



# Pennsylvania Landowner

VOLUME IV • NUMBER 2

JUNE 1991

## Wetlands Reform In The 102nd Congress

by Congressman Tom Ridge

**"In a Mire with the Wetlands" . . . "Rogue Regulators" . . . "Common-Sense Wetlands Rules Urged" . . . "Protection of Wetlands Stirs Intense Debate."**

These are just a few of the recent headlines that have appeared across the country on the wetlands issue. The public furor building over current wetlands regulations combined with the upcoming debate on reauthorization of the 1972 Clean Water Act will hopefully prompt congressional action on this issue during this Congress. Such action is long overdue.

Recognizing the plight of many private property owners in Pennsylvania and personally frustrated by the nonsensical regulatory approach to wetlands, earlier this year, I introduced legislation to completely overhaul Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act requires individuals to file for Section 404 permits in order to carry out certain activities in navigable waters. However, the federal agencies with jurisdiction over the Act - namely the EPA, the Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - have broadened the definition of navigable waters to include wetlands.

---

*"Recognizing the plight of many private property owners in Pennsylvania and personally frustrated by the nonsensical regulatory approach to wetlands, earlier this year, I introduced legislation to completely overhaul Section 404 of the Clean Water Act."*

---

H.R. 1330, the "Comprehensive Wetlands Management and Conservation Act," is intended to restore fairness and balance to the current regulatory process by redefining the wetlands definition, classifying wetlands into three categories based on functions and values and providing for compensation to landowners when their properties are "taken." Additionally, this legislation provides for a streamlined and expedited permitting process, which emphasizes the conservation of high-value wetlands by providing incentives for private sector participation in restoration and enhancement efforts. I believe that these are positive first steps needed to protect a dwindling natural resource in a rational way.

The legislation was introduced on March 7, 1991 with approximately 53 co-sponsors from 24 states. At this writing, this legislation has the support of 125 co-sponsors from 36 states and continues to gain momentum. The legislative outlook looks promising in light of reauthorization of the Clean Water Act, which provides the window of opportunity for consideration of H.R. 1330. Should we garner support from two hundred and eighteen members - enough to ensure passage when the measure is brought before the full House of Represent-

tatives - this legislation could succeed as a free-standing piece of legislation. If not, consideration of the Clean Water Act will still provide an opportunity for the provisions of H.R. 1330 to be enacted.

The Public Works and Transportation Committee is already gearing up for consideration of the Clean Water Act. Hearings focused solely on the wetlands issue were tentatively scheduled for the third week in May, but will more likely occur in early June. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which also exercises jurisdiction over Clean Water, is expected to follow the lead set by the Public Works Committee in reviewing this issue. Thus, two important Committees will review this issue in the very near future. I will be testifying in support of H.R. 1330, along with a bipartisan coalition of supporters of the bill, in the hopes that this legislative solution will be accepted by members of both Committees either as a free-standing bill or as part of the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. Already, the legislation enjoys support from nearly half of the members of the Public Works Committee and the Merchant Marines Committee.

Despite this solid support from members of the House, agricultural groups, private property owners and several national associations, opponents of H.R. 1330 claim that the legislation is unnecessary. This contention is completely wrong. Although proposed revisions to the **Federal Manual for Identifying and Delineating Wetlands** are expected to be released in the next few weeks, I do not anticipate that these changes will fully address the current regulatory quagmire nor succeed in balancing the legitimate rights of private property owners with the need to protect precious wetlands.

A legislative solution is the only answer. You can do your part by urging your Congressman to co-sponsor H.R. 1330 and urging your Senators to support similar legislation. Additional co-sponsors provide the leverage that is needed to ensure consideration of this legislation during this Congress. We have the best possible opportunity before us because of the consideration of the Clean Water Act. I promise to do my part and lead the fight to gain positive consideration by the committees of jurisdiction and on the House floor. I hope you'll join me in this vital effort!

# CO-SPONSORS OF H.R. 1330

**ALABAMA**  
Sonny Callahan (R-1st)  
Bill Dickinson (R-2nd)  
Claude Harris (D-7th)

**ALASKA**  
\*Don Young (R-At Large)

**ARIZONA**  
Jim Kolbe (R-5th)  
Jon Kyle (R-4th)  
John Rhodes (R-1st)  
Bob Stump (R-3rd)

**ARKANSAS**  
\*Beryl Anthony (D-4th)  
John Paul Hammerschmidt (R-3rd)

**CALIFORNIA**  
Glenn Anderson (D-32nd)  
Randy Cunningham (R-44th)  
William Dannemeyer (R-39th)  
John Doolittle (R-14th)  
Robert Dornan (R-38th)  
Wally Herger (R-2nd)  
Duncan Hunter (R-45th)  
Jerry Lewis (R-35th)  
Al McCandless (R-37th)  
Ron Packard (R-43rd)

**COLORADO**  
Wayne Allard (R-4th)  
Joel Hefley (R-5th)  
Dan Schaefer (R-6th)

**GEORGIA**  
Doug Barnard (D-10th)  
Newt Gingrich (R-6th)

**GUAM**  
Ben Blaz

**IDAHO**  
Richard Stallings (D-2nd)

**ILLINOIS**  
Terry Bruce (D-19th)  
Jerry Costello (D-21st)  
Phil Crane (R-12th)  
Dennis Hastert (R-14th)  
Glenn Poshard (D-22nd)

**INDIANA**  
Dan Burton (R-6th)

**IOWA**  
Fred Grandy (R-6th)  
Jim Lightfoot (R-5th)  
Jim Nussle (R-2nd)

**KANSAS**  
Dick Nichols (R-5th)  
Jim Slattery (D-2nd)

**KENTUCKY**  
Jim Bunning (R-4th)  
Harold Rogers (R-5th)

**LOUISIANA**  
\*Jimmy Hayes (D-7th)  
Richard Baker (R-6th)  
Clyde Holloway (R-8th)  
Jerry Huckaby (D-5th)  
William Jefferson (D-2nd)  
Bob Livingston (R-1st)  
Jim McCrery (R-4th)  
\*Billy Tauzin (D-3rd)

**MICHIGAN**  
Dave Camp (R-10th)  
Guy Vander Jagt (R-9th)

**MINNESOTA**  
Jim Ramstad (R-3rd)  
Vin Weber (R-2nd)

**MISSISSIPPI**  
Mike Epsy (D-2nd)  
Sonny Montgomery (D-3rd)  
Mike Parker (D-4th)

**MISSOURI**  
Bill Emerson (R-8th)  
Mel Hancock (R-7th)  
Ike Skelton (D-4th)

**MONTANA**  
Ron Marlenee (R-2nd)

**NEBRASKA**  
Bill Barrett (R-3rd)

**NEVADA**  
Barbara Vucanovich (R-2nd)

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
Bill Zelliff (R-1st)

**NEW YORK**  
Ben Gilman (R-22nd)  
Amo Houghton (R-34th)  
John LaFalce (D-32nd)  
Dave Martin (R-26th)  
Mike McNulty (D-23rd)  
Bill Paxon (R-31st)

**NORTH CAROLINA**  
Cass Ballenger (R-10th)  
Howard Coble (R-6th)  
W.G. Hefner (D-8th)  
Martin Lancaster (D-3rd)  
Charlie Rose (D-7th)  
Charles Taylor (R-11th)  
Tim Valentine (D-2nd)

