A mouse-eye perspective: Popping up from the forest floor in April 1997, these Mayapples were a sure sign of Spring. Celebrate this Spring on any of the numerous Outings opportunities on pages 28-31. photo by Sherry Best
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A Decade of Effort: Finally Success

by Caroline Pufalt

In January 1998 the Forest Service finally issued a decision to close two roads in the North Fork Sensitive Area. That success resulted from over 10 years of pressure by Sierrans and other conservationists. Many of our current readers responded to past letter writing alerts on this issue. And some of our readers were key players in the Forest planning process in which this effort originated. That was over a decade ago! We can congratulate ourselves on this ongoing effort in which we, a volunteer organization, stayed the course to move a cumbersome, forgetful and obstinate agency.

Forest Service roads 804 and 811 in the North Fork area were one of many issues at stake in the development of the Mark Twain National Forest’s first official management plan. In the Forest planning process Ozark Chapter identified seven “sensitive areas” for which we sought to gain protection from the sometimes rough hand of management by the Forest Service. An important characteristic of these areas was their relative roadlessness. But in the North Fork Sensitive Area were two roads of minimal seasonal use that we argued should be closed.

The North Fork Sensitive area was a roadless area identified in the 1970s in what was called RARE II. RARE II was a nationwide roadless area inventory which resulted in a list of roadless areas, some of which became candidates for official wilderness designation. The North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates You Need to Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozark Chapter meeting: Council Chambers, Columbia, MO contact Caroline Hafley at (573) 665-9544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter ConCom meeting: Council Chambers, Columbia, MO contact Caroline Hafley at (573) 665-9544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May/Oun Ozark Sierran Deadline contact Bob Vaneck at (816) 373-5763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter ConCom meeting: Longview Ciga, Kansas City, MO contact Caroline Hafley at (573) 665-9544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter ExCom meeting: Longview Ciga, Kansas City, MO contact Caroline Hafley at (573) 665-9544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Roads Matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Caroline Pufalt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roads are with us virtually everywhere. Unless we spend days on a remote backpack or wilderness river, we will likely spend part of each day on a road. We are well aware of the impact of major roads in our urban and suburban communities. But we may be less aware of the impact of roads on natural communities. A recently proposed policy on roadless areas announced by the Forest Service points to the critical and often negative impact roads can have in the wild.

The agency’s proposed policy would prohibit road building in three general circumstances:

1. Roadless areas of 5,000 acres or more
2. “Inventoried” roadless areas of lesser acres*
3. Non-inventoried roadless areas of less than 1,000 acres if adjacent to Wilderness areas.

cont’d on page 4... “Roads”

cont’d on page 4... “Decade”
**Decade... cont’d from page 3**

Fork Sensitive Area’s inclusion in RARE II pointed to its importance as one of the few remaining natural wild areas in our region. Thus, when we were unable to gain the closure of the roads in the North Fork we filed suit on that and other unresolved issues in the plan.

In 1987 the Ozark Chapter and other interested conservation groups eventually reached a settlement with the Forest Service. We reached an agreement in which the agency would study the factors involved in closing the roads, develop a plan for closure, and create a schedule to close these two roads. Or at least that’s how we understood it.

But over the years action was repeatedly delayed, until finally, in 1995, the Forest Service issued an environmental assessment (EA) examining possible road closure. That EA, however, proposed leaving part of the roads open. We cried foul, as this was a betrayal of our 1987 settlement agreement. The issue then seemed to be put on hold, and we feared we might enter a new round of forest planning, if not the millennium, with this issue still unsettled. A few more

cont’d on page 5... “Decade”

---

**Roads... cont’d from page 3**

This is a controversial policy. Many interests oppose this proposal as it will limit logging in the protected areas. Most logging requires new roads. The plan is also controversial because it exempts many critical forests in the far west that have had recent plan revisions. Especially disappointing is the exemption of the Tongas National Forest in Alaska. But the agency’s proposal is generally seen as a positive step. It is an evolving policy that will be subject to comment and review.

Part of the impetus for the new policy came from efforts by conservationists and some fiscal conservatives to eliminate the Forest Service’s road budget. The Forest Service is a major road builder and the agency’s road policy is widely viewed as a subsidy to timber companies. The new policy won’t much reduce road building overall, but it does do two critical things. First, it will protect many acres of roadless areas from further road building. Second, it represents a clear statement from the Forest Service acknowledging the detrimental effects of roads.

Roads damage natural areas by providing a pathway for non-native species. Many alien species thrive along disturbed roadways and in addition can be introduced by motorized and human traffic. Roads may be poorly constructed or poorly maintained. Or they may be built in unsuitable terrain. In either case they are likely to cause severe and ongoing erosion problems. Runoff from erosion can muddy creeks, destroying fish habitat. Roads provide an entry way for humans and motorized access, both of which carry increased fire risk into roaded areas. Roads increase access for unlawful off-road motorized traffic. Roads fragment wildlife habitat. Many creatures, great and small, may be isolated by a road.

We will follow the development of this new roadless area policy and see how it may be applied to areas in the Mark Twain National Forest. See a related article in this issue regarding the closure of two roads in the North Fork Sensitive area. Our efforts at protection of other roadless areas may be aided by this new policy. ■

* Inventoried means listed in RARE II or some other recognized roadless inventory.
Decade... cont’d from page 4

points of pressure were applied, and in January the Forest Service finally issued a decision notice closing roads 804 and 811.

At this writing the decision stands. The Department of Natural Resources was positively involved in this issue during early and later comment periods. Sierra Club member John Karel was a party to the 1987 settlement agreement. He has steadfastly supported the Sensitive Areas in the MTNF and has served as the chapter’s inspiration and sometimes our memory on this topic. Thanks to all Sierrans who wrote letters and made calls for the North Fork!

Forest Revision and Lead Drilling Decision Derailed by Politics

By Caroline Pufalt

N

ational level politics and policy shifts have had an impact on several issues of concern in the Mark Twain National Forest (MTNF). In our prior issue of the Ozark Sierran we discussed the upcoming forest plan revision for the MTNF. Since that writing, events in Washington, D.C. have resulted in the delay of planning revisions on the MTNF and many other national forests. The planning process results from several laws, including guidelines in the National Forest Management Act (NFMA). However, NFMA was written in 1976 and is under pressure for changes in both the law itself and the regulations that implement it. Late in 1997, in an effort to press for those changes, budgets for forest planning were delayed pending NFMA revisions. All forests that had not officially published a “notice of intent” for planning revision in the federal registry by October 1 of last year had their planning budgets delayed. The MTNF, and many other forests in the east and Midwest, fell in this category. Thus, planning has been delayed for many months.

Although the official revision process and the required steps of public participation are postponed, the Forest Service will still be gathering information that may be used in the planning process. And the public can still express an interest in planning revision and continue informal input. We will also want to get attuned to what is happening with NFMA revision. NFMA is a flawed but very important law. Unfortunately, current political pressures are not moving in the best direction on MFMA.

At present we can identify two important areas in NFMA that may be weakened. One is the planning process and public participation. The details of this process are spelled out in the regulations that implement NFMA.

Another important area of potential change is what is called the viability requirement. This requirement, currently in NFMA, requires the Forest Service to retain viable populations of native species in its forests. That sounds like a reasonable requirement for an agency whose lands are to be managed for, among other things, wildlife habitat. It also sounds reasonable to anyone who has worked on timber sales, since those sales are often described as necessary for wildlife habitat creation. But activists have been able to use this simple requirement to show the weakness and bias in some forest plans and management in the 1980s and 1990s.

cont’d on page 6... “NFMA”
cases where little concern is given non-game species, for example. Anti-environmental forces want even this basic requirement gutted. We will keep readers informed on the action taken on these and other forest planning related issues.

At this writing politics in D.C. have also impacted the MTNF decision on exploratory drilling in the Scenic River watershed. In the summer of 1997 the MTNF released an environmental assessment (EA) regarding the potential drilling. Many Sierrans commented on this proposal. Our concerns are many, but a basic procedural concern was that the EA considered only the impact of exploratory drilling when the impact of mining itself need to be considered. We and others called for the issuance of a complete environmental impact statement, instead of the much shorter EA. We also called for the denial of the permits to drill. A decision on the issue was expected in early 1998.

