizations which are aimed at undermining the forest economy and limiting development opportunity. The AMC in concert with Maine Audubon, Audubon Society of NH, and the Conservation Law Foundation received a three year grant of \$315,000 from the Jesse B. Cox Charitable Trust "to prioritize high value natural lands in the north woods of New England, and to promote a greenline strategy for the northern forests."

# TARGETS OF HURT: COMMENTS FROM AROUND THE NATION

This is funding for a direct assault on the citizens of the northern forest and their way of life. To make matters worse, these grants have been leveraged with the free use of federal land in the White Mountain National Forest in a most inappropriate collusion between the US Forest Service and the Appalachian Mountain Club which conducts lobbying and direct action activities from a “hiking” facility on the White Mountain National Forest. Memos indicate that the Forest Service and the AMC conduct business as a virtual partnership in which the Forest Service provides facilities to the AMC which in turn lobbies the federal government which the Forest Service is unable to do. Thus, in directing the AMC, the Jesse B. Cox Charitable Trust gains the additional ability to give virtually the same direction to the Forest Service.

The residents of the northern forest states are open to dialogue within their communities with the intent of providing for a sustainable future in the north country, but they are set upon by outside influences, i.e. undue influences, seeking to do for the northeast what they have already done to the northwest. If this is acceptable to Congress, I am ashamed to be a citizen of this country.

## **Matt Bennett, Tennessee**

In early 1995, ten local, regional, and national environmental organizations banded together to form the Southern Appalachian Forest Coalition (SAFC). Located in Asheville, North Carolina, SAFC is an umbrella group created to execute a unified political and media strategy to influence the management of the region’s five million acres of public land. According to an article published in the Asheville Citizen-Times, the group’s agenda included stopping clearcutting, protecting road-less areas and old-growth forests, and protecting wildlife and stream corridors. The article also mentioned that SAFC was not a membership organization and that funding would come entirely from foundation grants. SAFC owed more than just its funding to foundations. Its very creation was the result of a meeting sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trusts that suggested environmental groups could be more effective if they formed coalitions to lead and coordinate their efforts.

Using a coalition member, the Southern Environmental Law Center, as its fiscal agent, SAFC’s annual budget now approaches \$1 million. Their Form 990 lists grants from, among others, The Lyndhurst Foundation, Pew Charitable Trusts, Turner Foundation, W. Alton Jones Foundation, and the Merck Family Fund. These impressive resources and the ability to hire a sizeable full-time staff give SAFC a disproportionate influence in the National Forest planning process. Other forest users are often precluded from participating in the planning meetings due to job related responsibilities. The results are obvious; largely due to their influence, timber production is no longer included as a multiple-use outcome in the preferred alternative of the Region 8 National Forest Management Plans.

Foundation support has changed the rules of the game in the forest planning process. Public participation is skewed when a cadre of full-time activists, who do little else, is pitted against citizens who must earn a living and raise a family during the time when meetings are typically held. Sadly, from the standpoint of democratic participation, this domination will be further exaggerated by the Forest Service’s proposed new planning rule with its emphasis on collaborative decision making. Too often those sitting at the table will be the ones that are paid to be there, the rest of the public having been excluded by the necessity of earning a living elsewhere.

## **Jan Michael Jacobson, Florida.**

I have been Director of the Everglades Institute for the last twenty years. Prior to that I was, among other things, chairman of a Sierra Club chapter and thus a member of the Florida Sierra Club’s Florida Executive Committee (FLEXCOM).

It is my considered opinion that Mr. Arnold is both factually correct and politically astute in his analysis of the relationships between environmental groups and government agencies.

Indeed, I left FLEXCOM over an abuse regrettably all too similar to those documented by Mr. Arnold. These abuses were easily predictable from a Constitutional perspective, being what the Founders knew would occur if power was not balanced and checked.

We in the environmental movement organizations, and the officers in particular, departed from historically tested, and proven, American control of power; we allowed vast sums to be controlled by a handful of people. We assumed that they were “good people”. At the beginning (say, early 1960’s) many were.