**NORTH DAKOTA**  
Byron Dorgan (D-At Large)

**OHIO**  
Doug Applegate (D-18)  
John Boehner (R-8th)  
Paul Gillmor (R-5th)  
Bob McEwen (R-6th)  
Michael Oxley (R-4th)  
Donald Pease (D-13th)

**OKLAHOMA**  
Bill Brewster (D-3rd)  
Mickey Edwards (R-5th)  
James Inhofe (R-1st)

**OREGON**  
Bob Smith (R-2nd)

**PENNSYLVANIA**  
Bill Clinger (R-23rd)  
Joe Kolter (D-4th)  
Joe McDade (R-10th)  
Austin Murphy (D-22nd)  
\*Thomas Ridge (R-21st)  
Don Ritter (R-15th)  
Richard Santorum (R-18th)  
Bud Shuster (R-9th)  
Bob Walker (R-16th)  
Gus Yatron (D-6th)

**SOUTH CAROLINA**  
Butler Derrick (D-3rd)  
Robin Tallon (D-6th)

**TENNESSEE**  
Bob Clement (D-5th)  
John Duncan (R-2nd)  
Bart Gordon (D-6th)  
James Quillen (R-1st)  
Dan Sundquist (R-7th)

**TEXAS**  
Joe Barton (R-6th)  
Jack Brooks (D-9th)  
Jim Chapman (D-1st)  
Larry Combest (R-19th)  
Tom DeLay (R-22nd)  
Jack Fields (R-8th)  
Pete Geren (D-12th)  
Greg Laughlin (D-14th)  
Bill Sarpalius (D-13th)  
Charlie Stenholm (D-17th)  
Charlie Wilson (D-2nd)

**UTAH**  
James Hansen (R-1st)

**VIRGINIA**  
Herb Bateman (R-1st)  
Rick Boucher (D-9th)  
Jim Olin (D-6th)  
Lewis Payne (D-5th)  
Owen Pickett (D-2nd)  
Norman Sisisky (D-4th)

**WASHINGTON**  
Rod Chandler (R-8th)  
Sid Morrison (R-4th)

**WYOMING**  
Craig Thomas (R-At Large)  
\*boldface denotes authorizing member

# Write Your Legislators!

Listed below are key congressional members who need to hear your views regarding wetlands legislation. These representatives serve on the committees having direct influence on proposed wetlands legislation. Members are urged to contact these individuals by submitting letters calling for support of H.R. 1330 and citing any wetland problems you have encountered or may be aware of. As always, members should continue to call or write their own congressional representative and U.S. senators seeking support of wetlands legislation addressing private property rights.

Address Letters to: Honorable \_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515

## REPRESENTATIVES TO CONTACT

### PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES

Henry J. Nowak, NY, Chairman	James A. Traficant, Jr., OH
James A. Hayes, LA	Bob Clement, TN
Rosa L. DeLauro, CT	Lewis F. Payne, Jr., VA
Douglas "Pete" Peterson, FL	Jerry F. Costello, IL
Glenn M. Anderson, CA	Mike Parker, MS
James L. Oberstar, MN	Thomas E. Petri, WI
Douglas Applegate, OH	William F. Clinger, Jr., PA
Robert A. Borski, PA	Ron Packard, CA
Peter J. Visclosky, IN	Helen Delich Bentley, MD
Frank Pallone, Jr., NJ	Cass Ballenger, NC
Ben Jones, GA	Frederick S. Upton, MI
Bill K. Brewster, OK	Bill Emerson, MO
Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., AL	Mel Hancock, MO
Joan Kelly Horn, MO	Susan Molinari, NY
Barbara-Rose Collins, MI	Frank D. Riggs, CA
Nick Joe Rahall II, WV	Charles H. Taylor, NC
Joe Kolter, PA	William H. Zeff, Jr., NH
Tim Valentine, NC	

## MERCHANT MARINE & FISHERIES

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Gerry E. Studds, MA, Chairman	Neil Abercrombie, HI
William J. Hughes, NJ	John F. Reed, RI
Earl Hutto, FL	William J. Jefferson, LA
Thomas R. Carper, DE	Ernie F. H. Faleomavaega, AS
Robin Tallon, SC	Don Young, AK
Solomon P. Ortiz, TX	Jim Saxton, NJ
Thomas J. Manton, NY	Howard Coble, NC
George J. Hochbrueckner, NY	Curt Weldon, PA
Stephen J. Solarz, NY	Wally Herger, CA
Frank Pallone, Jr., NJ	Porter J. Goss, FL
Jolene Unsoeld, WA	Arthur Ravenel, Jr., SC
Greg Laughlin, TX	Wayne T. Gilchrest, MD
Nita M. Lowey, NY	John T. Doolittle, CA
Glenn M. Anderson, CA	

## WRITE YOUR STATE LEGISLATORS TOO!

### CO-SPONSORS OF S.B. 982

Raphael J. Musto (D-14)	Robert C. Jubelirer (R-30)
Michael D. Fisher (R-37)	Jeanett F. Reibman (D-18)
J. Barry Stout (D-46)	

### SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY COMMITTEE

David Brightbill, Chairman (R-48)	
Edward Helfrick, Vice Chairman (R-27)	
Edwin Holl (R-24)	Patrick Stapleton (D-4)
Stewart Greenleaf (R-12)	J. Barry Stout (D-46)
James Rhodes (R-29)	J. William Lincoln (D-32)
James Greenwood (R-10)	Robert Jubelirer (R-30)
Raphael Musto (D-14)	Ex-officio
Minority Chairman	

Address Letters to: Honorable \_\_\_\_\_  
Main Capitol Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120

# WRITE YOUR LEGISLATORS!

Below are two sample letters to assist you in writing your legislators.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1991

The Honorable \_\_\_\_\_  
United States House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman \_\_\_\_\_ :

As a member of the \_\_\_\_\_ Subcommittee, you will soon have an opportunity to correct a major economic burden that has been placed upon private landowners throughout the country. I am familiar with the Hayes/Ridge bill (HR1330) and believe that it offers the best alternative to protecting our valuable wetlands while respecting the property rights of the individuals who own the wetlands. I urge you to carefully consider this bill and support it with your vote.

I believe present policy must be changed. (If you know of a local horror story, recite it.) Currently, any property that the government declares to be a wetland becomes virtually useless. A property containing wetlands is next to impossible to sell, or to use as collateral. Those lands not currently cropped may not be altered in any way for future farm production or use of any kind. All we can do with wetland property is pay taxes and mortgage payments on it. It is simply not fair to require landowners to individually finance and maintain wetlands for the benefit of the rest of the world.

Please do what you can to get this bill enacted into law.

Thank you,

Name

\_\_\_\_\_, 1991

The Honorable \_\_\_\_\_  
Senate of Pennsylvania  
Main Capitol Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dear Senator: \_\_\_\_\_ :

I am requesting the Senate Environmental Resources & Energy Committee, of which you are a member, to give serious consideration to several inequities currently associated with S.B. 982, the Wetlands Mapping & Protection Act.

Presently the bill requires property owners who have been denied a permit for land use to proceed through the court process to determine if a taking has occurred. Landowners already have this right. The problem lies in the fact that most cannot afford this long and costly process. Additionally, property owners don't feel they should be required to forego this procedure when both the state and federal constitutions guarantee them the right to own and use property. Furthermore, no deed restrictions have been made known to current wetland owners, and court precedence has already proven that wetland permit denials constitute "takings" of private property. I would urge you to correct this inequity by mandating that permit denials create "takings" of private property and until recorded in deeds, current owners should be compensated if denied land use.