But apparently our efforts have not gone unnoticed. Representative Joan Emerson, from southeastern Missouri, Senator Ashcroft, and others in Congress wrote to Interior Secretary Babbitt and Agricultural Secretary Glickman questioning the delay of the issuance of “routine” exploratory drilling permits and calling for an inquiry into the matter. This may result in hearings in Washington on exploratory drilling in the MTNF and will, ironically, have the effect of delaying further any decision made by the MTNF.

We will also keep Sierrans informed on the developments of this important issue. Currently it is important to write and call our U.S. Senators and Representatives and remind them that we are strongly opposed to further exploratory drilling for lead in the MTNF. The letter signed by Emerson and Ashcroft was also signed by some of the most vehemently anti-environmental members of Congress, such as Helen Chenowith of Idaho and Don Young of Alaska. Their involvement in this portends that we will need to keep up the pressure from Missourians who do not want the lead industry (a top polluter) advanced in our state.

Citizen’s Lead School Training Available

by Sarah Bantz

For too long, citizens of this state have received half truths and been ignored when they raise concerns over the toxicity of lead or the boom and bust economic cycles of mining. This spring, Heartwood will

cont’d on page 7... “School”
School... cont’d from page 6

host the Citizen’s Lead School to raise citizen’s understanding of lead-related issues. By providing advanced education from experts independent of corporate bias, the Citizen’s Lead School teaches citizens the expertise and skills which they often lack in attempting to determine the future of our communities. The School operates under the premises that knowledge is power and that an active citizenry is necessary to create a just society. Most of these courses will be held on Saturdays on the University of Missouri-Rolla campus. For more information, contact Heartwood at (573) 443-6832. Our confirmed presenters include the following:

March 29
Dr. Thomas Power, Ph.D., Chair, Economics Department at the University of Montana at Missoula. Dr. Power’s most recent book, Lost landscapes and Failed Economies: The Search for a Value of Place, looks beyond today’s natural resource economics rhetoric to a reality where environmental protection and economic stability have much in common. He has authored many articles, papers, and reports in the field of resource economics.

March 29
David Chambers, Ph.D., Center for Science in Public Participation specializing in technical fields of water quality, acid mine drainage, and mining policy. David has 15 years of industry experience and five years experience serving as the Mining Analyst for the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund. He is presently Executive Director of the Center for Science in Public Participation and specializes in groundwater quality of acid mine drainage.

April 25
Dr. Ana Maria Murgueytio, M.D., Ph.D., St. Louis University School of Public Health. Dr. Murgueytio is an Assistant Professor of Community Health in Environmental and Occupational Health. Her research focuses on communities near hazardous waste sites and impacts on vulnerable populations. Dr. Murgueytio has studied the effects of mining waste on old lead belt communities.

May 10
Aimee Boulanger, Mineral Policy Center. Community responses to mining threats.

Book Review: Slide Mountain, or the Folly of Owning Nature

Review by Caroline Pufalt

Slide Mountain is an interesting and odd book. It is an interesting book because it addresses a question that is often in environmental news these days, We read of controversies over “ takings” and “property rights” that are all too common and seemingly intractable. It is an odd book because it looks at this controversy from an unusual angle by examining cases that are on the fringes of property law issues. Today, we are used to conflict over human values placed on nature which seem to pit owls against timber or cattle against native grasslands. But those are cases cont’d on page 8… “Book”
in which conflict is mainly over what people choose to value.

The cases examined in *Slide Mountain* often illustrate how the forces of nature can confound our attempts at defining and owning nature. Thus conflict involves not just differing values placed on nature, but nature herself contributes to the debate.

The first case reviewed will ring true to many Missourians as it involves the creation and loss of land along the Missouri river and who should own that “new land.” Legal precedent tried to make a distinction between land that was gradually built up as opposed to land that was suddenly “created” by a flood.

But natural forces do not always lend themselves to our time scales. In fact, it is often hard to determine when backwater becomes wetland and then land itself. Steinberg examines a legal case involving the states of Nebraska and Iowa. Not long after the case was finally settled, land previously determined to belong to Nebraska had, due to flooding, apparently moved back toward Iowa.

Another case reviewed involved the importance of our definitions of natural features: specifically, when is a lake a lake and when is it just a wide spot in a river? The meandering Mississippi and Atchafalaya rivers presented this dilemma. The stakes included who owned rich oil lands along the banks of the lake or river.

In both these cases our concepts of property ownership and the definitions required to keep the laws enforcing those concepts working were challenged by the ongoing processes of nature. We want nature to conform to our definitions and remain immutable so our ideas of ownership work. But we sometimes find that we cannot easily separate one part of nature, land itself for example, from the forces of water and weather that form it.

In other examples, Steinberg wanders onto even more unstable

---

*Slide Mountain, or the Folly of Owning Nature*

By Theodore Steinberg
Book Review: Living Downstream: An Ecologist Looks at Cancer and the Environment

Review by Jim Rhodes

Living Downstream is a book that will make you think. Or maybe even change your life. I have to say that before reading it I hadn’t given much thought to cancer’s link to environmental contamination. Sure, we all know that a lot of chemicals now in common use are carcinogenic. And I would bet that nearly all of us either know somebody who has cancer or perhaps even died from it. But what causes cancer and how it is linked to the widespread use of agricultural and industrial synthetic chemicals somehow still seems shrouded in mystery.

The author of this book, Sandra Steingraber, is an ecologist from Illinois who was herself once diagnosed with bladder cancer. In 276 pages of this absorbing book, which was published last year, the author discusses how the widespread use and proliferation of chemical toxins has led to increased rates of cancer. After reading it, I am now buying organic food as much as possible and I have also installed a water filter on my home tap.

Some facts are in order. First, at least one-third of all Americans will get cancer in their lifetimes. One in five will die from it. Although many of these deaths are related to causes such as smoking, many are not. Second, no less an organization than the World Health Organization has “concluded that at least 80 percent of all cancer is attributable to environmental influences.” Third, the average middle aged man has 177 organochlorine residues, including dioxin, in his tissues.

These three facts alone should convince us that we are living in a new era with serious health consequences. The author goes back to describe the pioneering writings of Rachel Carson in Silent Spring published in 1962. Carson herself died from cancer after completing this classic book. Although Carson was eventually successful in getting DDT banned, we must now contend with new chemicals that have been approved as well as many others whose hazards are essentially unknown.

This book should also be of special interest to us in Missouri because of its midwest perspective. She writes, “In 1993, 91 percent of Illinois’s rivers and streams showed pesticide contamination. These chemicals travel in pulses: pesticide levels in surface water during the months of spring planting — April through June — are sevenfold those during winter, although detections never fall to zero.”

This is an important book that deserves to be widely read. The author writes eloquently and poetically about complex scientific issues from a personal perspective. I recommend it highly.

Living Downstream: An Ecologist Looks at Cancer and the Environment

By Sandra Steingraber
Top 10 Reasons Why We Need A Carbon Tax

by Jim Rhodes

President Clinton has said that he believes higher taxes on fossil fuels intended to restrict consumption, commonly known as a “carbon taxes,” would not be politically acceptable to most people and aren’t necessary because other tax incentives and technological innovations will save the day.

Although the President is probably correct that a broad-based carbon tax would meet stiff political opposition and come under heavy lobbying pressure, this doesn’t mean that such a tax is a bad idea and should not be discussed. His assumption that technological innovations will achieve the necessary reductions is partially correct since such innovations are possible. The problem is that right now they aren’t cost competitive with cheap oil and coal.

A carbon tax could help the economics of supply and demand move us toward energy efficiency. If the price of a given commodity goes up, the demand will go down. Right now the price of energy from fossil fuel is relatively low since the cost of extracting coal, oil, and gas is fairly low. These costs do not include the costs of the impact on health or the environment.

Nobody likes a tax increase, but the government has to get its operating revenues from somewhere and there is no reason why the phased implementation of a carbon tax could not be coupled with reductions in other federal taxes. The idea would still have to be sold politically but I believe that this could happen since, unlike an income tax, it would be very easy to reduce your taxes by simply conserving energy.