But money and power do predictable things to even the best of us, as Lord Acton observed so long ago.

It is my opinion, based on my experience and research, that unaccountable power is perhaps even more likely to corrupt than absolute power.

And the environmental movement is not accountable to anyone, in large part not even its members.

## **Julie Smithson, Ohio:**

Our area is under threat of being declared a National Wildlife Refuge by the actions of corrupt officials of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, acting in collusion with The Nature Conservancy, which is attempting to impose

# TARGETS OF HURT: COMMENTS FROM AROUND THE NATION

one of its restrictive "Bioreserve" projects on our farming community.

The Columbus Foundation and Affiliated Organizations, a consortium of urban foundations unconcerned about rural economies and the property rights of farmers, gave The Nature Conservancy a grant of \$25,000 in 1996 "For Darby Bioreserve Project, including hiring riverkeeper to promote citizen-based protection of Big and Little Darby Creeks."

Despite massive opposition to the Project by our local citizens, the USFWS continues to act under the influence of The Nature Conservancy and their funders in the Columbus Foundation consortium to cripple our farm community.

We request that Congress fully investigate this foundation-funded attempt to destroy the economy of our local farm community.

## **Laura Busby, Arkansas**

The McKnight Foundation is the source of so much money that harms residents along the entire Mississippi River that it is almost impossible for most people to understand.

During the 1998 McKnight gave many millions for its "Mississippi Program" in grants to Environmental Support Center in Washington, D.C., the National Wildlife Federation, Tides Center, and many others that affect our area.

A Mississippi River Main River Levee Project was halted by a lawsuit filed by the Sierra Club, Audubon Society and other foundation-funded environmental organizations that asked for and received a delay in a California court. The delay allowed time for water to seep under the levee to into a street inside the city limits of West Memphis, Arkansas. The seepage was declared a "slide," a life-threatening danger. The slide was tardily reported to the Corps of Engineers and repaired just in time.

There was never an apology from any organization that delayed our levee's completion. Human life was definitely at the bottom of their list of priorities.

## **John C. Martin, Colorado**

The Grand Mesa National Forest in west central Colorado has established Travel Management after a ten year effort. One plan was scrapped, public comment in addition to a "working group" that met for 18 months finally came up with a decision in 1995. The 1995 decision was appealed by over 300 Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) groups and individuals, and at a meeting with the Forest Service Supervisor, a settlement agreement was signed. With the good faith work of the public, organizational representation and the agency, the more expensive route of a court action was avoided.

Over \$100,000 in state OHV funds have been spent to date and another \$65,000 is dedicated to achieve balance between OHV needs and the forest. This year, the Forest Service will complete the terms of the settlement agreement. Years of mutual trust between the public and the agency, founded in that agreement, have made the difficult issues easier to deal with, fostered by mutual trust.

Because of the President's definition of a road, the roadless initiative will close existing roads on all the areas where user dollars and hundreds of hours of volunteer time have made the trail system better for the people and the forest. I guess "no good deed will go unpunished by the current administration." Ten years of public involvement, five years of partnership between the public and the agency will have no merit or value.

## **Judy Keeler, Bootheel Heritage Association, New Mexico**

Our area is under siege by various environmental groups and federal agencies. When The Nature Conservancy (TNC) failed to sell the Gray Ranch to the US Fish and Wildlife Service for a Wildlife Refuge in 1991, they sold it to another nonprofit organization called the Animas Foundation (a Missouri private operating foundation, 1997 Assets: \$37,907,924; Income \$4,666,644) in 1993, while retaining for themselves a conservation easement on the property. John Cook, Vice President of Natural Resources for TNC, is on the board of directors for the Animas Foundation. In 1994 Mr. Cook also helped organize a group called the Malpai Borderlands Group (1998 assets: \$860,295; Income \$355,940), of which he is currently co-director. TNC's general council, Michael Dennis, is also the Malpai Group's general council. The Group's application for tax exempt status, drafted by Dennis, states they intend to develop and implement a "comprehensive land management strategy" for nearly one million acres in Southwest New Mexico and Southeast Arizona. They intend to manage this area "in cooperation" with federal and state agencies.

