



PENNSYLVANIA LANDOWNER

VOLUME V • NUMBER 3

SEPTEMBER 1992

Natural Heritage Inventory Programs

Another Scheme To Take Your Land?

In the June 1992 edition of Pennsylvania Landowner, it was reported that the Erie County Planning Commission, in conjunction with the Department of Community Affairs, appropriated \$35,000 for a "natural heritage inventory" study. The study, to be conducted by the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy (WPC) is to identify "significant" natural areas within the county. According to information released by the WPC, the purpose and intent of the project is as follows:

1. Aid county and local government in comprehensive planning, land use review, and decision making in areas where natural areas are located;
2. Assist federal, state, and local agencies in streamlining environmental permitting, thus avoiding costly delays for development activities;
3. Provide public and private interests with information which can lead to the ultimate protection and preservation of natural areas (examples: DER, state parks, local parks and recreation departments, and private conservation organizations);
4. Provide valuable information to the academic community;
5. Alert land developers to natural area locations so that development can be channeled around environmentally sensitive sites.

In discussions with local officials and Conservancy representatives, PLA has been informed that all counties within the state must have a revised comprehensive plan completed by the end of 1993. However, whether a county chooses to conduct an NHI study is entirely at the discretion of the county planning commission. To

◀ *Land use pertaining to many areas of private property, such as those adjacent to LeBoeuf Creek (shown to the left) could be affected by NHI listings.*



Erie County List of Areas Identified During Data Collection as Potential Natural Heritage Sites

date, information available reveals that 12 of the 67 counties within Pennsylvania have chosen to conduct a study. Of these, Butler, Delaware, Berks, Lancaster, Pike, and Monroe counties have completed their studies, while Erie, Clinton, Chester, Centre, Union, and Lycoming Counties are still in the process of evaluating sites.

In a letter to David Skellie, Executive Director for the Erie County Department of Planning, PLA expressed concerns and objections to the NHI study for a variety of reasons. Initial concerns centered upon statements made by the WPC stating they had legal authority to enter private, unposted land without obtaining landowner permission. This statement led to several media articles with the PLA, Erie County Farmers' Association and the WPC debating the issue of land access. Ultimately, the Conservancy conceded that, in fact, they did not have legal authority to enter private land without consent. PLA also stated in its letter to the commission that "depending upon a number of factors, the concept of a 'blacklist' of sorts or suggesting a de facto boycott raises serious policy and legal questions." PLA's ultimate concern is that once private property is officially designated without landowner consent on a map or official listing, this 'blacklist' of sorts may devalue private property. Furthermore, land use controls by federal, state, or local agencies may be imposed to preserve the property in its natural condition without compensation to the owner.

Landowners should be aware of the serious threats to property rights that NHI inventories can lead to and express their concerns to county officials, as well as to state and federal representatives. Furthermore, landowners should keep apprised on the national scope of this program. Information describing the use of this inventory system nationally, as well as a description of properties targeted for preservation in two Pennsylvania counties which are participating in the NHI program, are listed for review. Reprint of a letter received from a PLA member in Cumberland county also follows as a perfect example of the abuse and property value diminution that can occur with listings of this type. To inquire whether your property has been targeted for preservation, members should contact their local planning commission office.