For those who doubt that strong action to curb greenhouse gases is necessary, I have put together my “top 10” list of why we need a carbon tax.

Here it is:

1. **Urban Sprawl** - Aside from the social fragmentation that is the result of sprawl, sprawl is continuing to convert farms and forests into more subdivisions and shopping malls. The proposed Page Avenue bridge over the Missouri River to serve the growing suburbs in St. Charles County and further west is a prime example of the costs of sprawl. The major reason why people are able to move out to the “burbs” and not worry about having to drive 30 miles to go anywhere is the relatively low cost of gasoline.

2. **Urban Air Quality** - Again, if gas weren’t so cheap, people wouldn’t be driving so much and we wouldn’t have the problems that we now have. Electric utility companies also contribute to the problem as a result of burning coal to produce electricity. As long as coal is a low cost way to produce electricity, utility companies have little incentive to invest in sources of energy such as solar, wind, and geothermal.

3. **Potential Crop Failures** - Many of the computer simulations of what a future climate might be like show decreased rainfall in the central U.S. This could result in serious crop failures in the midwest and the need to irrigate crops to prevent such failures. Irrigation is not cheap and groundwater aquifers are already being depleted in many areas.

4. **Exxon Valdez** - As long as oil that is shipped overseas in oil tankers, we will probably continue to see more tanker disasters. More expensive oil will encourage people to drive less and/or buy vehicles that get better gas mileage.

cont’d on page 11... “Reasons”
Reasons... cont’d from page 10

5. Nigerian Human Rights Abuses - The arrogance of the Shell Oil Company has been amply demonstrated in the atrocities that have occurred in this country as the result of the greed for more oil. Politically around the world the oil companies have tremendous political influence and they have demonstrated little concern for the environment or the impact their operations have on local populations.

6. Effects of Coal Mining - Coal is still being mined both in open pit mines and in strip mines. Open pit mines result in huge scars on the landscape and strip mines result in acid mine drainage that is impossible to control and acidifies the streams that it enters.

7. Increased Exposure to Tropical Diseases - It is very possible that major epidemics of diseases such as malaria will occur as a result of warming weather conditions. Populations of disease vectors such as mosquitoes may explode in the warmer world we will have.

8. Rise in Sea Levels - Sea levels are rising as a result of warming (and hence expanding) oceans as well as from melting of glaciers and ice stored in the polar ice caps. It has been estimated that the sea level will likely rise 1.5 feet and that the U.S. could lose as much as 10,000 square miles of coastline over the next hundred years.

9. Worsening Weather Conditions - Although it may be true that “some like it hot,” in the not-too-distant future large areas of the world will be subjected to significantly hotter summers than now occur. How hot? It depends on just how long we go without really addressing the problem. A rise of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit is likely to occur in the next century. After that, who knows. Other possible effects include more severe hurricanes, more “500 year” floods due to wetter springs, increased desertification, and even more severe winters in some areas.

10. Disruption of Existing Ecologies - A warmer climate will result in massive changes in the world’s ecosystems. In the past such changes have usually occurred gradually over thousands of years, but the current change will occur many times faster. One possible result may be the die-off of vast tracts of deciduous forests now covering large areas of the United States as these forests can not adapt to the rapid warming.

This is an incomplete list. It could have also included the decline in passenger rail travel, Conoco’s effort to extract oil in the Escalante National Monument, pressure to drill for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, air pollution from oil refineries, and acid rain damage to crops, lakes, and forests.

A carbon tax will not mean disruption of our lifestyle. Electricity can be generated by solar, wind, and geothermal sources at costs only slightly higher than what we are paying now. And there are alternatives to gas-guzzling cars, vans, and pickup trucks. We need to let the politicians know that there are many people who would be in favor of a carbon tax if it is implemented fairly and does not result in an increase in the overall tax burden. They need to hear from people who want to avoid the potentially disastrous effects of global warming. And they must hear from those who want to move from an economy based on fossil fuels to one based on the increased use of renewable sources of energy.
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Will Consumers and the Environment Be Hurt By Electric Utility Deregulation?

by Wallace McMullen

large industries and electric and investor-owned utilities are supporting restructuring, or “deregulation”, of the electric industry. The avowed goal is completion among electricity vendors. The idea was given a major impetus in 1995 when utilities were required to accept and transmit power they had not generated across their service area. This is called “wheeling” power in the industry.

The restructuring of the electric power industry could be very detrimental to small consumers and the environment. Utility companies might be able to evade environmental concerns under the guise of being competitive, despite the social costs and adverse environmental impacts of generating and selling electricity at the lowest dollar cost without concern for the long-term effects involved. Another undesirable possibility is that small consumers might get stuck with paying the bills for past investments by utility companies which become uncompetitive in a restructured marketplace...nuclear generating plants, for instance.

The push for restructuring is coming from big industrial electric consumers that want to get the lowest price possible on the electricity they consume. From the utility point of view, big customers with a consistent demand for electricity are more desirable than small residential consumers whose seasonal consumption of electricity varies greatly. The result of these factors in a deregulated market structure might give the big customers lowered rates and produce higher charges per unit for the small customers. This would especially hurt residential ratepayers with limited income.

The Ozark Chapter has been participating in a Task Force studying these issues which the Public Service Commission convened. Ken Midkiff was appointed to the task force, and Rachel Locke and Wallace McMullen have attended several meetings as his representatives. We intend to advocate a pro-environment and pro-consumer viewpoint.

Steve Mahfood, Director of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, told our delegation that Missouri currently has lower costs for electricity than surrounding states. This would seem to indicate that Missouri need not rush to “deregulate” at this time, as we are better off than our neighbors. We can watch the outcome of other states’ experiments, without a loss of competitiveness, and then choose the best ideas once the results of new structures become apparent.

Gory Details:

Electric utility managers conceptually divide their industry into many different functions, which tends to make the discussions of deregulation very complex. These functions include the generation, transmission, and distribution of electricity, meter reading, and customer billing. Most deregulation scenarios assume that these functions will no longer all be performed by one company.

With a new division of functions, you get a new cast of characters, like “Retail Electric Providers” (REPs), and “Independent System Operators” (ISOs), who may provide reliable electric service by operating a “Poolco” (a statewide entity that buys the electricity from generation firms and resells it to local distribution firms, with the prices for buying and selling set by competitive bidding).
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reselling competitively determined, while performing some or all of the functions of an Independent System Operator).

One of the stated goals is that consumers can tell their local utility company who they want to provide their generation service. Think of this as telling your local telephone company which long distance service you want. Theoretically, information would be available so that consumers could make informed choices. We believe that such information should contain environmental data: type of fuel used (coal, oil, natural gas, solar), emission or discharge data, ownership of company, and so forth. With such information, consumers could choose solar-generated or natural-gas generated power, both of which are much less polluting than coal or oil.

Another difficult area involves what the utility industry refers to as “stranded costs.” While this can quickly get real complicated the basic premise is that utility companies made investments in power generation plants under the current regulatory system, which guaranteed them a specific return on their investment. If the regulatory system changes, those returns are no longer guaranteed, and those investments become “stranded.” Fortunately or unfortunately, depending on perspective, nuclear power plants probably will not survive under a competitive system, and utility companies owning those plants will be howling the loudest to recoup their bad investments.

It is very difficult sorting out all of the conflicting interests among utility companies. Each has its own set of goals, depending mostly on ownership. Some municipalities own their own power generation plants, others buy all of their electricity. There are rural electric co-ops, for-profit investor-owned plants, and federally owned hydroelectric dams.

Sierra Club positions.

Rather than taking sides in all of this, the Ozark Chapter and the National Sierra Club have established some goals. We will be examining the various developments, policies, decisions and strategies from the perspectives of these goals:

◆ That ALL consumers must benefit equally — small as well as large.

◆ That energy efficiency in generation and consumption will be incorporated into any new regulatory system.