Since incorporation of these two nonprofit entities, individuals living within the 1 million acres have been pressured by federal agencies to cooperate in this strategy. According to a MOU signed in April of 1993, the ecosystem of the area would be restored using fire. Pressure began to be applied to local residents when a "fire map" of

# TARGETS OF HURT: COMMENTS FROM AROUND THE NATION

the area was developed in 1995. Land owners had been asked to submit a copy of their individual allotments to the Animas Foundation. Many cooperated. The maps were then compiled into one large map that became known as the "Malpai Borderlands area". Next, the Forest Service began to pressure individuals to allow naturally occurring fires to burn their allotments. The Forest Service also began to develop a fire plan for the area that included "naturally occurring", and prescribed fires. They recommended individuals "grassbank" on the Gray Ranch to reduce the "costs" associated with these fires. This was not acceptable to many because it involved placing a conservation easement on their property to be held by the Malpai Group.

In addition to the prescribed fires, the residents were "strongly encouraged" to: 1) preserve "open space" by limiting subdivision on their private property; 2) adopt Chihuahua leopard frogs to be placed in their dirt tanks; 3) develop a Conservation Agreement with Assurances for prairie dogs, which the Animas Foundation relocated to the Gray Ranch over the objections of the county; and 4) offer protection for jaguars that never inhabited the area. Most recently, they have had their allotments mapped by US Fish and Wildlife for "occupied habitat", and the whole Hidalgo County designated "occupied range" for jaguar. Simultaneously, the New Mexico Wilderness Coalition, headed by Dave Foreman, former Earth First leader, is pushing for the area to be designated a wilderness.

Preserving "open space", as perpetuated by the Malpai Borderlands Group and TNC, has the potential to create the greatest economic harm to the county and its residents. Already one of the poorest counties in the state of New Mexico, the closing of Phelps Dodge's Hidalgo Smelter, has left little tax base on which to operate. Further restricting development will be the death knell. It is evident the Malpai Group is being positioned to become recipients of any mitigation fees extorted from local businesses and residents that do decide to develop their private property. Presently this county has one of the highest occurrences of endangered and special status species in the state, as identified by TNC. These species can easily be used to leverage their "buyout" of the area.

Funding for the Animas Foundation and the Malpai Borderlands Group has come from grants given by federal agencies, chiefly the Forest Service which funds a position to administer the Malpai Borderlands agenda, and the National Resources Conservation Service, which also funds a position for the Malpai Group. Large foundation donations have been made by: Liz Claiborne - Art Ortenberg Foundation, Clark Family Foundation, Doris Duke Foundation, General Motors, Hewlett Foundation, JR Short Milling Co, Mildred Andrews Fund, McCune Foundation, Moriah Fund, Nadalynn Conway Trust, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Norcross Wildlife Foundation, Orvis Company, Orvis-Perkins Foundation, Perkins Charitable Foundation, Point Foundation, Thaw Charitable Trust, Tides Foundation, Wallace Research Foundation, and Wolf Creek Foundation.

We respectfully request Congress fully investigate these foundation grants and federal agency involvement in this clear attempt to destroy our county's economy.

## **Rachel Thomas, Arizona**

From December 8, 1995 The Nature Conservancy (TNC) notified the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) of their interest in accepting and managing a fund established for the purpose of mitigating endangered species impacts at Roosevelt Lake, Arizona. On March 18, 1996 a federal grant was given to TNC for \$25,000. May 24, 1996: the amount was increased by \$25,000 to file an option to purchase Saddle Mountain Lakes, a commercial fish farm and ranch operation. August 19, 1996: a draft grant was transmitted to TNC which was the agreement between BOR and TNC for \$4,198,804.00 with \$1,747,426.00 federal funds obligated by Jennis L. Hemingway, BOR. September 18, 1996: the total amount for the mitigation activities was increased by Hemingway to \$4,422,804. November 15, 1996: a fully executed copy of the grant was transmitted from BOR to TNC. November 22, 1996: a request by TNC for funds to purchase a nut harvester (\$6,000) and a Massey-Ferguson 650 Tractor (\$7,500). December 3, 1996: approval for purchase of equipment by BOR.

