

## Timber views counter those of ecologists

Sixty-two million acres of roadless wilderness gives environmentalists and the timber industry quite a bit to argue about.

If some environmentalists get their way, says Jim Stratton of the University Survival Center, all acres in the Forest Service land under consideration would be designated wilderness.

But if loggers such as Dave Birwell of Roseburg's Rosboro Lumber Co. had to decide, the land would be opened to log trucks and chain saws.

The decision will be left up to Congress later this year, but it's a safe bet both groups will work hard to swing the votes in Congress their way.

"Some citizen groups are meeting to determine where the priority areas are and some kind of bill will come out of that," says Stratton. "Then we are going to wait for the congressional hearings."

Birwell says pressure from environmentalists will result in more wilderness than is necessary.

"Whenever a senator from the home state puts up land for wilderness it comes through fairly well, because to senators from other states, it's no skin off their backs."

Birwell adds that there is already a proportionally high amount of wilderness in Oregon.

"Right now there are over 16 million acres of wilderness, which is equivalent to an 8-mile-wide strip across the United States, but more than 10 million of those acres are in the Western coniferous forests, which is barely over 10 percent of the land base," he says. "Something's haywire as hell."

Conversely, Stratton says not enough land is wilderness, and the senators may even take some away.

Hatfield (Sen. Mark Hatfield, R-Ore.) has a bill that would take some wilderness areas and make them non-wilderness. The reason, says Stratton, is that Hatfield "gets a lot of money from timber companies when he runs for re-election, so naturally he's got timber people on his mind — that's just one of the realities of politics."

Stratton and Birwell also disagree about multiple use.

"Multiple use means that the forests are used for all purposes possible; wood, water, wildlife and forage. With wilderness there is only one use," says Birwell.

"You get your best quality uses out of a wilderness area," counters Stratton. "You get your best water quality, your best fisheries and in reality, timber production screws-up the other uses."

Birwell says old-growth forests eventually destroy themselves and environmentalists are wrong when they think they are preserving the forest for the future.

"Like every living thing, the forest must die, and the death of a forest is not a pretty thing," he says.

Wilderness is also a state of mind, not an official designation, Birwell says. "Wilderness is for those who think the spirit of the pioneer lives on and that you can go into an area without seeing anyone," he adds. "There will always be those places anyway."

Stratton says this non-wilderness attitude is typical of loggers and Forest Service employees.

"They went to school to learn how to manage the forests, so that's what they do," says Stratton.

Birwell argues that leaving land as wilderness makes it difficult to manage the remaining timber lands and that timber will become more scarce.

"The timber baron died after World War II and timber stocks are notoriously poor earners, but the people who own timber now are going to be wealthy because the wilderness people are going to make them that way," Birwell says.

# Oregon day

## Congress ponders which RARE II figures add up

Stories by  
MARV FJORBEC  
and KEN SANDS  
Of the Emerald

What environmentalists and timber interests disputed and what economists' calculations couldn't settle, Congress must now decide.

The second Roadless Area Review Evaluation (RARE II) will soon begin winding through Congress, and federal legislators will face an army of witnesses and a barrage of economic data supplied to help them decide which lands will be left wild and which will be opened for roads.

With a long trip ahead, the program has an even longer history. The evolution of RARE II began in 1972, with an attempt to identify those areas best suited for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

But that RARE I proposal inventoried too few lands and so RARE II emerged in 1977. New data and opinions were gathered from then until last fall, and in January the foresters released their updated version of the study to Congress.

But the new program has hardly brought peace. Instead, controversy has broken out over the method used in judging land status.

In one camp is Oregon Student Public Interest Research Group's Randal O'Toole. The Oregon State University forestry graduate advocates adding a strict economic analysis of the RARE II proposal.

In another camp are the U.S. Forest Service's own economists, who defend their proposal by noting their development of indexes rating

economic potential for lands under consideration.

Complicating their work are economists such as Oregon State's Kenneth Gibbs, who criticizes methods used by O'Toole's study and the federal government's work.

All three will begin to bend the ear of Congress as soon as subcommittee hearings get under way to decide which, if any, of the forests in the 62-million acre Forest Service proposal should gain wilderness status.

Meanwhile, the Carter administration is putting together its own proposals on the Forest Service's ideas, while the Senate has already begun its hearings. The House is set to begin work on the proposal in the next couple of months.

Economically, the battle lines drawn for the Congress will be based on making money from timber sales while still reaping the non-monetary benefits of any given area. But the method used to judge those values is being disputed by economic researchers such as O'Toole and the Forest Service's own team of money managers.

"The Forest Service ended up with a lot of data but no way to put it together," O'Toole says. "Unless you put a dollar amount on it, you've got nothing to hold it together."

O'Toole contends the Forest Service had no economic analysis on its RARE II proposal, which makes its findings misleading.

"They don't want to take the time to get the data," O'Toole charges. "They want to go in there and cut. They're not willing to sit down and go over these economic details."

In an initial economic model of RARE II completed last spring, O'Toole predicted a combination of 30 areas which the Forest Service wants to develop for timber will lose nearly \$1.5 million in maintenance and development costs each year if they are developed for timber. And that, O'Toole adds, could be inflationary.

Additionally, O'Toole says 30 other areas couldn't be managed on a sustained yield basis without losing more money.

"But it's a moot point as far as the Forest Service is concerned. They made the decision last May that they weren't going to do an economic analysis, and it was irrevocable," maintains O'Toole while advocating the Forest Service apply dollar amounts to its proposal.

But O'Toole's work has drawn fire from both Forest Service and non-government economists, who say his study is misleading.