◆ That government subsidies, tax incentives, and monies for research and development be given to alternative and renewable sources of energy. We must end reliance on fossil fuels, nuclear and hydro generation sources, and develop sustainable alternatives. The technologies are in place. All that is needed is to provide the same government largesse to solar and wind generators that was supplied to current generation systems. These new sustainable systems could be developed incrementally and could eventually supplant current power sources.
Governor’s Total Transportation Conference Gets Mixed Reviews

by Ron McLinden

Missouri Governor Mel Carnahan spoke at the First Annual Total Transportation Conference in Jefferson City on January 7. The conference, a follow-up to the work of his Total Transportation Commission, was intended to demonstrate the Governor’s commitment to improving Missouri’s transportation systems, to continue dialogue on transportation funding issues, and to help build and maintain a broad base of support for a “total transportation” funding program. Total transportation means looking at transportation as a comprehensive, interconnected system, rather than as separate modes. About 250 people attended the event.

The roster of speakers was decidedly unbalanced. Only one public transit person was invited to speak, and there were no representatives of rail freight or passenger service, or of handicapped and special needs populations, or of bicycle, pedestrian, or environmental advocates.

Prior to the conference Ozark Chapter members tried several avenues to get additional consideration of environmental issues into speakers’ remarks. Perhaps the closest we came to success was that State Economic Development Director Joe Driskill mentioned the importance of a quality environment and energy efficiency to the state’s economy during his closing remarks. To compensate for the lack of balance, we distributed two brochures on “Smart Growth” to conference attendees prior to the conference.

Seven legislators were among the 25 speakers. Unfortunately, they had pressing business at the Capitol — the General Assembly began its 1998 session that day — so there was not much dialogue with them at the conference. Their message to the conference, however, was pretty unambiguous: The General Assembly will not consider any total transportation funding measures this year. There are two reasons for this:

(1) The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) is in the doghouse right now, mostly because the cost of the fifteen-year highway plan, which MoDOT used in 1992 to justify a six cent per gallon increase in gas taxes, has turned out to have been under-estimated by about $13 billion. Put another way, it’s going to cost twice as much to build all the roads that were promised six years ago as the legislators were told.

(2) 1998 is an election year, and no incumbent wants to propose raising taxes in an election year.

While it won’t pass any big funding programs this year, the General Assembly can be expected to consider instituting major changes in budgetary and other processes which would provide more legislative oversight of MoDOT. There appears to be broad agreement that legislative oversight should not include deciding which highway projects to build or in what order. In practice, this intent will probably turn out to be far easier to express than to adhere to. Meanwhile, MoDOT is implementing organizational reforms on its own, such as hiring Chief Operating and Chief Financial Officers, to carry out duties formerly performed by the Chief Engineer.

While a transportation program such as proposed by the Total Transportation Commission would include as much as $2 billion for public transit over a period of up to 20 years, it may be just as well from our perspective that the program is being delayed. We’ll have just that much...
Ever Hear of Smart Growth? You’re Likely to Hear a Lot More

by Ron McLinden

Smart Growth? Is there any other kind? Unfortunately, the answer is Yes.

The U.S. has produced a lot of growth which has turned out to be not very smart, especially since the end of World War II. With the best of intent, and in response to concerns which seemed valid at the time, we have spread ourselves ever more thinly across our metropolitan areas and towns. Close up it looks like prosperity, but when we step back to see the bigger picture, we discover that the consequences are catching up with us.

We needed to expand the housing supply for post-war families, so we encouraged suburban sprawl rather than central city in-fill housing. That made us dependent on automobiles for transportation. We built urban freeway systems with the intent of serving central business districts, but the freeways spawned suburban shopping malls and office parks instead. We let transit systems decline, thinking we’d all simply drive our own cars. In fact, we had such confidence in our cars that we began to design our cities and suburbs as if no other form of transportation existed. Walking? That mode would become, well, “pedestrian.”

Before long the baby boom generation will start to retire, and some
cities... continue on page 16... “Growth”

Urban sprawl has dominated post WorldWar II development patterns across the United States. Debates over growth and development have pitted pro- and anti-growth forces against each other on the playing fields of fiscal responsibility, environmental protection, preservation of community character, economic growth, public infrastructure investment, and provision of public services. Recently, the debate has been changed by the emergence of a new perspective: Smart Growth. Smart Growth makes the link between development and quality of life. Smart Growth recognizes that how buildings are built and where development takes place are the factors that make development either a community asset or liability. Smart Growth advocates seek growth and development where it will build community, protect environmental amenities, promote fiscal health and keep taxes low, maximize return on public and private investment, and encourage economic efficiency.”

—Smart Growth Web Site (www.smartgrowth.org)
Growth... cont'd from page 15

boomers will no longer be able to drive. But where will they walk?

We want to get people off welfare rolls and onto payrolls, but many of the jobs have moved to the suburbs beyond the cost-effective reach of public transit. How will they get there?

Our cars have become extensions of ourselves. Our attachment to them separates us from one another. We no longer meet on the sidewalk, exchange greetings, and form the face-to-face relationships which are one of the cornerstones of community. Instead, we pass one another out on the thoroughfare, disguised behind our windshields.

In our city building and rebuilding we’ve given most of our attention to the individual pieces — the house or the office building or the strip mall — and not enough to the question of whether they add up to a human “habitat” which will promote and sustain “community.”

At the same time, we’re discovering that many of the problems we thought we could solve by moving out of the cities have followed us. Traffic congestion is worse in most suburbs than in the central cities. There’s broad consensus that we can’t build our way out of congestion — and we probably couldn’t afford to try it, anyway. Despite the current prosperity, we don’t have the fiscal resources to repair all the existing infrastructure which needs repair, much less build all the new street and freeway capacity our growth projections tell us we will need.

We’re starting to realize our road systems are double-edged swords: they give us mobility for people and raw materials and products, but they also entice us to locate ever farther away from one another. That imposes a heavy overhead of transportation costs on our entire economy and makes us all car-dependent. We can’t remain competitive in the global economy for long when workers in developing countries can be had for less than the typical American needs to make car payments.

Smart Growth is a response to the past half-century of suburb building and city disinvestment. It is a synthesis of practices and principles, some new and some old, which have the effect of creating healthy, attractive living environments which are economically efficient, fiscally sound, and environmentally responsible.

Smart growth embraces concepts like “walkable” neighborhoods, reasonable mixes of land use, transit-friendly development, accommodation for bicycle and pedestrian travel, a variety of housing types and prices within neighborhoods, clustered development, integration of storm water management with greenways and open space, restoration and re-use of existing buildings, reinvestment in existing infrastructure, in-fill development, re-use of industrial “brownfields” rather than developing new “greenfields,” energy- and resource-efficient buildings, and lifecycle costing of building design and components.

Smart Growth involves careful consideration of a broad array of the implications of a given development — not just the initial cost of building the streets and other infrastructure in a new subdivision, for example, but the long-term “operating costs” of low-density development: delivering parcels and pizzas, collecting trash and plowing snow, getting the kids to soccer practice and the aging parent to the medical clinic.

Smart Growth appeals to social liberals and fiscal conservatives alike. It seeks efficiency of operation and maximum return on investments in public and private infrastructure.

Applied to Missouri transportation policy, Smart Growth encourages us to consider the full consequences of the transportation investments which Missouri makes. Will a new highway bypass draw commercial life away from the town square, making part-time jobs less accessible to pre-driving-age teens and shopping less accessible to non-
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Smart Growth is not just the name of an emerging attitude toward development, or of a growing citizen organization in the St. Louis region. It is also the name of a new national initiative, a public/private partnership to redirect the nation’s public and private investments into forms and patterns which will be more advantageous to us all, individually and as a nation.

To learn more about Smart Growth you can join the Smart Growth Network, a cooperative effort of the Environmental Protection Agency, Urban Land Institute, International City/County Management Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, and a number of other organizations. Call (202)962-3591 for information. Or you can check out the Smart Growth website: www.smartgrowth.org.

Legislative Report

by Ken Midkiff

The Ozark Chapter has two major priorities for positive legislation this session:

▼ A bill (HB1580) sponsored by Rep. Chuck Graham (D-Boone County) to legally redefine large Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations as “industrial facilities” and remove them from the designation of “agricultural operations.” This bill would apply to facilities of more than 3,000 “animal units” or 7,500 hogs, and would make such operations come into compliance with all Clean Air, Clean Water, and OSHA laws, as well as subject them to county planning and zoning ordinances and higher tax rates.