## **Mike Noel, Utah**

Michael Noel is a retired 25 year federal employee. Mike worked in the Kanab Bureau of Land Management (BLM) office in Southern Utah for 22 years. During that period he received numerous special achievement awards and quality step pay increase awards for outstanding performance in his job. Mike never received any yearly evaluation rating below a superior. He was a good worker and was well respected by many different supervisors and by the citizens in the community in which he worked and lived. During the last 6 years of his employment with the BLM Mike was assigned as the project manager for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Andalex Coal Mine Proposal know as the Warm Springs EIS. There were a total of 3 federal agencies BLM, Office of Surface Mining, US Park Service, 1 Utah State Agency, the division of Oil Gas and Mining and a private, government selected, consultant, ENSR in Boulder Colorado that provided input, review and consultation on the EIS.

After 5 years of work on the EIS and several months prior to the intended release of the Draft EIS to the public, the document was sent to the Washington Office for review. During this time the EIS was reviewed at the

# TARGETS OF HURT: COMMENTS FROM AROUND THE NATION

highest levels of the Interior Department and because the impacts of the proposed action on the federal lands were found to be minor to moderate and completely mitigatable, Noel and his project manager joint lead counterpart with the OSM, Floyd McMullen, were subjected to intense scrutiny and pressure to change the impacts identified in the EIS.

Despite the preparation and review by over 100 federal, state, and private resource specialists, these politically appointed Washington Office Interior Department managers were unhappy with the document. Noel and McMullen held firm to the findings in their document and were not willing to make changes based merely on the fact that the green bureaucracy in Washington wanted the project stopped. During this review process with Washington Office, Noel was in fact demoted from project manager to assistant project manager and his duties were severely restricted.

In September of 1996 the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument was created with the statement by Bill Clinton that the area must be protected from coal development. This is of course was a lie and was only a means for the administration to invoke the Antiquities Act to create the monument.

After the creation of the monument, Noel became persona non grata in the BLM and was told that he was to be reduced from a GS 12 to a GS 11 grade. The normal occurrence would have been to give Noel a promotion and an award for completing the complex and highly controversial EIS that would have been legally defensible in a court of law.

Noel opted for an early out with a 20% reduction in retirement benefits and went to work as the executive director for the Kane County Water Conservancy District. Last year he organized the Color Country Chapter of People for the USA in Kanab and another Chapter in neighboring Garfield County. Noel and over 1000 members of PFUSA in Kane County are working with local and state government elected representatives and citizens to try and overturn the monument designation through the judicial process. He is also fighting water rights issues and the RS2477 road battle with the BLM to keep them from closing over 1279 miles of county roads in the new monument.

Mr. Noel's experience is not a isolated one. Many former BLM employees including Mr. Jim Parker, former BLM state director for Utah and Ed Sherick, former Monticello Utah Area Manager are also actively involved in helping the rural counties in Utah protect their rights against the green agenda of the Clinton Gore administration. After reading Ron Arnold's book Undue Influence, Mike contacted him to thank him for his presentation of the "real facts concerning the creation of the GSENM"

## **Shauna Johnson, Utah**

Three years ago, a diverse group of County residents and agencies formed a committee to develop a plan to protect the floodplain of the Virgin River with a locally-driven plan that would protect private property rights, the economy of the region, and the sensitive and endangered species of fish that USFWS had identified in the river. We worked for three years, in close cooperation with USFWS, BLM, Park Service, State of Utah, to develop a plan that would satisfy USFWS requirements. The Grand Canyon Trust were invited to be part of the process, and did participate, and in October of 1999, our plan was approved and signed off on by all participants, and published and publicly implemented. This plan was supposed to alleviate the need for Critical habitat designation for the Virgin River floodplain which is 85% private property and the main source of water for our whole area.