- | | |
|---|--|
| West Lake Bluff | West Branch French Creek & E. Alder Brook Wetlands |
| Lake Bluff—Presque Isle Bay | West Branch French Creek #2 |
| East Lake Bluff | Drumlins |
| Lake Erie | SGL #191 |
| Presque Isle | SGL #191 Wetland Depression |
| Presque Isle Bay | SGL #167 |
| Coast Guard Station Erie | Weeks Valley Road Forest |
| East City Line Forest | Weeks Valley Forest |
| City Limits Open Space | Four Mile Creek Headwaters |
| Harborcreek Forested Lake Bluff Crest | Wintergreen Gorge |
| Eight Mile Creek Gorge/Scott Run Confluence | Township Line Forest |
| Six Mile Creek Gorge/Park | East Branch LeBoeuf Creek & Headwater Confluences |
| Mount St. Benedict Forest | Waterford Wetlands Macrosite |
| Depot Road Forested Knoll | SGL #109 |
| Township Boundary Forested Plateau/Ravines | Owens Boggy Woods |
| Six Mile Creek and Seven Mile Creek Forested Headwaters | Waterford Wetlands |
| Twenty Mile Creek Gorge | Lake Pleasant |
| Cemetery Road Bluff | Lake Pleasant Outlet |
| Route 20 North Forest | Siegal Marsh |
| Prindle Road Forest | Siegal Marsh South |
| Greenefield Forested Ridge/SGL 163 | Cradle Knolls |
| Twelve Mile Creek Gorge | Elk Creek Road Forest |
| Grahamville Reservoir | Summit Township Forest #1 |
| Howard Eaton Reservoir | Summit Township #2 |
| Smith Reservoir | Dunn Valley North Forest |
| Tributary to Twelve Mile Creek Gorge | Langdon SW Forest |
| North East Lake Bluff/Slump | Glenwood Park Woods |
| Sixteen Mile Creek Gorge | Summit Township Conifer Stand |
| Tributary to West Branch French Creek #1 | New Road Forest |
| Tributary to West Branch French Creek #2 | Asbury Woods Nature Center |
| West Branch French Creek #1 | Bear Run Gorge |
| Mallick Park | Love Marsh |
| Lowville NW Depression | Presque Isle Marsh Vegetated Shallows |
| Hill Road SE Forested Valley | Walnut Creek Valley |
| Lowville SW Fen | Thomas Run Ravine & Woods |
| West Alder Brook Wetlands | Fringed Gentian Site |
| West Branch French Creek & Darrow Creek | Mouth of Elk Creek |
| Wattsburg Fairgrounds Wetlands/Stream | NW County Forested Lakeplain |
| | 1-90 Mature Second Growth Forest |
| | SGL #314 (David M. Roderick Preserve) |
| | Marsh Creek Headwater Wetlands |
| | Marsh Creek Lake |
| | Upper Conneaut Creek |

Erie County NHI Potential Sites (continued)

Crooked Creek SGL #101 Route 6N Forest Ashtabula Creek Wetlands Conneaut Creek Heron Rookery Devil's Backbone Little Elk Creek Slumps Little Elk Creek Elk Creek Meandering Channels Brandy Run Cussewago Creek Wetland Cussewago Creek Headwaters Falk Run Ravine/Escarpment Mouth of Falk Run Trace Fossil Site Body Fossil Site McLane Bog/Fen Conneauttee Creek Wetlands Edinboro Lake Edinboro Lake Fen Edinboro Bog Washington Township Forest College Woods Steadman's Fields McLaughlin Road Wetlands #1 & #2 Elk Creek Headwater Wetlands West Branch Darrows creek SGL #192 LeBoeuf Creek Headwater Wetlands LeBoeuf Lake LeBoeuf Creek French Creek Site #1 French Creek Site #2 Mill Village Special Species Habitat Kuhn's Fen Dutchtown Fen Mill Village Fossil Site French Creek Tributary Beaver Pond Kimble Hill Road Forest French Creek Tributary Headwater Swamp Wheelertown Road Swamp Fish Hatchery Fen Bentley Run Headwater Wetlands	South Branch French Creek #1 Hatch Hollow Wetland SGL #102 SGL #102 SE Wetland Boleratz Bog(s) Hell's Half-Acre Hubbel Run North Hubbel Run South Wattsburg Fen Natural Area Wattsburg Fen French Creek Dam Site SGL #167 SGL #162 Hatch Hollow Road Swamp/Woods Titus Bog Beaver Run Beaver Run Seep Pine Run Wetland Union Township Headwater Wetlands South Branch French Creek Headwaters South Branch French Creek #2 Washington Street Bogs Coe Swamp Wheeler Road Forest SGL #154 Hare Creek Corry Wetlands Winton Run Forested Headwaters Brokenstraw Creek Whitney Run Fen #1 Whitney Run Fen #2 Concord Corners NW Forest Horton Run Wetlands LeBoeuf Township Heron Rookery Mitchell Lake NW Wetlands Hemlock Woods, Edinboro Headwaters of Cussewago Creek SGL #101 Jumbo Woods West Branch Conneauttee Creek SGL #101 Laura Olsen Sanctuary Erdman's Woods
---	---