I would also request that the excessive costs associated with mitigation requirements be addressed. Current costs will not allow for most landowners to use land they have already bought and paid for.

Additionally, I feel that one **sole** state agency, such as the DER should be given authority to handle the wetland program. Too many agencies involved in the process has been a primary problem, such as the PA Fish Commission who also regulates wetlands.

In closing, I feel that it is necessary to create uniformity with federal guidelines to create a truly workable wetland program, and that final state legislation should contain a requirement that state legislation cannot exceed federal requirements.

Thank you for your attention and consideration to this matter.

Name

# "Wetlands Issue Addressed At State & National Levels"

1991 will be an extremely important year for private property ownership rights. Your property rights entail certain personal freedoms regarding what you do, or choose not to do with your property. In 1991 Congress will address the need to reauthorize the Federal Clean Water Act, including section 404, which deals with the issue of wetlands. To date, several proposals have been introduced in Congress and at this time, your individual attention and quick response is pertinent to the federal and state bills presently in committee, awaiting approval for enactment.

Of the approximate 15 federal bills introduced this session, H.R. 1330 has been targeted as the "lead" bill, known as The Comprehensive Wetlands Management and Conservation Act of 1991. Introduced by Congressman Jimmy Hayes of Louisiana and Congressman Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania, H.R. 1330 provides a concise and structured program for the identification and delineation of wetlands based upon their functions and values for regulatory purposes. Additionally, the bill balances the need for the effective and complete protection



Authorizing sponsors of H.R. 1330 Congressman Jimmy Hayes (left) and Congressman Tom Ridge (right).

of the nation's truly important wetlands while addressing the needs for essential community growth and the constitutional rights of private landowners.

The state bill, known as S.B. 982, and introduced on April 23, 1991 by Senator David Brightbill is referred to as the Wetlands Mapping and Protection Act. This bill recognizes the importance of establishing classifications of wetlands; however, the balance between "no net loss" of wetlands and the justification for private

ownership rights is not addressed.

The following analysis of federal and state legislative proposals may help recognize the provisions of each bill. On May 8, 1991, the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association testified before the Senate Environmental Resources & Energy Committee in Harrisburg regarding S. B. 982. Public hearings are tentatively scheduled for early June with the Public Works and Transportation Subcommittee on Water Resources concerning H.R. 1330 in Washington, DC. The Pennsylvania Landowners' Association will also submit comments to this committee regarding proposed federal legislation.

## H.R. 1330/Hayes-Ridge

1. Provides mandatory compensation for type "A" wetlands (exceptional value) at the option of the owner, as well as an appeal process for any permit denial in a class "B" wetland where a permit must first be secured. No permit required for type "C" (ordinary value) wetlands.

2. Legislative definition given to wetlands rather than a regulatory definition. Surface water must be present for 21 consecutive days, as well as "obligate" or water dependent plants being found on site.

3. Places limits on permit fees. \$10.00 non commercial, \$100.00 commercial.

4. Places wetland authority with one federal agency, the Army Corps of Engineers, to eliminate interagency contradictions.

5. Defines in law what constitutes "normal farming" and silviculture practices, according to the Secretary of Agriculture in consultation with the Extension Office for each county.

6. Federal bill states the need to address the health hazards of wetlands, as well as the benefits.

7. Will record wetland classifications on property records.

8. Expedites the permitting process by imposing time limits.

9. Allows for public hearings regarding wetland classifications.

## S. B. 982/ Brightbill-Musto

1. No mandatory compensation for permit denials. Property owners would be required to go through the court process (Court of Common Pleas) to determine if "taking" had occurred. This would be at considerable expense to the property owner. Funding proposed through a bond issue to purchase exceptional value wetlands at **state's discretion** through condemnation.

2. Will follow regulatory definition currently in place until legislative definition is obtained. This may cause problems if state mapping occurs prior to federal legislative definition being implemented.

3. No permit fee limits.

4. Does not delegate one sole state agency to handle the state program. State law should eliminate the PA Fish Commission and any other state agency from having regulatory authority over wetlands.

5. Waivers included for certain farming practices in areas that have been in use in the last 25 years. "General" permits required for other various practices such as ponds, minor drainage on sloping cropland, grassed waterways, terraces and diversions and other activities if part of a conservation plan approved by a county conservation district.

6. State bill only promotes education regarding wetland values, does not recognize health hazards.

7. Same

8. Same

9. Same

*It should be noted that the excessive costs of mitigation requirements for private landowners is still of concern. Additionally, state legislation should contain a provision requiring that state guidelines cannot be more stringent than federal requirements.*

## Rogue Regulators

It seems everyone wants to save the nation's wetlands — the environmentally correct term for swamps, bogs and marshes. In his first State of the Union message, George Bush pledged there would be "no net loss" of wetlands while he was President. The problem is that federal bureaucrats have decided to crack down on alleged wetland losses without bothering to wait for Congress to decide which of 50 definitions of wetlands should be written into law.

Using creative legal interpretations, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers are devaluing many properties without compensation, saddling builders with lengthy delays and boosting housing costs. In the infamous John Pozsgai case, a 58-year-old grandfather is now serving a three-year prison term for improving a lot he bought that was filled with 7,000 old tires.

The EPA and the Corps have been so eager to implement the Bush "no net loss" wetlands policy (a phrase, incidentally, with no discernible meaning) that they have undertaken a slew of enforcement actions even though there is no actual wetlands law on the books. Section 404 of the 1972 Clean Water Act required permits for discharging material into "navigable waters." Imaginative bureaucrats developed a federal manual arbitrarily extending Section 404 so that any given site qualifies as a wetland if it meets only one or two elastic standards for the presence of wildlife, vegetation or soil wetness.

Bernard Goode, who headed the Corps regulatory office until 1989, told Reason Magazine that the parameters were drawn very broadly; moreover, the burden of proof that a site isn't a wetland is squarely on the property owner. No wonder environmentalists claim that the new definition includes most of the eastern half of the U.S. and 40% of drought-stricken California. Among the areas the EPA and the Corps now regulate as wetlands are: landlocked potholes where water collects for a week each year, small landscape depressions, man-made agricultural ditches and pine forests.

Armed with their creative definition of wetlands, federal bureaucrats are creating nightmares for property owners across the country:

- A Pennsylvania family learned that they couldn't sell their 127-acre ancestral farm valued at \$190,000 after it was labeled a wetland. The government offered no compensation.

- Brian Newman, a North Carolina builder, bought 28 acres of land in 1985. About five were wetlands. His project would

have disturbed only 1.4 acres, but it took four years and thousands of dollars to secure a permit.

- The developer of a housing project on Long Beach Island, N.J., was denied a permit for his 11-acre property, effectively rendering it worthless. He recently won a \$2.6 million judgment against the government.

The Corps of Engineers claims that it receives 14,000 requests for wetland permits a year and approves 97% of them. But the Corps also requires most applications to be revised and frequently takes years before it deems an application "complete." And if the Corps were to compensate landowners for their wetland-designated property, the price tag would be shocking. To save 600 acres of marginal wetlands in Staten Island, N.Y., would cost \$400 million in compensation and \$1 billion in new storm drains.

Alarmed by the rogue actions of the wetlands bureaucracy, 90 Members of Congress have signed on to a bill of Reps. Thomas Ridge (R, PA) and Jimmy Hayes (D, LA) to finally codify wetlands policy into law. It would exclude from regulations areas that didn't meet a reasonable definition of wetlands and focus protection efforts on the most valuable land.