During the entire process, the GRAND CANYON TRUST, funded by grants from THE GENERAL SERVICE FOUNDATION-\$10,000/yr.; the PINCUS FAMILY FUND-\$30,000/yr.; GEORGE S. and DOLORES DORE ECCLES FOUNDATION-\$37,500/yr.; the FORD FOUNDATION-\$200,000/yr.; the J.S. and JESSIE E. QUINNEY FOUNDATION-\$37,000/yr.; attempted to usurp and undermine our efforts, even as they were supposed to be working on the planning team. They tried to start a separate committee, tried to bring in their own fish biologists to refute the science behind the plan, and applied for a large grant, stating that the Virgin River Planning committee was supporting them. Their overt behavior throughout the whole process caused the plan to take a lot longer than it should have, but in the end, they signed off on it as did the USFWS. Within 2 weeks of the implementation of our Plan, the USFWS listed our river as Critical habitat, despite the fact that they had signed an agreement when we did the plan. They were strongly encouraged to do this by the Grand Canyon Trust, who have openly stated that they will see their goals implemented on the entire river.

This is causing great difficulty for planning and land use efforts by private citizens and local governments, and is negatively impacting local economies. We have an excellent locally-driven management plan, and we hope that you will help us reestablish its authority, by investigating the breach of trust by the Grand Canyon Trust and the USFWS, and the foundations that helped pay for the harm that has been done.

# TARGETS OF HURT: COMMENTS FROM AROUND THE NATION

## **Rich Petaja, Montana**

Liz Claiborne, who operates a \$26 million foundation, and Art Ortenberg, who, with Claiborne, operates a separate \$39 million foundation, together own a \$2 million home on Lake Lindbergh in Montana.

Their view across the lake looks at timbered private land, presently undeveloped. Claiborne and Ortenberg apparently wished to keep their view free of other homes and urged their environmental movement friends to support the purchase of virtually all the private lakefront visible from their home by the U.S. Forest Service with public money.

The Forest Service agreed after a number of local environmental groups urged them to buy the private lakefront property, and the multi-million-dollar sale is now being transacted through the Trust for Public Land.

The Liz Claiborne and Art Ortenberg Foundation gave \$12,500 to the Five Valleys Land Trust in 1998, and other sums to other environmental groups that supported the federal purchase of this private land.

Our bureaucrats appear to be catering to a landed gentry with taxpayer funds.

## **Marcia H. Armstrong, California**

1) In the last decade, the Klamath Forest Alliance has appealed every grazing permit renewal decision on the Klamath National Forest except one. Every one of the appeals has been over-ruled by the regional office. This has caused a great deal of unnecessary expense, time and effort by Forest Service staff and the grazers, taking resources from actual range management.

2) In the last decade, Felice Pace of the Klamath Forest Alliance has worked to undermine the spirit and effectiveness of the Scott River Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Planning (CRMP) Group, acting in bad faith until the group disbanded and reconstituted to purge itself of Mr. Pace and his disruptive tactics. KFA had repeatedly used the consensus process in the past few years to block decisions. After two incidents when KFA's representative, Felice Pace, acted in a physically aggressive manner toward other participants, the group requested that another KFA representative be appointed. The CRMP was refused. The group disbanded as a CRMP and reconstituted as the Scott River Watershed Council comprised of members that are representative only of themselves and not of any group.

3) Klamath Forest Alliance is funded by Weeden Foundation, \$20,000, 1997; The Homeland Foundation, \$15,000, 1997; Richard & Rhoda Goldman Fund, \$20,000, 1997; W. Alton Jones Foundation, \$80,000, 1997; Foundation for Deep Ecology, \$10,000, 1996; Compton Foundation, \$10,000, 1996; W. Alton Jones Foundation, \$25,000, 1996; W. Alton Jones Foundation, \$25,000, 1995; W. Alton Jones Foundation, \$30,000, 1992; W. Alton Jones Foundation, \$30,000, 1991; The Needmor Fund, \$10,000, 1991; The Needmor Fund, \$13,000, 1991.