"What is wrong with his analysis is that he polarized people by making two growth rates," says Gibbs, a former Forest Service worker. Gibbs wrote in a reply to O'Toole's work that the study had used two growth rates in judging what economists call "benefits from preservation as opposed to development." That error may have skewed the findings back toward the environmentalist point of view, Gibbs says.

"That kind of erroneous analysis does more harm than good," Gibbs maintains.

But neither does Gibbs agree with the work of the Forest Service economists, whom, he says, were also slightly inaccurate in detailing the vari-

ous costs and benefits of wilderness allocation.

"On the other hand," Gibbs explains, "it wasn't an economic analysis because they didn't evaluate all the uses. But, whether they put it in dollar terms or not, it's still an economic analysis because it still looks at the trade-offs, the costs and benefits."

Judging those trade-offs isn't a difficult chore when dealing with items that go through markets, Gibbs says, because prices can be compared. The project gets a little rougher, however, when economists have tried to gauge non-market items.

"In wilderness," Gibbs says, "people get benefits whether they use it or not, so it's more than just environmentalists versus timber interests."

"If we could figure out how to judge the worth of those things, immediately, a lot of us would be out of work."

Among the items that must be rated, Gibbs says, are the market items, plus the aesthetic benefits that are received without the market process.

"What they should analyze in RARE II is whether the foregone is worth the wilderness plus the other benefits," Gibbs says. "But they don't have the hard and fast numbers."

To get those numbers, Forest Service economists have tried to judge the utility of harvesting in one area by using indexes instead of dollars.

(Continued on Page 11)

## Oregon's federal legislators wait for mountain to come to them

While lobbyists for loggers and environmentalists scramble to prepare for congressional hearings on RARE II, three of Oregon's federal legislators are waiting for the mountain of information to come to them.

Aides to Fourth District Rep. Jim Weaver, a Democrat and U.S. Sens. Mark Hatfield and Bob Packwood, both Republicans, say their bosses want to look over most of the data, including expected Carter administration recommendations, before they decide.

"We prefer to wait until the administration makes recommendations" before making a commitment, says Hatfield press aide Jennifer Oldfield.

When those recommendations on how to allocate 62 million acres included in the Forest Service proposal arrive, Oldfield says Hatfield will evaluate them and then "will likely come up with a bill of our own."

Packwood and Weaver are holding their RARE

II cards just as close to their vests, although Weaver has long been a supporter of wilderness and conservation projects.

Packwood aide Bruce Hagan says Oregon's junior senator has yet to study the proposals in depth, while Weaver's Eugene aide, Ron Eachus, says the representative will consider a number of factors in assessing land status.

However the three legislators vote on the Forest Service's RARE II proposal, which will divvy up 62 million acres of land for wilderness and non-wilderness use, strict economic analysis won't play a major role.

Oldfield says Hatfield will consider economics of forest management when he views and later votes on the RARE II proposal, but profit won't be a controlling factor.

"We'll evaluate the uniqueness of the individual areas and its ecological system before deciding," Oldfield says, adding the amount of existing wildlife will also be a consideration for Hatfield.

Hagen of Packwood's office says they would support an economic analysis — if it didn't take too much time.

"Maybe the Forest Service didn't do a very good job (in its analysis of wilderness feasibility), but Packwood doesn't want RARE II left in the air. 'Uncertainty hurts here,'" Hagen added.

Packwood's economic concern centers on the effect creation of wilderness will have on specific localities. "Wilderness has a certain impact on the area and the effect will be very localized, like a mill shutting down."

Weaver, meanwhile, will concern himself with other factors that might not play strictly into the economics of wilderness or non-wilderness allocation, aide Eachus says.

"We ought to look more at reforestation and log exports as opposed to how much will be lost in wilderness areas," Eachus says. "The real timber supply problems tend to be reforestation problems."

OSPIRG and the Oregon Wilderness Coalition plan to celebrate Oregon's 120th birthday Wednesday with joint demonstrations against the Forest Service's RARE II proposals.

"Oregon Day" will feature a noon press conference in the EMU Forum Room, and slide shows throughout the day in addition to sales of buttons, bumper-stickers, T-shirts and cookies.

Randal O'Toole of OSPIRG says at least 30 roadless areas would lose money if used for timber harvest and would contribute to inflation. The public needs to be aware of this, he adds.

"Throughout the day we will be educating people about specific roadless areas," says O'Toole.

Slide shows will run throughout the day in front of Suite 1, in the lower lobby of the EMU annex. The sales booth will be in front of the University Bookstore and in front of Suite 1.



### CHINA BLUE RESTAURANT

#### MUSHROOMS WITH CORN

\$4.85

Chinese Black Mushrooms cooked with Corn and in a White Cream Sauce



#### China Blue

879 E. 13th Ave.  
343-2832

Hours  
Mon. - Thurs.  
11 to 10  
Fri. 11 to 11  
Sat. 5 to 11  
Sun. 5 to 10

## PEACE CORPS

### The toughest job you'll ever love.

See our recruiting representatives for information on current and future volunteer opportunities in 65 developing nations.

CONTACT: Bob Violetta  
UO Peace Corps Coordinator  
Hendricks Hall, Rm 18  
Tele: 686-3807 Daily 9 a.m.-1 p.m.

### Bong and Pipe Sale

20% off any pipe and 15% off any bong with this ad.

It's high time you hit Lazar's Bazar for the best bong selection in town. Over 100 different styles to choose from

Lazar's Bazar

1036 Willamette Street

687-9766



### emu Food Service

#### Cafeteria

11:00 a.m. - 1:30 p.m. Mon. - Fri.

Assortment of complete meals

Desserts	Meatless Dishes
Salads	Luncheon Specials
Juices	Sandwiches
Soft Drinks	Soups

Homemade Soup & Chili