Up to now, the EPA has been treating landowners as if they were villains out of Dick Tracy. Last December, agency enforcers circulated a memo inside the agency promoting a "Wetlands Enforcement Policy." It called for a "first 'wave' of publicity" on wetlands enforcement to begin this coming week with a press conference highlighting a "cluster" of enforcement actions. The EPA now says the press conference has been delayed, and the manual defining wetlands is being "rewritten."

Congress shouldn't count on a more rational EPA to run wetlands policy even if Members do pass some ambiguous standards into law. Congress has made a habit of leaving the details of legislation to the regulators. And they have become used to being a law unto themselves.

The only way to both preserve genuine wetlands and protect property rights may be to appoint enough judges who will properly interpret the takings clause of the Constitution. If the government wants to protect every stray pool of water, let it write a check to pay for the privilege. The status quo subjects too many people to abuse from regulators in zealous pursuit of their own definition of the public good.

— Reprinted with permission of the *Wall Street Journal*. Copyright 1991. Dow Jones & Company, Inc. All rights reserved. April 17, 1991 Edition.

## Newsworthy Notes

- For those following the John Pozsgai case (the Hungarian immigrant jailed in Allenwood Prison for cleaning up a dump labeled as a wetland) it will be of interest to note that over 10,000 signatures were collected by PLA members and other property rights organizations for submittal to President Bush in protest of John's imprisonment and the current wetland regulatory program. Additionally, "Current Affair" did an excellent piece on John's case on April 22, 1991. The Washington Legal Foundation was also filing a commutation as we went to press, seeking a presidential pardon for John. Members are urged to support this commutation by writing to President Bush at: The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20500. If preferred, members may phone the White House at (202) 456-1111. Phone operators will take your messages for the President. Do your part! Write or call today!

- In a recent court ruling regarding the government's alleged jurisdiction over 90 acres of Missouri farmland belonging to farmer Allen Mosely of Rothville, Missouri, the FARMER WON! Justice Department lawyers for the case contested the government had the right to forbid use of the 90 acres of farmland belonging to Mosely after they declared his "DRY" land "WETLAND." This would have financially ruined the small farmer. Jurors deciding the case obviously agreed it was ridiculous to consider Mosely's property "WETLANDS" and to forbid use of the property because of such. The case was decided on April 19, 1991 in United States District Court in Hannibal, Missouri.

- Those following the Gaylen Snowman case in Coudersport, PA will be pleased to know the government has dropped all charges against this PA potato farmer for alleged violations related to disposal of chemical containers in a farm dump. After a thorough investigation, the government conceded no illegal activity had occurred and that containers were properly disposed of. All this torment and injustice was due to a disgruntled employee who wanted to cause problems.

## "PROPERTY RIGHTS ISSUE GAINS ATTENTION"

"The Private Property Rights Act is quickly becoming one of the hottest topics of discussion on Capitol Hill", according to Senator Steve Symms. Senate Bill 50 is currently pending in the Senate Government Affairs Committee with 38 co-sponsors, over a third of the Senate. In addition, more than 30 conservation, agriculture, recreation, sportsmen and citizen organizations are backing the bill. Senator Symms stated he recently has been asked, "... if we already have the Fifth Amendment, why do we need the Private Property Rights Act?" The answer is simple. The Constitution's Bill of Rights limits the power of government to control property without offering compensation. But currently, if you feel this right has been abused, your only recourse is to sue. The Private Property Rights Act instructs agencies to respect private property (and to pay compensation when necessary) before they regulate, so that you don't have to sue to secure your own rights.

In addition, on March 21, 1991, a bipartisan group of 73 Members of the House of Representatives joined together to introduce H.R. 1572, a House version of Senate Bill 50. This bill will force government agencies to consider the impact of their regulations on private property rights. To encourage prompt passage of this critical legislation members should contact the Committees of Referral: Committee on Government Affairs, John Glenn, Chairman, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Judiciary Committee, Jack Brooks, Chairman, United States House of Representatives, 2449 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515. Committee on Agriculture, Kika de la Garza, Chairman, United States House of Representatives, 1401 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515.

### ORGANIZATION SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 50

American Agriculture Movement  
American Agri-Women  
American Farm Bureau Federation  
American Forest Council  
American Forest Resource Alliance  
American Mining Congress  
American Paper Institute  
American Sheet Industry Association  
Blue Ribbon Coalition  
Citizens for a Sound Economy  
Competitive Enterprise Institute  
Fairness to Land Owners Committee  
Greater Yellowstone Conservation Districts\*  
Land Improvement Contractors Association  
Landowners Association of North Dakota

National Association of Realtors  
Nat'l Assoc. of Reversionary Prop. Owners  
National Cattlemen's Association  
National Farmers Organization  
National Forest Products Association  
National Grange  
National Inholders Association  
National Milk Producers Association  
National Water Resources Association  
Outdoor Advertising Association of America  
Pennsylvania Landowners' Association  
S.T.O.P. of Indiana  
The Fertilizer Institute  
U.S. Chamber of Commerce  
Washington Property Owners Association

## PA Lumber Company Deals With Environmental Terrorism

By Mary Wirth

Walter Weaber and Sons, Inc., a sawmill in Lebanon, PA, recently reported what they call an act of environmental terrorism. The company was in the process of harvesting timber on a sale on private property in Washington County, MD. The day after Thanksgiving, Walter Weaber and Sons, and the property owner received anonymous phone calls stating the trees on the sale had been spiked to prevent harvesting.

Mark Golitz, Resource Forester for the company, stated "The caller referred to the road the sale was on and said the trees were spiked along the road." In fact, as the harvesting took place spikes were found in almost every tree on the 200 acre sale.

Mr. Golitz continued, "We harvested the trees anyway and brought them to the yard where we went over them with a metal detector. As the last logs came through in March we had removed spikes

from just about every tree." He stated he saved the spikes and is taking them to a legislative dinner sponsored by the Hardwood Lumber Manufacturers Association of PA to show first hand that the threats to loggers and mill workers are real and need to be dealt with.

Congressman William Clinger, R-PA, the ranking member of the Energy, Environment and Natural Resource Subcommittee, introduced in the House a bill that would make tree spiking a federal crime. In California, a spike in a tree caused a saw blade to explode seriously injuring a mill employee. As a result, Congress passed legislation making it illegal to spike trees on federal land. Clinger's bill (HR 1185) would make it a federal crime wherever it occurs, protecting private property as well, and would ban convicted individuals from ever entering federal lands. It also establishes a reward for information leading to the conviction of a tree spiker.

## REGIONAL DIRECTORS APPOINTED

New Regional Directors have recently been appointed by the PLA Board of Directors. These individuals are persons active in their own area of the state and concerned about diminishing private property rights. Members located in or near these regions of Pennsylvania should contact these individuals with newsworthy information relating to property rights issues or with questions related to prob-

lems in their geographic area.

Greg Snowman, Coudersport, PA - (814) 274-9355  
Mary Wirth, Kane, PA - (814) 837-8944  
Eva Foster, Westtown, PA - (215) 399-1846  
Victoria Pozsgai-Khoury, Morrisville, PA - (215) 295-9554  
Ted Ochs, Lucinda, PA - (814) 744-9301

Members may also contact the association's public affairs consultant in Harrisburg at (717) 234-8814. Additionally, members in need of legal help regarding wetlands problems or any other environmental issue may contact the association's counsel at Buchanan Ingersoll, P.C. Contacts are John Ward in Harrisburg at (717) 237-4815 or Hank Ingram in Pittsburgh at (412) 562-1695.