▲ A bill (no number assigned as of Feb. 2) sponsored by Rep. Rocky Johnson (D-Bonne Terre) that would require an annual lead severance fee of 5% of the market value of processed lead. This would be paid by the lead mining companies and would be used to clean up old lead mining sites and for remediation and abatement of lead paint health problems in urban housing. Other provisions will be added as the legislation progresses.
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We are also supporting other legislation:

▲ Environmental Justice Commission — HB 994; sponsored by Rep. Joan Bray (D-University City)


▲ Campaign Finance Reform — HB 1552; sponsored by Rep. Joan Bray.

▲ Campaign Finance Reform — SB 779; sponsored by Sen. Ken Jacob (D-Columbia). Same as HB 1552.

▲ Removal of taxes for conservation, parks and soils, and DNR fees from provisions of the Hancock Amendment — SJR 22; sponsored by Sen. Wayne Goode.

Bills that we adamantly oppose:

▼ Agricultural Products and Producers Anti-defamation Act — HB 923; sponsored by Rep. Sam Leake (D-Laddonia). This bill would attempt to statutorily repeal the First Amendment to the US Constitution.

▼ Repeals the portions of the Missouri Clean Air Act that authorizes enhanced inspection and maintenance procedures for automobiles in the St. Louis area — HB 1104; sponsored by Rep. Joe Treadway (D-St. Louis).

▼ “No stricter than federal requirements” to be imposed on Missouri’s environmental regulations — HB 1341 and SB 750; sponsored by Rep. Mark Richardson (R- Poplar Bluff) and Sen. Larry Rohrbach (R-California).


▼ Sewage Disposal Law Exemptions — HB 1390; sponsored by Rep. Kelly Parker (D - Salem). This bill seems to be based on an assumption that sewage from houses on small lots is more polluting that sewage from houses on large lots. Hmm. Sen. Bill McKenna (D-Barnhart) has a similar Bill — SB 739, in the Senate.

Since it appears unlikely that either of the “no stricter than federal bills” will be advanced, we will need to be alert for attempts to amend this on to other legislation. Last year, such an effort led to the demise of the needed amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Other legislative measures that will likely be introduced will address the chip mill problems developing in the southern Ozarks. Chip mills convert trees to chips used for everything from particle board to pulp and have a voracious appetite: each mill can process up to 25 acres of trees per day. The preferred method of cutting is clearcutting, since the mills can use any size trees.

See the information below to stay up to date on these issues.
Campaign Finance Reform Effort to Pursue Petition Drive

by Chris Hayday

The last issue of the Ozark Sierran contained an article about the Missouri Alliance for Campaign Reform (MACR) and the Alliance’s efforts to bring meaningful reform to Missouri’s campaign finance laws. Legislation has been introduced in both the House and Senate, and MACR is hopeful that there will be real debate on this issue on the floor of both chambers.

On Friday, January 30, the MACR Board of Directors voted to also pursue a petition drive to achieve its goals.

The ballot language is currently being approved by the Secretary of State’s office, and we expect the petitions to be available for circulation by March 1. I hope that you will get involved in this effort.

MACR has until July 2 to collect 120,000 signatures to place the issue on the November ballot. Please help by circulating the petitions, volunteering your time, or contributing money to help in this campaign.

More information will follow, but, in the meantime, feel free to contact me if there are any questions or if you would like to volunteer to help. I can be reached by phone at (573)875-4507 or by e-mail at chayday@aol.com. You can also contact the MACR office at (314)731-5312.

Coming Soon to a Missouri Location Near You!

by Rachel Locke

Hello Everyone! I know that November is a long way away for many of you, but for me it’s right around the corner. Why? Because as the Chapter’s new Voter Education Coordinator, I know that before November we have lots of people to educate about candidates’ positions on environmental issues. It’s our duty as an environmental organization to tell the public which candidates support the environment and which don’t.

I’ll be working out of St. Louis, but my efforts will reach statewide. So look for me to come to your area soon!

The Ozark Chapter and I need you to help and win valuable prizes doing it. Monitor your local newspapers, television, and radio stations and get a free Sierra Club calendar. Join the Urban Hiking Initiative to distribute vote charts and information about candidates’ positions on environmental issues and win cool Sierra Club prizes as you distribute more and more literature. Write letters to the editor and to elected officials and become famous in your community and with other Sierra Club members.

Contact me at (314)771-2861 or rachel.locke@sierraclub.org. You can volunteer now or just get more information about the voter education program. Remember! As an environmental organization it’s our duty to tell the public how elected officials vote on the issues we care about. If we don’t tell people — they’ll never know!
The Endangered Topeka Shiner

by Ken Midkiff

The Endangered Species Act is a remarkable document. It is a statutory verification of the respect for life held by the American people. In its rather arcane and stilted legal phrases, it sets out the processes for identifying and protecting those life forms with which we share the planet.

But some folks just don’t get it. They think that the sun rises and sets on human ambitions and that nothing should get in the way of us doing whatever we want with this remarkable planet.

Several decades ago, a new branch of biological studies was created: ecology. It was labeled. It set out a premise that had long been recognized by naturalists and theologians. There is a web of life. All things are connected. It is impossible to pick out one species and study it without taking into account everything that surrounds it.

That also applies to human beings. We are an integral part of that web. What affects our surroundings affects us. If we diminish the plants and animals that inhabit our planet, we also diminish the quality of our lives. All creatures have intrinsic values: all life is valued because all life is sacred.

Now listen to what a leader in the Missouri Farm Bureau has to say about the imminent extinction of a species: “It is just BAIT. If it has no value, what does it matter? Some other minnow will take its place.”

These statements, and others equally disrespectful, were made at a hearing this week on the proposed listing of the Topeka Shiner as an endangered species. The Missouri Farm Bureau and the Cattlemen’s Association showed up to present statements in opposition to the listing. They never gave any evidence that would show that the Shiner is not in danger of extinction. They did give much evidence of their lack of concern about the natural world. At least they are consistent.

These organizations have opposed the listing of almost every species in danger of being destroyed, from the wolf to the Indiana Bat.

Fortunately, these agribusiness organizations did not represent the feelings of real farmers who showed up at the meeting and expressed their deeply-felt opinions about taking care of the earth. A majority of the local landowners—the hearing was in Bethany, about 80 miles northwest of Columbia—stated that they understood that some farming practices may have degraded local streams. They stated that they wanted their streams protected, they valued clean water, they respected the gift of good land, and they supported the listing of the Shiner. They also denounced the Farm Bureau and the Cattlemen’s Association, stating in no uncertain terms that those organizations’ statements did NOT represent their opinions.

One farmer went a little further. He stated that industrial style agriculture and agricorporations were responsible for the decline of water quality and the accompanying demise of the rural way of life. He wondered why the Farm Bureau was supporting agricorporations instead of family farmers. He understood perfectly the thesis that all things are connected.

All of this, of course, was a sideline to the real purpose of the hearing, which was to gather information on the decline of the Topeka Shiner and to determine whether it should be listed.
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as an endangered species and afforded the protection of the U.S. government. All evidence presented by fisheries biologists and other scientists was not refuted. The Topeka Shiner has disappeared from most streams that it once inhabited, declining by 80% across its range. The current populations continue to diminish. This species once was found in all streams of Boone County; it now is found, in ever-declining numbers, only in the Bonne Femme watersheds of the Three Creeks Conservation Area. Similar situations exist in Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota and Minnesota.

The causes of the threatened extinction of this small fish are varied and several. It has evolved over millions of years in free-flowing, clear, cool, shaded prairie streams. From the tallgrass streams of Kansas’s Flint Hills to the sycamore lined creeks of Missouri, this species found a niche. But evolution did not prepare it for us. We dammed headwater creeks for livestock watering, and we eliminated streamside vegetation, we allowed erosion and pesticides to run off into the streams. We destroyed the aquatic habitat of this fellow creature.

Now, our mistakes have been manifested. The problems are recognized, and the solutions are available. But there are those who get stuck in the way things are done, and think that is the way things must be. We, however, are adaptable. We can change. And we should change, when it is demonstrated that what we are doing is destroying life.