"POSTING FOR SUPPORT"

A landowner's guide to promoting education

Education... the key ingredient in promoting support and common sense related to environmental issues and private property rights. That's what "Posting for Support" is all about.

The program was initiated in Pennsylvania in 1988 as a method to draw attention to property rights issues, of which much of the general public was, and still remains in many areas, unaware. It has since expanded into 17 states. Take a look at what "Posting for Support" does:

Education - enhances education at the grassroots level by enabling property owners to talk "one-on-one" with recreational land users to inform them of unfair land use controls.

Solidarity - provides a mechanism by which landowners can display their unity and desire for legislative changes.

Protest/Lobbying Effort - enables property owners to display their concerns and objections regarding unfair policies which effect THEIR land use without having to demonstrate in Harrisburg or Washington. Your legislators are aware of this "silent, but highly visible protest" and it's a reminder every day of the year!

Wildlife Management Control - The "PFS" program allows hunters access with landowner permission (preferably to members), thereby continuing wildlife management and hunter recreation. It also allows landowners the privilege of knowing who is on their property and whether *individuals obtaining land access are supporting PLA members.*

Courtesy Enhancement - Stresses the need for individuals to seek permission before entering private property and promotes "Common Courtesy" to the landowner.

Organization Support - Landowner participation generates needed dollars for continuation of PLA's non-profit work on land rights issues and representation of private property owners.

With the onset of various hunting seasons beginning in September, it's important that participating members make sure their signs are clearly posted and that members seeking land access request permission and carry their membership identification cards. Do your part in supporting your organization! If you have not already joined the hundreds of Pennsylvania property owners participating in this program, do it today! Call the PLA office to order your signs. Help yourself in protecting the rights to your own land. If you don't, there's no one to blame but yourself!

Berks County Completed Natural Heritage Inventory Study

Members should note suggestions by the commission to limit or restrict development in "buffer areas" along streams and in "open spaces," as well as to restrict logging. Areas identified only by a series of letters and numbers may include several tracts of private property. To inquire further about these sites, individuals must visit their county courthouse to identify actual ownership.

Blue Mountain

Largest forested area in county; important recreational resource; four animal species of special concern including a globally-imperiled moth; much of the land is protected, but many tracts in need of protection agreements.

Neversink Mountain

Site for two rare butterflies and one rare plant; open space and low-impact recreation in urban area.

Pine Swamp

A good-quality natural community with excellent (A) populations of PE and PR plants, a good (B) population of a PE plant; only small portion is protected legally but needs complete protection and cooperation from landowners.

Sacony Creek Marsh

Relatively large marsh with three plants of special concern; excellent site for natural history and environmental education classes; recommend acquisition.

NC507

Rich plant diversity in mature woodland and Spring Run community; protect as part of municipal water supply.

NC510/Trout Run

Exceptional value stream; limit development in watershed and maintain and create vegetated buffer zone along creek.

NC511/Sacony Creek

Exceptional value stream; limit development in watershed and maintain and create vegetated buffer zone along creek.

NC512/Pine Creek

Exceptional value stream; limit development in watershed and maintain and create vegetated buffer zone along creek.

NC520/Northkill Creek

Exceptional value stream; protect water quality by limiting development; maintain and establish, where necessary, a vegetated buffer along stream.