## PLA HAVING AN AFFECT

In recent months, PLA has been the target of the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs through their past president, Mr. Leonard Hess. Mr. Hess has written a totally defamatory article on the PLA and submitted it to several Pennsylvania newspapers and environmental organizations for reprint. Found below is a copy of his article which appeared in the **Port Allegany Newspaper**. A longer version of this article recently appeared in the "**Sylvanian**," the newsletter for the PA Sierra Club, as well as the newsletter for the PA Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs. A reprint of the Association's response to this letter is also found below, as well as additional letters which were submitted to the editors of these publications by concerned individuals and which were received by the PLA office. Space limits printing all of the positive letters received by the Association's office criticizing Mr. Hess and his unprofessional letter filled with untruths. However, it should be noted that this letter is proof of the progress the Association has made in relation to property rights issues and wetlands in particular. Lies and deceit have often been used by individuals such as Mr. Hess as a last desperate attempt to discredit notable intentions of organizations such as PLA.

— Editorial Staff

### Is PLA A Wolf In Sheep's Clothes?

Dear Editor:

Perhaps the most dangerous anti-environmental organization ever to arise in this Commonwealth is the PA Landowners' Association.

It masquerades as a group of small farmers and landowners concerned about the loss of property rights to governmental regulation, particularly those regulations concerning protection of wetlands. Their basic philosophy seems to be that it is the right of every property owner to do as they please with their property, regardless of the impact this may have on the greater good of society as a whole.

Who is the PLA? Are they really beleaguered family farmers who are being regulated out of existence by the government? Let's take a closer look.

The PLA charges \$500 a year for a corporate membership, and that membership list includes the Rochester and Pittsburgh Coal Company, Brookville Wood Products, Robert Brace Farms, Inc., K & J Coal Company, Troyer Farms, and Troyer Potato Products, Inc.

Business members of the PLA pay \$100 per year, and include: Brown Timber and Land, Canterbury Coal Company, Cubbon Lumber, Mead Oil Company, Fisher Real Estate, Mortenson Gravel, Corry Peat Products (peat is obtained by excavating wetlands), Shannon Land and Mining Company, Wayde Cisney Lumber Company and many others.

The PLA's associate members include: the Independent Gas and Oil Association of New York, the Builders Association of Metropolitan Pittsburgh, the PA Coal Association, the PA Association of Realtors, the PA Potato Cooperative, the Allegheny Hardwood Utilization Group, and the Hardwood Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Even a cursory glance at this partial membership list reveals that the PLA is not a group of family farmers. Indeed, it is an organization of corporations and industries that historically have profited from the exploitation of the land and its products.

They have very deep pockets, political sophistication and a vested interest in overturning most of the environmental protection laws and regulations we have fought so hard for.

Where does it end? Is it the right of the property owner to strip for coal without reclaiming the land? Is it his right to buy hazardous waste on his property and then sell that land for housing developments, as was done at Love Canal?

Can he discharge mine acid, drilling brine, or raw sewage into streams and groundwater without concern for others? Can he rape and pillage the land simply because he is the present owner?

The PLA is rapidly growing in membership, power and political influence across the state and nation. We, as members of local, state, and national environmental organizations had better get our collective heads out of the sand, or we will be run over by bulldozers!

Leonard E. Hess

Immediate Past President

PA Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs

***"It takes your enemy and your friend, working together, to hurt you to the heart; the one to slander you and the other to get the news to you."***

**— Mark Twain**

### PLA REBUTTAL

Dear Editor:

In response to a letter recently published in your paper from Mr. Leonard Hess of the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs regarding the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, we would like to offer a few remarks.

Mr. Hess chants a litany of devastation that he alleges is the work of property owners. He asks if coal can be stripped, hazardous waste buried, mine acid and raw sewage discharged into streams. If he is the least bit aware, he should know that all, and more, of such activity is carefully monitored and/or prohibited by an army of government regulators. He accuses the landowner of wanting the right to rape and pillage the land. This is typical demagogic rhetoric being constantly screamed by those who do not take time to learn the facts, or, if aware of them, choose to ignore any that refutes their cries of irresponsible accusations. It would be interesting to know how much of his own property Mr. Hess would sacrifice for the public welfare and whether or not he must rely upon his property for any support or survival.

In regard to his accusations related to corporations, businesses, and other associations who are members and support the causes of PLA, we would note that it is discriminatory on the part of Mr. Hess to think that these members do not merit the same rights to private property as he or any other small individual landowner. In addition, Mr. Hess should be aware that the majority of our members are small private landowners owning anywhere from a suburban lot to 200 acres.

In regard to the Association's "deep pockets" Mr. Hess may be interested in knowing that much of the work involved with the organization is offered by volunteers concerned about their eroding property rights. Maybe if Mr. Hess would have accepted an invitation offered by the PLA three years ago to discuss the concerns of landowners with the Sportsmen's Federation, unwarranted accusations such as his would not be taking place.

Finally, Mr. Hess sounds the alarm for the members of local, state, and national organizations to get their heads out of the sand! We agree - for if their heads are in the sand, they not only do not know what is going on, they are undoubtedly in violation of a wetland regulation of one kind or another!

PLA Board of Directors

## Rebuttals (Cont.)

Dear Editor:  
(Sierra Sylvaniaian)

I am personally insulted by the article of Len Hess in your Feb./March issue on the PA Landowners Association. I am a member of the PLA, I am not a large company (although I have nothing against them as they are comprised of people like you and working to make a living). I am not a farmer. I am not even a landowner (except a small home lot). I am simply a person who believes in the Constitution of the U.S. and the right to own private property which is the foundation of our nation.

This is a prime example of criticizing a group without even taking the time to understand their beliefs or viewpoints. And since Mr. Hess obviously is upset because this group is using posting as a tool to educate, he attacks and unfairly misrepresents the organization because he disagrees with its actions. It is so easy for groups to disagree without taking the time to put yourself in those peoples shoes and try to understand their beliefs. This is now prejudices of all sorts of people exist.

Mr. Hess makes it clear he disagrees with the right of Americans to own property. That, I'm afraid, is not an issue to be taken up with the PLA but your federal government. This right is fundamental to American freedoms and is not the issue.

The issue is the fact that these landowners have bought their land, pay taxes on it, and are now expected to give it up with no compensation . . . You say it doesn't happen? I recently wrote a newspaper article on a 65 year old widow who owns a 125 acre farm in Erie County. She had the farm up for sale for financial reasons and got an offer of \$190,000 contingent upon passing wetlands tests. Well, a private lab in Erie tested the property and found 90% fit the wetland criteria in the federal manual although there is no swamp or marsh area on the property. The sale offer

was withdrawn.

Now, explain to me how this is justice. This woman paid over \$150,000 for the property plus taxes for 13 years. She still owes \$72,000 on the land and it is now worthless due to wetland regulations. I wonder how many of your members would be cordial at being forced to donate \$190,000 to the wetlands cause. This is not a unique case.

The PLA takes the stand that our Constitution requires just compensation for government taking of property. And in those cases that go to court the courts agree with them. That does not make them "anti-environment." Landowners are some of the most dedicated environmentalists alive. Who in their right mind would pollute and destroy their own property?