And that is what scares the agribusiness organizations. They want change to be dictated by profits, not by concerns about some ostensibly useless piece of bait. The usual scare stories, based on half-truths and fabrications, were hauled out. But the truth is this: not one farmer in Missouri has gone out of business or lost any land because of environmental regulations or the Endangered Species Act. Not one. Changing techniques does not translate as an invasion of landowners rights. Such change does recognize that landowners have stewardship responsibilities.

Yes, the Topeka Shiner can be used as “bait.” Yes, it can be viewed as just a “food source” for larger fish. In the end, I suppose, everything is just bait. Including us. But, somehow, I would prefer to view life as a bit more intricate and involved, a bit more sacred, than treating everything and everyone as valuable only for nutritional content.

Chapter Conservation Committee Report

by Caroline Pufalt

Our Chapter Conservation Committee started off 1998 with a meeting that contained all the things that make the Sierra Club worthwhile. Well, almost all.

We had lively discussions on important conservation issues, we celebrated our successes, we tried to meet our challenges, and we met with an important new state agency head. We even got outside for a group picture and after the meeting we enjoyed sharing food and stories of outings and conservation struggles.
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We were pleased to have Steve Mahfood, new Missouri Department of Natural Resources director, address our group. Mr. Mahfood affirmed his commitment to environmental protection and described the challenges of managing a large and sometimes controversial agency.

We had a long and sometimes vigorous discussion of the issue on the April 1998 national ballot regarding immigration policy. Attendees discussed both whether immigration levels were appropriate for our country and whether the club should have a policy on those limits. The deciding vote was cast as five for alternative “B” (no policy on limits), two against, and one abstention. We then passed this result on to the Executive Committee, recommending that they endorse alternative “B”. They later voted unanimously to endorse “B.”

We discussed the upcoming legislative agenda. Joe Engeln, chair of the Legislative Committee, has been doing an impressive job of keeping up with the relevant bills and providing the committee with understandable summaries. We then endorsed positions on several of the bills and left a few for “wait and see.” Ken Midkiff, our lobbyist, will carry forth our concerns.

Missourian Roy Hengerson is also a member of the national Sierra Club Board of Directors. He often reports to our committee regarding national level club issues. As national Sierra Club Treasurer he can tell us more about the Sierra Club budget than we may want to know, but we were pleased to hear that the club is expected to have ended the year in the black and that the national budget items directly affecting the Chapters are not scheduled for significant adjustments in 1998.

In other conservation news, Ron McLinden reported on attending the governor’s Total Transportation Conference. Caroline Pufalt reported on the delay of forest planning for the MTNF and on a long sought victory in the closing of two roads in a sensitive area of the forest. We also noted that August 1998 will be the 20th anniversary of the defeat of the Meramec dam. We encouraged members to write letters on behalf of the Big Muddy Wildlife Refuge and the endangered Topeka Shiner. Thanks to Troy Gordon for his work in our chapter’s response on these issues.

Ben Jones has been appointed Chapter Political Chair for 1998 but was unable to attend the January meeting. Outgoing Political Chair Chris Hayday asked that we consider taking a position on the upcoming U.S. Senate race.

The committee also voted to support an initiative petition for achieving campaign finance reform. The chapter has in the past endorsed efforts by the Missouri Alliance for Campaign Reform (MACR) to pass related legislation. Given the difficulty, some would say impossibility, of passing effective reform via the legislative route, the MACR group has proposed a petition to place the issue before the voters. The Ozark Chapter is only one of many groups participating in this effort.

The next Chapter Conservation Committee meeting is scheduled for March 1 in Columbia. Our Chapter Executive Committee will also meet in Columbia on February 28. For the past two years the Chapter Conservation Committee and Executive Committee have met on separate weekends. But after some discussion we are changing our schedules so that the two committees meet on the same weekend. This is similar to the arrangement we had in previous years. In April we will meet the weekend of April 18 and 19 in Kansas City. Conservation and Executive Committee meetings are open to all Sierrans.
Steve Mahfood Named New Director of DNR

by Ken Midkiff

A long-time Sierra Club member and friend of the environment, Steve Mahfood, has been tapped by Governor Mel Carnahan to serve as the Director of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources. David Shorr, the previous Director, resigned as of December 31, 1997, to pursue a private legal practice.

Mahfood has been with the State Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA) for thirteen years and served as the Director for the past several years. The EIERA is within the Department of Natural Resources, so Mahfood is well acquainted with the responsibilities and the personnel in the various divisions.

The Ozark Chapter gave Mahfood the “Public Official of the Year” award in 1993, in recognition of his work for environmental protection. The Ozark Chapter was involved in supporting the Governor in this appointment. Steve Mahfood has a broad and deep knowledge of environmental issues, and he has demonstrated his commitment to protecting our natural resources and human health. We look forward to working with him in areas of mutual concern.

Legacy

What will yours be? You joined the Sierra Club because you are concerned about the well-being of the Earth. Continue your involvement by remembering the Sierra Club in your will. For more information and confidential assistance contact John Calaway, Sierra Club Planned Giving Program, 85 Second St., 2nd floor, San Francisco, CA 94109, (415) 923-5538, or locally, contact Roger Hershey (816) 795-7533.

From left to right: Roy Hengerson, Chapter MRCC Delegate and National BoD Member; Gale Barros, Secretary and Council Delegate; Bob Sherrick, Newsletter Editor; Wallace McMullen, Computer Chair; Rebecca Schedler, Membership Chair; Gina DeBarthe (in front), THB Group Rep; Chris Haiday; Ginger Harris (in front); Keet Kopecky, Chapter Chair and Treasurer; Ben Jones, Political Chair; and Ron McLinden, Transportation and Urban Issues Chair.
Why We Need a Comprehensive U.S. Population Policy

When the Sierra Club Board adopted in 1996 a “no position” stance on immigration, it failed in its mission to “Protect America’s Environment.” Since then the Club has focused on human rights and consumption. While laudable, ignoring the 60% of U.S. population growth caused by current legal immigration is like trying to heat a house with the windows open. Passage of the petitioners’ referendum only returns the Club to the pre-1996 population policy.

Sierra Club excuses to avoid the immigration issue center around: 1. globalism over nationalism, and 2. political correctness over environmental correctness.

Club statements are illogical:

President Adam Werbach stated, “Immigration is not an environmental issue.” However, population does impact the environment.

The Club stated: “Restrictive immigration quotas will not end the human-rights abuses that drive millions around the world from their homes.” However, most immigrants are not driven from their homes by abuses, but come to America for jobs to raise their standard of living. Help to improve the status of the world’s poor has to be implemented where they live.

Because immigration levels since 1965 are significantly higher than historic levels, we have had to build many more schools, sewage plants and roads. If present levels continue, population in 2050 will be nearly 400 million. Imagine what our environment will be like then!

The Sierra Club immigration referendum is simple. Vote for either: “A” a sustainable American future; or “B” never-ending U.S. population growth, driven principally by immigration.

For an 8-page booklet detailing our position, write Sierrans for U.S. Population Stabilization, PO. Box 2399, Berkeley, CA 94702, or phone (510)841-3688; or visit our web-site: www.ecofuture.org/ecofuture/susps/

Endorsed by:

Anthony Beilenson, U.S. Congressman 1977-1996
Lester Brown, President, Worldwatch Institute
Herman Daly, co-founder, International Society of Ecological Economics
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Ozark Chapter Supports Alternative “B”

By Roy C. Hengerson

At its January 24 meeting, the Ozark Chapter Executive Committee voted unanimously to support Alternative B on the immigration/population ballot question which will be on the 1998 Sierra Club (National) election ballot. Alternative B supports the current Club position, adopted by the Board of Directors in February, 1996, to take no position on specific immigration levels and policies.

The acrimonious debate over immigration levels and quotas has been raging across America. While there is no doubt that population is an environmental issue, the Sierra Club can better address this issue in a global, comprehensive way that avoids the polarized and emotional discussion over specific immigration policies.
Global Problems Need Global Solutions

This spring, you have a chance to strengthen Club policy against overpopulation. You also have a chance to reject policy that wrongly targets immigrants as the cause of our environmental problems.