## **Consequences and Questions**

**POINT: THE POWER TO DESTROY AMERICA'S GOODS-PRODUCING ECONOMIES IS NOW CONCENTRATED IN THE HANDS OF A FEW INFLUENTIAL WEALTHY FOUNDATIONS, GRANT-DRIVEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS AND ACTIVIST FEDERAL EMPLOYEES. SHOULD THIS CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH AND POWER BE REGULATED?**

**POINT: REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS ARE SO LAX THAT THE PUBLIC CANNOT DISCOVER THEIR GRANTS OR EXAMINE THEIR INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO CONTENTS FOR CONFLICTS. SHOULD THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS BE STRENGTHENED? SHOULD PUBLIC ACCESS TO THIS INFORMATION BE MADE MANDATORY?**

## **Call for Investigation**

**CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS OF PRESCRIPTIVE PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS FUNDING GRANT-DRIVEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS WHOSE MEMBERS ARE IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT POSITIONS THAT WOULD PERMIT UNDUE INFLUENCE OVER AGENCY DECISIONS.**

**CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF THE POWER TO HURT ACROSS THE UNITED STATES AND A REPORT ON THE ACTUAL STATE OF THE NATION IN TERMS OF HARMED PARTIES WITH SUGGESTED REMEDIES.**

# MARK DOWIE MISATTRIBUTION

The accurate quote:

"For considerable sums of money, public opinion can be molded, constituents mobilized, issues researched, and public officials button-holed, all in a symphonic arrangement."

was never written or spoken by Mr. Joshua Reichert, Pew Charitable Trust's Environment Program Director. It was misattributed to Mr. Reichert by writer **Mark Dowie** in his book, *Losing Ground*, published in 1995 by MIT Press.

In April, 2000, Mr. Dowie sent the Pew Charitable Trusts' chief attorney the following correction and apology:

**Mark Dowie**  
**12642 Sir Frances Drake**  
**Point Reyes Station, CA 94956**

April 11, 2000

Joy A. Horwitz, Esquire  
Director, Legal Affairs and General Counsel  
The Pew Charitable Trusts  
One Commerce Square  
2005 Market Street  
Suite 1700  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7077

Dear Ms. Horwitz:

I am writing to acknowledge a misattribution on page 51 of my book, *Losing Ground*, regarding the block quote attributed to Joshua Reichert, director of The Pew Charitable Trusts' Environment program, in footnote 25. Although Mr. Reichert has said to me in an interview that he strongly believes that environmental groups need to respond more effectively to the tactics of environmental opponents, to my knowledge, the quotation was not written or spoken by him. Nor does it appear in the document entitled "Environmental Strategies: Concept Statement" (December, 1993), which I inadvertently listed as the source of the quotation.

The quoted language appeared in a report on environmental issue campaigns prepared by four individuals, including Tom Wathen, then an Environment program officer at Pew. Specifically, the quoted language was presented in a list of the most frequently cited reasons given by members of the environmental community, who had been interviewed by the report's authors, explaining why the environmental movement had failed to employ its assets as effectively as it might have.

I am sorry if this matter has caused you undue hardship.

Regards,  
(Signature)  
Mark Dowie

**\$10.00**

**THE CENTER FOR THE DEFENSE  
OF FREE ENTERPRISE**

is a non-profit, tax-exempt, publicly supported educational foundation organized under 501(c)(3) and 509(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue code.

The Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise was founded on July 4, 1976, by a coalition of concerned citizens to promote and defend the principles of the American free enterprise system. To that end, the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise conducts many educational and legal action projects designed to better inform the public about the benefits of the free enterprise economic system. This report is one of a periodic series on the problems of free enterprise.

Additional copies of this report are available for \$10.00 from the address below. Questions concerning this report should be addressed to: Editor, "Power To Hurt" For more information, please contact:

**CENTER FOR THE DEFENSE  
OF FREE ENTERPRISE**

Liberty Park  
12500 N.E. Tenth Place  
Bellevue, Washington 98005  
(425) 455-5038  
FAX (425) 451-3959  
Web Site: <http://www.cdfc.org>  
Email: [editor@cdfc.org](mailto:editor@cdfc.org)