I am very disappointed an organization such as the Sierra Club would print such a biased and non-factual article. I can only assume you follow such standards for all your articles. Nothing is ever black or white and any organization that blatantly ignores the fundamental philosophy of another organization must fear that that philosophy makes sense and therefore should not be told.

It frustrates me when such battle lines are drawn instead of cooperation and a search for common ground. People should always, at the very least, be willing to listen to other viewpoints and try to understand their reasoning. You would be surprised when you stop focusing on the differences how much we all have in common!

Sincerely,

Mary F. Wirth  
Kane, PA

Dear PLA:

I'm certain you've seen this article by now, but I've enclosed it anyhow. "Dedicated To Environmental Destruction — PA Landowner's Association" which appeared in the Sierra "Sylvaniaian."

I had, until I saw this article, wondered why so much anger was displayed against the environmental groups at the meetings I've attended. With such one-sided articles as this I'm no longer surprised. The article seems to go off on a number of emotional tangents that are not relevant to the landowners issue. I'm certain Len Hess has strong ideals or he wouldn't be so vocal; I always have respect for someone who speaks out, whether I'm in agreement or not.

The Sierra attack demonstrates the impact that the PLA

is having. I hope both sides can control the anger and work within the system we have.

The identification of corporate membership only demonstrates the obvious bias: in prejudices against businesses - it doesn't convince me of anything. We still need to protect wetlands, while protecting ownership rights and values.

I attended the recent Waterford meeting that Ridge spoke at. It was informative as usual.

Larry Walden  
Waterford, PA

EPA now has a hotline number for individuals to contact regarding environmental issues and regulations. Interested individuals may contact EPA HOTLINE 1-800-832-7828.



Lorraine Bucklin

The Pennsylvania Landowners' Association recently retained the services of Lorraine Bucklin for the position of Assistant Executive Director. Lorraine accepted the position in March of 1991, and prior to joining the association, served as the manager for the Chamber of Commerce in Harborcreek, Pennsylvania.

Her background includes project

coordination with local governments, public relations, and business administration. Ms. Bucklin currently resides in Harborcreek, Pennsylvania and was a long time resident of the Findley Lake area.

Lorraine will occupy the new PLA office located in the Troyer Executive Office Building located in Waterford.

# TRESPASS

By Ben Love

The right of exclusion is an important stick in the proverbial bundle of property rights. A property owner has the right, in most cases, to exclude others from his land. Frequently, landowners are met with requests for land access from students, scientists, recreationists, conservation groups, and government agents. In the past, most landowners have felt these intrusions were harmless and land access has been easily acquired. Unfortunately, the ghosts of these past 'guests' have returned to haunt the landowner in the form of studies, theses, reports, etc. that support endangered species listings, National Natural Landmark sites, Natural Areas, wetlands, National Park and Refuge expansion plans, and other "environmentally sensitive" themes that more often than not result in government land acquisition or land use controls.

In far West Texas, a grassroots organization, the Davis Mountains Trans-Pecos Heritage Association, has recognized the seriousness of the problem. Its members represent over five million acres of land much sought after by the state and federal governments. To deal with the trespass problem, our group has formed a Land Access Committee which has published some guidelines for land access.

Among the principles the Land Access Committee imparts to our members are:

1. You can say "no" if approached by someone for access to your land. If that person has some legal right to be there, then he should be able to prove that he is entitled to legal access. If he cannot, then "stick to your guns" and say "no".

2. If you feel inclined to grant permission, follow the Land Access Recommendations prepared by the Land Access Committee as follows:

Ask for a letter from the requester stating:

- The NAME of the requesting party, his TITLE, and his AGENCY or ORGANIZATION,
- A description of the exact PURPOSE of the proposed visit,
- The NAMES, TITLES, and ORGANIZATIONS of all the persons who would be present,
- The DATE and TIME of the proposed visit,
- The EXACT LOCATION to be visited.

This will give you an opportunity to evaluate the validity of the request, verify the identity of the persons involved, and, if you wish, consult with your attorney. In most cases you may grant or deny access to anyone as you see fit; however, due to recent environmental developments and threats, you are advised to exercise extreme caution in allowing anyone on your land who is not well-known to you.

If, after following the above steps and after obtaining the necessary information, you determine that the person requesting access should be allowed on your land, the Land Access Committee additionally urges you to accompany that person (or per-

sons) so as to verify that they do exactly as they represented. If you are unable to accompany them, you should have a responsible person do so. Then, after each entry, make notes of exactly what happened, where, and when.

Then, ALWAYS request a copy of any report or other documentation that results from any field survey, study or investigation.

3. It is important to be aware that often government agencies will "piggyback" once one agency acquires land access. For example, if land access is granted to a state game commission biologist, a U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service biologist might tag along and collect data with the state biologist. Also, keep in mind that information gained by one agency is often simply handed over to another.

4. It is not only essential to guard the front gate of the property, but the back gate must be watched as well. Information gained by illegal trespass is nonetheless "information".

Recently, in West Texas, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service proposed an endangered species listing for an aquatic plant, the Little Aguja pondweed. When the landowners and the Davis Mountains Heritage Association challenged the listing, we learned that information the Service relied upon was provided by persons who had never acquired permission to be on the property! The Service has taken the position that information is information regardless of its source. The National Park Service has likewise used land information from persons who did not have permission to be on the land.

5. Educate those in authority in your county to the problems with trespass. Davis Mountains Trans-Pecos Heritage Association vice president Dick Hughes has embarked on a campaign to educate local law enforcement officers, county attorneys, and county judges on the seriousness of the scientific trespass issue.

6. And finally, if you feel the trespass violation is serious enough, press charges with your local law enforcement officials.

As one West Texas rancher put it, "I'd rather have a ring of cattle thieves on my ranch than a mischievous biologist. The cow thieves will only get away with a few cattle, but the biologist will help the government make off with the whole darned ranch!"

.....

*Ben Love is a 4th generation cattle rancher from Marathon, Texas. He owns and manages the San Miguel Cattle Co. and is an attorney with experience in real estate and natural resource law. Mr. Love is President of the Davis Mountains Trans-Pecos Heritage Association, and is Chairman of the Endangered Species and Wildlife Subcommittee (Private Lands Committee) of the National Cattleman's Association. Ben Love, P.O. Box 387, Marathon, TX 79042.*

*Reprinted with permission of Land Rights Letter. Copyright: 1991.*



# POSTING FOR SUPPORT IMPLEMENTED NATIONALLY

## WHY SHOULD YOU GET INVOLVED?



In 1988, The Pennsylvania Landowners' Association initiated a member "Posting" program designed to generate education and public awareness regarding unjust governmental land use policies. The program, known as "Posting For Support," has been instrumental in reaching thousands of individuals unaware of the excessive land use restrictions being placed upon private property. Many of these restrictions often reach the point of becoming confiscatory in



nature and are viewed by thousands of private property owners throughout the country as being unconstitutional.

Land use restrictions governing endangered plant and animal species, archaeological sites, scenic rivers, scenic roads, and wetlands are just a few samples of environmental land use restrictions initiated to force private property into a "preserved" status for the purpose of providing scenic, cultural, and health benefits for societal purposes. And while property owners do not object to conserving areas targeted as **truly environmentally sensitive**, they do object to the manner in which these initiatives are being achieved — at the expense of private landowners. Generally, none of these restrictions are mentioned in deeds at the time of purchase, and subsequently, private landowners have invested life savings and years of paying property taxes into land which they are now unable to use. And what has been exceedingly difficult to understand is the attitude portrayed by many major environmental and sportsmens' organizations stating that they believe these types of confiscatory programs are legitimate and good. Thus, another reason for our posting for support program.