There are two measures on the Club’s ballot:

“Alternative B” tackles the root causes of overpopulation, pollution, and the loss of wilderness. It addresses immigration as a symptom of overpopulation.

“Alternative A” requires the Club to focus on immigration and immigrants as an environmental problem.

Oppose Alternative “A”

New immigration restrictions won’t stop timber, mining, and oil companies from destroying our environment.

Immigration restrictions won’t stop global overpopulation; restrictions only shift symptoms from place to place.

“A” distracts us from effectively pursuing our environmental mission.

Because of “A,” members are quitting in unprecedented numbers and the media has never been so hostile.

“A” Alienates Crucial Allies

“A” creates the perception that immigrants cause America’s environmental problems.

To many, “A” is discriminatory. We shouldn’t ignore this concern. Latinos, African-Americans, and Asian-Americans are key partners in our battle to protect America’s environment.

“B” Fights Overpopulation

“B” focuses our energy on real solutions to overpopulation by:

◆ Providing 300 million families globally with access to family planning.

◆ Reducing the annual 1,600,000 U.S. unplanned births — a number far higher than total immigration.

◆ Advocating education and equality for women — keys to lowering birthrates.

“B” is the Grassroots Position

Local volunteers began advocating this position in 1992. “B” has since gained support at every level of the Club through a democratic process.

Vote for “B”

“B” is endorsed by:

Adam Werbach, President

cont’d on page 26… “Alt. B”

Sierra Club leaders have been struggling with the immigration/population policy matter for many years and came up with the current position after extended debate in the Club yielded no specific policy that could receive the support of a significant majority of Club members and activists. If we are mandated to come up with such a policy, as Alternative A requires, many other critical Club conservation campaigns will not receive the resources and attention they need. In addition, we will lose valuable allies in the environmental movement, who will be distressed over the Club’s actions in this highly sensitive area of public policy.

Unsustainable human population growth is a global problem and must be addressed in a global context. Our current policies and positions enable the Sierra Club to achieve significant progress over time on these issues. You are urged to support Alternative B on the immigration/population ballot question on your 1998 Sierra Club election ballot.
Alt. A... cont’d from page 24

Brock Evans, former Sierra Club
Associate Executive Director; former
Vice-President Audubon Society

Dave Foreman, co-founder Earth
First!

Dorothy Green, founding President,
Heal the Bay

Marilyn Hempel, Executive Director,
Population Coalition of the Leagues
of Women Voters

George Kennan, former U.S.
Embassador to the Soviet Union

Martin Litton, former Sierra Club
Director, John Muir Award

Farley Mowat, author, Never Cry Wolf

Norman Myers, senior advisor, United
National Population Fund

Gaylord Nelson, founder, Earth Day;
U.S. Senator 1963-1981

Charles Remington, co-founder ZPG

Galen Rowell, author, nature
photographer

Stewart Udall, Secretary of the
Interior 1961-1969; Counselor
Grand Canyon Trust

Captain Paul Watson, co-founder
Greenpeace; founder Sea Shepherd

E. O. Wilson, conservation biologist,
Harvard; author, The Diversity of
Life
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Board of Directors

Former Presidents:
Robbie Cox
Sue Merrow
Denny Shaffer
Richard Cellarius
Joe Fontaine

Additional others:
Council of Club Leaders (70-1)
Sierra Club California
Sierra Club Canada
Sierra Student Coalition

National Committees:
Population
Environmental Justice
Political

Chapters:
Angeles Chapter
Lone Star Chapter
Ozark Chapter

Regional Conservation Committees:
Midwest RCC
Southwest RCC

Joni Bosh, Arizona, Former VP,
Conservation
Kathy Fletcher, Washington, Former
VP, Conservation

Susan Heitman, Chair, Outings
Committee
Santos Gomez, Population Committee
Elden Hughes, Muir Award Winner
David Wells, Alabama, Chair, Council
of Club Leaders
Rep. Peter Kostmayer, Zero
Population Growth*

Brent Blackwelder, President, Friends
of the Earth
Dolores Huerta, Co-Founder, United
Farm Workers*

Carl Anthony, President, Earth Island
Institute*

Hazel Wolf, National Audubon
Conservationist

Communities for a Better
Environment
Ruth Kaplan, Former E.D.,
Environmental Action
Peter Frumhoff, Union of Concerned
Scientists*

* Identification Only

Additonal information:
http://www.igc.org/sierrapop
Without their commitment to the wild places of this earth, photos like this would be impossible. Join us!

Your Name ________________________________________________________________
Address ___________________________________________________________________
City / State ___________________________ ZIP ________________________________
☐ Check enclosed (made payable to "Sierra Club") ______________________________
Phone (optional) __________________________ E-Mail (optional) ___________________
Cardholder Name __________________________ Card Number ____________
Expiration Date ________________

MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIES

INDIVIDUAL  JOINT
INTRODUCTORY ...... ☐ $25
REGULAR ............ ☐ $35 ....... ☐ $43
SUPPORTING ........... ☐ $50 ....... ☐ $58
CONTRIBUTING ...... ☐ $100 ....... ☐ $108
LIFE ................... ☐ $750 ....... ☐ $1000
SENIOR ................. ☐ $15 ....... ☐ $23
STUDENT ............... ☐ $15 ....... ☐ $23
LIMITED INCOME ... ☐ $15 ....... ☐ $23

Contributions, gifts or dues are not tax deductible; they support our effective, citizen-based advocacy and lobbying efforts. Your dues include $7.50 for a subscription to SIERRA magazine and $1.00 for your Chapter publications.

Protect America’s Environment
For our Families...For our Future

Enclose check and mail to:

Sierra Club
P.O. Box 52968, Boulder, Colorado, 80322-2968
Eastern Missouri Group

Feb 28-Mar 1 (Sat-Sun) Trail maintenance on the Ozark Trail. We will take up where we ended last year: tread work, clipping, and wind fall removal. Common commissary. Menu suggestions welcome. Bob Gestel (314) 296-8975.

Mar 1 (Sun) Three mile afternoon hike in Jefferson Barracks County Park. Come enjoy the fresh air and good fellowship as we walk by historic buildings and on part of the paved hiking trail. Marsha Armentrout (314) 892-4279.

Mar 7 (Sat) Day hike to Amidon Conservation Area to see Castor river shut-ins and granite glades. Stream crossing included. Kevin Hunter (314) 544-5157.


Mar 8 (Sun) A surprise hike to an igneous dome mountain top in the St. Francis Mountains. This is a 6-8 mile hike that has not been done as a Sierra Club hike and is a real challenge. Limit 10 people. Paul Stupperich (314) 429-4352.

Mar 8 (Sun) Ozark Trail hike, Trace Creek Section between highways A and 32. A special prize for the hiker who can find long lost Peters Cave, shown on the trail map. Wayne Miller (314) 569-0094.


Mar 11 (Wed) Beginners backpack planning meeting at 7:30 pm at the club office. We will discuss equipment: where to buy it, rent it, and borrow it. It is not necessary to own or buy any equipment. Bob Gestel (314) 296-8975.

Mar 13 (Fri) Evening hike through Kirkwood historic neighborhoods. Approx 3-5 miles. Optional dessert and coffee afterwards. Suzanne Smith (618) 281-4762 (after 6 pm, weekdays only).

Mar 14 (Sat) Visit Graham Cave where humans lived 10,000 years ago. We will walk from the cave to the Loure river to look for early spring wildflowers, glades, bluffs and waterfalls. Approx. 4-5 miles. Moderate pace for beginners and others. Kathy Wodell (314) 240-0675.


Mar 14-15 (Sat-Sun) Glade restoration at Meramec State Park. Removal of Eastern red cedar will allow the return of many native grasses and wildflowers that attract birds, butterflies and other wildlife that are adapted to glade and savanna. Come one day or both. Penny Holtzmann (314) 487-2738.

Mar 14-15 (Sat-Sun) Overnight backpack trip on the Berryman Trail. We will make an early camp and do some exploring in the Mark Twain Forest. Common commissary. Rich Krebs (314) 939-4436, and Bob Gestel, 296-8975.

continued on next page
Mar 15 (Sun) Enjoy a nice March day at Meramec State Park. Hike about six miles. Paul Stupperich (314) 429-4352.