Through this program, landowners have been given the opportunity to reach "grassroots" recreationalists and environmental interests to explain the hardships being placed upon private landowners, and solicit their support of private ownership rights. Participating landowners can require membership of those individuals seeking private land access. This program not only offers educational benefits to members, but supplies the organization with needed funds to continue its legislative goals in seeking fair property rights legislation.

The program has also been initiated nationally through our national property rights affiliate, the Environmental Conservation Organization (ECO). Several property rights organizations in other states such as Wisconsin, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Colorado, Florida, North Dakota, Missouri, and Tennessee are networking through ECO and have also initiated this program to continue much needed education at the grassroots level.

It is hopeful that sometime in the future we may initiate a law in Pennsylvania where private landowners won't have to "post" their property to protect their rights. But in the meantime, legislators, recreational users, and environmental interests need to continually be made aware of the unfair land use policies being imposed upon private property owners and of our unwillingness to relinquish our constitutional right to own and use private property.

Many thanks to those participating in the posting for support program. Your involvement has helped the association to achieve public awareness regarding land use issues and solicit membership among both landowners and recreational users alike. **For the sake of private property ownership, take pride in displaying your signs and make efforts toward keeping them neat and easily recognizable.**

*For those who are not yet a participant in this program and would like to become involved, signs may be ordered through the application in this newsletter, or by contacting the association's office. Additionally, it should be noted that not all environmental and sportsmens' organizations are oblivious to private property rights. Several Pennsylvania hunting clubs, as well as the Unified Sportsmen of PA, are supporting PLA members.*

## The hell raising nun

Her name is Sister Thomas More Bertels.

They call her the hell raising nun.

She has spent the last 25 years of her life trying to organize farm women because she believes they are the most potent political force American agriculture could ever unleash.

"If farm women were better organized," she says, "the family farm would not be an endangered species on the American landscape."

She believes the same is true of women in timber, mining, fishing, and oil and gas exploration.

"Women," she says, "get things done. Unlike their men, they are extroverts, and they are power hungry. They understand systems. They know how to work together, and they are not afraid to demand things of politicians. No politician in his right mind says to a woman, 'Don't call me, I'll call you,' because women will turn on them, like an enraged lioness defending her cubs."

Well now, as you might suspect, the Catholic church is not nearly as excited about Sister Thomas More's viewpoints as are the women she cajoles into action.

As a matter of fact, she has been blacklisted from speaking at church sponsored functions for saying things like this:

*"Who's gumming up free enterprise? Churches are. Churches go to bat for the underdog. 'Save the farmers,' they say. How do they want to save the farmers? They want more government intervention. While farmers are moving toward the market, churches are moving toward farming as a public utility."*

She is nonplussed about her blacklisting.

"I tried love for 20 years and nothing happened, so I got out of that racket," she laughs. "What the world needs now is not love, sweet love, but power, sweet power!"

"Power," she says, "is what gets things done," and in her view, there is a great deal that needs to get done quickly if America's timber and farming communities are to be saved from the wave of environmental hysteria she says is sweeping the country.

"This wave of environmentalism is the work of people who want to make radical changes in the economic, political, and religious systems which have been fundamental to our nation's progress," she declares. "These people want to destroy the free enterprise system and the democratic principles which have guided America since its founding."

Bertels does not come by this perspective out of hand. She holds a PhD in



Sister Thomas More Bertels

history from the Catholic University of America.

Her doctoral thesis, *The policy making process in agriculture*, became her calling 25 years ago.

"What I discovered was that agribusiness has been highly fragmented by a host of farming associations that don't know how to work together and, in some instances, actually compete with one another. Farmers, who are the risk takers and the entrepreneurs, got lost in the shuffle because they don't speak out and they don't know how to make the system work for them. I believe God has called me to teach them how to become an effective political force."

Bertels teaches *Economics 101* and *The Power of Politics* at Silver Lake College in Manitowish, Wisconsin. Among her students, as well as her followers, she teaches what she calls "the gospel of free enterprise, entrepreneurship, and unity among those who feed, clothe, and shelter the nation."

"I come from a mining community," she says. "I haven't forgotten my roots, and I am not ashamed of them. I am proud of the fact that my father was a miner, and I am well aware of the contribution miners, loggers, farmers, and fishermen make to this nation."

"You know," she continues, "I asked to teach the economics class here at Silver Lake after I read the course book and discovered there was nothing in it

about our extractive industries. I teach about the extractive industries, even though it isn't in the book. How else will students learn about the role natural resource-based industries play in their lives?"

Bertels is deeply distressed about corporate America's pattern of giving to mainstream environmental groups.

"It's disgusting and inexcusable," she declares. "There are more gutless wonders in corporate America's board rooms than any other place I know of. They actually think they can buy off the environmental movement by giving it money. Who would you rather give your money to; someone who buys your product or someone who wants to put you out of business?"

In her opinion, there is only one way to deal with the environmental movement. "Farmers, ranchers, loggers, fishermen, oilfield workers, and miners are going to have to get their acts together," she declares. "The American people do not know what is going on or how it will affect their lives. They do not know where the products they enjoy come from or what it takes to produce them. Resource-based industries are going to have to learn how to work together, how to speak with one voice, how to work the halls of Congress much more effectively."

"In short," Bertels says, "resource-based industries and their grass roots groups need to learn how to play the power game."

"For too long now, you have assumed that patiently telling and retelling your story to the American people would create a groundswell of public support," she says. "That's simply not true. You must also apply pressure to the political process. Patience without pressure is perceived as paralysis."

In Bertel's opinion, strength in numbers is not, by itself, the answer either. She advocates a systems approach.

"If numbers were the answer, the environmentalists would not have any power because there aren't that many of them," she says. "Resource-based industries and their workers already have a system, if they would only use it. It is the distribution network that connects the extractors . . . the loggers, miners, and farmers . . . with the consumer through a network that touches virtually every business in America. Learn to use this system and you can create the political power base you need to make changes in the congressional process that is currently undermining your way of life and your livelihoods."

*Evergreen publication, August 1990.*

Recently, membership renewals for 1991-92 have been mailed to all current Pennsylvania Landowners' Association members. It is of primary concern that each member consider the monumental task the Association undertakes to inform and educate the public by defending the rights of private property ownership. We urge you to

take the necessary steps to help us retain the rights and privileges that have existed in our nation for over 200 years. It is your membership dollars that will enable us to continue our grassroots efforts against major environmental advocacy budgets as listed below.

## The "Green Machine"

In order by budget	Members	Budget	Dues		Members	Budget	Dues
1 The Nature Conservancy	600,000	\$156,100,000	\$15	16 Trout Unlimited	2,538,176		
2 National Wildlife Federation	975,000	87,200,000	15	17 Izaak Walton League	1,554,000		
3 Ducks Unlimited	550,000	67,400,000	20	18 National Toxics Campaign	100,000	1,500,000	15
4 Greenpeace USA	2,300,000	50,200,000	20	19 American Rivers	14,000	1,500,000	20
5 World Wildlife Fund	940,000	35,500,000	15	20 League of Conservation Voters	55,000	1,400,000	20
6 Sierra Club	560,000	35,200,000	33	21 Environmental Action	20,000	1,200,000	20
7 National Audubon Society	600,000	35,000,000	20	22 Earth Island Institute	32,000	1,200,000	25
8 The Wilderness Society	370,000	17,300,000	15	23 Rainforest Action Network	30,000	876,000	15
9 NRDC	168,000	16,000,000	10	24 Rainforest Alliance	18,000	750,000	20
10 Environmental Defense Fund	150,000	12,900,000	20	25 Citizens Clearinghouse HW	7,000	693,000	20
11 Sierra Legal Defense Fund	120,000	6,740,000		26 Sea Shepherd Conservation			
12 Defenders of Wildlife	4,082,459			Society	15,000	498,650	
13 Nat'l Parks & Conserv. Assn.	3,361,200			27 Earth First	15,000	150,000	20
14 American Wildlife Federation	100,000	3,300,000	25	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>7,769,000</b>	<b>547,143,485</b>	
15 Friends of the Earth	30,000	3,100,000	25				

• Compiled from: "Inside the Environmental Groups," *OUTSIDE Magazine*, September 1990, and The Political Economy Research Center.

## A NEW WRINKLE ON WETLANDS

If you touched a wetland (even a pothole in a field) after November 28, 1990, with an eye toward improving drainage or preventing the normal flow of water into it, you're technically out of program compliance — unless you restore it. If you are certified out of compliance, in addition to losing crop program

payments, you can lose a host of other benefits: Agricultural Conservation Program, Emergency Conservation Program, Water Bank Program, dairy refunds, dairy indemnity payments, wool and mohair payments, and livestock feed benefits are among them. Basically, you may continue to farm wetlands, low spots

potholes, etc., when they dry out. But you **may not improve** drainage or prevent normal flow of water toward the wetland. You may **maintain** or **repair current drainage** in or through the wetland, but you can't improve it.

*Doane's Agricultural Report, May 3, 1991*

## DER Unrolls More Red Tape On Wetlands Property Dispute

By Chuck Hayes

At first Barney Roberti, the Youngsville businessman who has been trying to obtain a permit to develop property he owns near Pittsfield, thought he had received the good news he had been waiting for.

Then he read the letter from the state Department of Environmental Resources further and saw the special conditions DER has attached to issuance of the permit.

Roberti had purchased the property between the gas station and church near the intersection of Rts. 6 and 27, with the original intention of developing a small retail plaza.

But he ran into so much difficulty with the state environmental agency, which regards the parcel as a wetland, that he scaled those plans back to include only his own woodworking supply store.

Although Roberti maintains that the property is only wet because of a collapsed PennDOT drainage pipe, DER has still refused to allow him to fill in the property so he can build. While DER contends the entire 1.14 acre parcel is a wetland, Roberti contends only about a third of the land is even wet.

On April 16, Roberti received in the mail from DER what he initially thought was the long-awaited permit which would allow him to fill the property and begin construction.

"It looks great until you read the special conditions," said Roberti.

Special Condition "D," for example, reads: "Permittee shall submit a 1.1 acre wetland replacement plan to the department for approval."

That replacement land and Roberti's plan for creating a wetland there must be constructed prior to filling in the land

Roberti already owns.

Special Condition "F" states: "Permittee shall monitor wetland replacement area for a minimum of two years. If created wetlands are not functioning after two years, remedial work will be required that will include, but not be limited to, regrading and replanting. Success will be achieved when 85 percent of the vegetation has survived after two years."

In essence, "I'm expected to buy land and have it approved by the DER as suitable to be turned into wetland," said Roberti. "I will then be committed for life with a blank check to the state of Pennsylvania to create and support this artificially created wetland. Nobody in the DER has been able to tell me why I must donate tens of thousands of dollars to the state of Pennsylvania for the right to use my own land in Pittsfield."

Roberti paid about \$20,000 for the property.

Roberti said that if he were to agree to the special conditions set forth by DER, which he has not, he would not be able to fill or use the land for a minimum of two years. At that time, after he has gone through the time and considerable expense of creating an artificial wetland, DER would then decide if he could use his property in Pittsfield.

Roberti wonders, "If the state of Pennsylvania has the knowhow and capability of creating wetland at will, what about their persistent statement that once wetland is lost it will be gone forever? Why are they condemning and taking private property when the state has thousands of acres of their own land and the ability to make wetlands any place they want?"

Reprinted with permission.  
Warren Times Observer, May 3, 1991.



"AND IT COMES WITH A  
GUARANTEED EXEMPTION FROM  
THE CLEAN WATER ACT."

## UNLESS ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS BEGIN MAKING SENSE, YOU MIGHT AS WELL LIVE IN A TREE.

- Current environmental law allows agencies of the government to restrict, and often prevent the use of privately owned land—without compensation to the landowner.
- Every landowner needs to convince Congress that environmental law must respect individual property rights and economic opportunity.
- Join PLA and make sense out of environmental legislation.
- Tell a friend.

PLEASE ENROLL ME AS A MEMBER OF PLA TO HELP SECURE THE RIGHT OF THE INDIVIDUAL WHILE WE RESPECT THE ENVIRONMENT.

X NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY, STATE, ZIP \_\_\_\_\_  
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT \_\_\_\_\_  
PHONE # \_\_\_\_\_  
ACRES OWNED (if any) \_\_\_\_\_  
COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_ TOWNSHIP \_\_\_\_\_

- WETLANDS VIDEOTAPE (VHS)**—  
"Our Environment, Whose Property?"  
\$15.00 Donation  
Please send me a copy of this limited edition PLA video tape.
- "POSTING FOR SUPPORT"** program — Yes, I wish to become a participant in this program. Please send me \_\_\_\_\_ signs. I have enclosed 40¢ for each sign ordered.
- PART** — Political Action Response Team — Yes, I wish to participate in this program sponsored through PLA's national affiliate ECO. Please put me on the PART mailing list.
- YES**, I will help the PLA to continue its fight to put **PEOPLE** back into the environmental equation, and to uphold the principle of private land ownership. Please find enclosed my contribution of \_\_\_\_\_.

Members are encouraged to participate in one of the following categories:

- |   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP</b>   | \$25.00                   |
| Any individual supportive of private property rights.   |                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP</b>  | \$50.00                   |
| Not-for-profit organization supporting property rights issues.                                    |                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>BUSINESS MEMBERSHIP</b>   | \$100.00                  |
| Any business entity supporting the free enterprise system and the principle of private ownership. |                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>SUSTAINING ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP</b>                                   | \$250.00                  |
| Inclusive of any corporate not-for-profit organization.   |                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>CORPORATE MEMBERSHIP</b>  |                           |
| Any corporation supporting the above classifications.   |                           |
| Sustaining \$500.00   | Gold Club \$ 5,000.00     |
| Silver Club \$1,000.00  | Platinum Club \$10,000.00 |

- **Enclose form with check or money order payable to:**  
**Pennsylvania Landowners' Association**  
P.O. Box 391  
Waterford, PA 16441

Please allow up to 4 weeks for delivery of membership card.

*Pennsylvania Landowner* is published as a member service by the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, Inc. (PLA) — Reproduction or use of editorial or graphic contents in any manner is welcomed with permission. To reproduce or to comment on newsletter content, change of address notices or subscription requests should be directed to the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, Inc., P.O. Box 391, Waterford, PA 16441, Telephone: (814) 796-3578 or Harrisburg, PA, Telephone: (717) 234-8814.

*Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, Inc.*

P.O. Box 391  
Waterford, PA 16441

BULK RATE  
U.S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
Permit No. 7  
Waterford, PA