Mar 15 (Sun) St. Patrick’s sunset hike at Castlewood State Park. Show you’re green. Bring an Irish song or some other blarney. Dinner follows. Elmer McNulty (314) 965-3181.


Mar 21-22 (Sat-Sun) For forest watchers. Spend the weekend or a day hiking and motor touring the Rolla-Houston district of the Mark Twain National Forest with the forest watchers. See scenic areas and timber management practices. Car pool from St. Louis. Ann Eggebrecht (314) 725-1560, or Hank and Katie Dorst (417) 932-4623.

Mar 21-22 (Sat-Sun) Trail maintenance. Come and enjoy the earliest spring flowers and do a little good on the Ozark Trail. Bob Gestel (314) 296-8975.

Mar 28-29 (Sat-Sun) White water races on the St. Francis River. The Sierra Club provides judges for the slalom races through the rapids of Millstream Gardens. We need volunteers for one day or both. Free camping nearby at Silver Mines. This is a fun weekend and your chance this season to join this human community repairing a biotic community at Washington State Park. Come one day or both. Penny Holtzmann (314) 487-2738.

Apr 4-5 (Sat-Sun) Glade restoration. Last chance this season to join this human community repairing a biotic community at Washington State Park. Come one day or both. Penny Holtzmann (314) 487-2738.

Apr 11 (Sat) Highway cleanup. Remember the importance of removing the trash before tonight’s full moon. Diane DuBois (314) 721-0594.

Apr 11 (Sat) Weldon Spring. We will hike the back loop of the Weldon Spring trail, a distance of 8.2 miles. Lots of bluff views of the Missouri river and the KATY trail. This is a great place for white trillium which, hopefully, will be in bloom. Kathy Wodell (314) 240-0675.

continued on next page
Outings Continued

Apr 11-12 (Sat-Sun) Explore Taum Sauk Mountain State Park. We will explore Profit Mountain and Church Mountain. Be there or be square. Paul Stupperich (314) 429-4352.

Apr 18 (Sat) New members get acquainted hike at Powder Valley Nature Center. This hike is for new and old members. You can hike a mile and a half or three miles on the paved hiking trails as we get acquainted. Take time to visit the Nature Center, too. Marsha Armentrout (314) 892-4279.

Apr 18 (Sat) Water quality monitoring at Creve Coeur Creek, including chemical testing and macro invertebrate sampling. We need trainees to help us in this important project facilitated by Mo. Dept. of Natural Resources and Mo. Dept. of Conservation. Leslie Lihou (314) 726-2140.

Apr 18 (Sat) Wildflower hike at St. Francois State Park. Easy walk. This hike always fills up, so call early to reserve your place. Bring your wildflower field guide and plan on an informative outing. Jack and Pat Harris (314) 894-9021.

Apr 18-19 (Sat-Sun) Trail maintenance. We may begin a new loop trail from Himont Tower site to the Ozark Trail and back. Come out and be a trail blazer. Common commissary. Any suggestions welcome. Bob Gestel (314) 296-8975.

Apr 19 (Sun) Day hike to search for wildflowers at Emaneneger County Park. Diane Favier, (314) 894-5549.

Apr 25-26 (Sat-Sun) Sam A. Baker State Park. Car camp Saturday night at modern campsites. Hike the Mudlick trail on Sunday for 12 miles through a park that rivals Hawk. Steve Viggers, (314) 984-8752.

May 1-3 (Fri-Sun) Prairie State Park. Easy backpack on the prairie. We will visit other nearby prairies. Kathy Wodell and Diane Favier, (314) 894-5549.

May 2-3 (Sat-Sun) Backpack trip at Ha Ha Tonka State Park. We will follow a new backpack trail with some possible cross country. Limit 12. Stacy Bernard (314) 965-9624.

Osage Group

Mar 7 (Sat) Map Reading Course. How to navigate to that perfect wild spot, or at least not get too hopelessly lost. Meet at 10 am at the Sierra Club office (Silver Key Plaza at 914 N. College Ave., Ste. 1) for work shop, shade grown coffee and bagels followed by “feet on” experience in the woods. A great opportunity to get ready for spring and summer trips. Randal Clark (573) 875-0514.

Mar 12 (Thur) SPRING WILDFLOWER WALKS with Randal Clark. This weekly spring excursion has become a tradition in Columbia. This year Roxie Campbell, Rockbridge State Park naturalist, will join Randal in showing us the succession of spring flowers in the Rockbridge–Three Creeks areas. Meet at 5:30 pm at the Rockbridge –Devil's IceBox parking lot. Dinner at a local restaurant after the walk. Randal Clark (573) 875-0514.

Mar 14 (Sat) Hike the Devil's Backbone Trail of Mark Twain National Forest. Meet leader Elaine Schilare, (573) 659-3583, at 9 am at Pine Ridge campground a couple of miles east of Cedar Creek on Highway Y.

Mar 19 (Thur) Spring Wildflower Walk. See Mar 12.

Mar 26 (Thur) Spring Wildflower Walk. See Mar 12.

Mar 28 (Sat) Annual Spring Sierra Club New and Old Member Party and Pot Luck. Join us at Marion Mace's home for dinner and festivities. 7 p.m. 1995 ElDorado. (573) 875-2916.

continued on next page
Outings Continued

Mar 28-29 (Sat-Sun) Spectator Sports Sierra Club Style. Grip the edge of your rock, enjoy the spring in the granite mountain of the St. Francis River area. Hike, camp, party! Join us to enjoy, from the bank, the annual White Water Races at Silver Mines. Call Daryl Meller by Mar 22 if interested. (573) 395-4267.

Apr 2 (Thur) Spring Wildflower Walk. See Mar 12.

Apr 4-5 (Sat-Sun) Early Spring on the Jacks Fork River. An overnight canoe trip. Daryl Meller (573) 395-4267 or Kay Stewart (573) 445-0114.

Apr 9 (Thur) Spring Wildflower Walk. See Mar 12.

Apr 11 (Sat) Hike Three Creeks State Forest. Meet at 9 am at the Highway 63 Roadside Park just north of Ashland. Elaine Schilare (573) 659-3583.

Apr 11-12 (Sat-Sun) Birdwatching and canoeing. A joint outing with the Columbia Audubon Society. Trip size is limited. Susan Hazelwood (573) 445-4925.

Apr 10-12 (Fri-Sun) Spring in the Arkansas Ozarks. Base camp with backpacking options in the Sylamore Creek area. Randal says this is THE most spectacular Ozark stream and the right time for peak wildflower displays. Kay (573) 445-0114 or Randal (573) 875-0514.

Apr 16 (Thur) Spring Wildflower Walk. See Mar 12.

Apr 18-19 (Sat-Sun) Canoe an Ozark stream. Kay (573) 445-0114.

Apr 20 (Mon) Vernal Equinox Hike and Pot Luck. This is substituting for the bimonthly Full Moon event! Meet at Ken and Julie Mikk’s, 1005 Belleview Ct. at 6:30 PM to hike a scenic nearby trail followed by pot luck dinner. Call for more information at (573) 815-9250 or (573) 442-5570.

Thomas Hart Benton Group

Mar 20-22 (Fri-Sun) Backpack the Big Piney. A spring trip to one of the most beautiful trails in the Midwest, on a ridge above Paddy Creek in south-central Missouri. Leave Kansas City on Friday evening and return Sunday evening. A moderately strenuous trip. Jeff Pierce (913) 599-3966.

Apr 4 (Sat) Wildflower Hike at Trice Dedman and Wallace State Park. Wander among the wildflowers in two woodland communities, then stop for lunch in historic Plattsburg. Keet Kopecky (816) 966-9544.

Apr 25 (Sat) Cycling the Katy Trail. Come for a leisurely ride along the Katy Trail near Rocheport. The trail is really flat, and you can rent bikes at the trailhead. LeeAnn Googe (816) 453-8558.

May 2 (Sat) Tour Historic Watkins Mill. Scenic beauty, a steam-powered Civil War-era woolen mill, delightful weather - this trip has it all. Anne McDonald (913) 441-2449.