SP520, SP524, SP525

Three aquatic plant species - one in reservoir and two in nearby ponds; include protection in watershed management plan.

SP502

PA vulnerable plant; maintain wooded habitat; good protection potential for Pine Creek woodland.

SP509

Fair population of a PE plant; protect with easement on site and buffer around it; threatened by invasion of aggressive, weedy plants.

SP552

Good population of a G5S2S3 aquatic plant; protect water quality of Allegheny Creek below dam by restricting development.

NC524/Goose Lane Seep

Potential for rare plants in and around this natural spring; seek easement on wetland.

SA507

Fair site for a PE animal; maintain water quality and quantity in wetland; prevent further encroachment.

SP503

Poor (D) population of a globally-rare, PE plant; maintain wooded wetland; seek protection agreement with landowner.

SP503

Fair population of a PT rush; protect Sacony Creek and its floodplain; monitor population.

SP525

G5S3, PR plant; protected within municipal watershed lands; monitor population.

SP529/Birdsboro Seeps

Fair (C) population of globally-rare, PE plant; protect as part of management plan for municipal watershed.

SP535, SP553

Fair and poor populations of two plants of uncertain status in PA; maintain open habitat; limit development in Hay Creek corridor.

SP552

Fair population of a G5S3 plant; maintain present open habitat along tributary of Hay Creek.

SA501

Remnant population of a PE animal; protect stream corridor to prevent further erosion/ sedimentation in wetlands.

SA506

Nesting site for G5S2 bird, maintain woods as open space and wildlife habitat.

SP503

PA vulnerable plant; maintain woodland along Middle Creek.

SP504

Very poor population of globally-rare, PE plant; protect water quality and wooded wetland and upland buffer along Andstadt Hill.

SP510

Fair population of a PT sedge on Bieber Creek floodplain; maintain current wet meadow habitat by mowing.

SP528

Poor population of a TU plant within a cemetery; notify owner and manager of location.

SP541

Fair population of G5S3 plant within state park; include protection in management plans.

SP557

Poor site for a PR plant; highly disturbed area; monitor only.

Appalachian Trail

Important site for open space recreation, mostly protected but some areas still in need of permanent restrictions on development and land use.

French Creek

High-quality Coldwater Fishery; limit development in watershed and maintain vegetated buffer along banks.

Little Lehigh Creek

High-quality Coldwater Fishery; limit development in watershed and maintain vegetated buffer along banks.

Pine Creek

High-quality Coldwater Fishery; limit development in watershed and maintain vegetated buffer along banks.

Schuylkill River

Preserve as much open space as possible along river and all islands; excellent recreational resource.

Sixpenny Creek

High-quality Coldwater Fishery; limit development in watershed and maintain vegetated buffer along banks.

Chapel Hill Forest

Mature woodland with seeps and floodplain forest; amphibian breeding area; complete protection recommended.

Rock Church Swamp

Waterfowl and amphibian breeding habitat; flood control; water quality improvement; conservation easement recommended.

Little Swatara Floodplain Forest

High vegetative diversity in small area; flood control and bank stabilization.

Lobachsville Floodplain Forest

Mature floodplain woodland with good diversity; poor forest regeneration because of deer; recommend against future logging.

Shenkel Hill Forest

Diversity of plant life in fairly large woodland; open space and wildlife habitat; logging is a threat; recommend easement.

Unionville Creek

Large forested tract adjacent to French Creek S.P.; hiking and passive recreation; forested corridor nearly to Schuylkill River.

West Branch Pine Creek Seeps

Mature trees with fairly high diversity; a source of water for West Branch.

GE514/Spitzenberg Hill

Geologic feature and scenic views; fairly diverse flora.

Amityville Floodplain Forest

Floodplain islands and north-facing slope; diverse flora and wildlife habitat; water quality protection; maintain in present condition.

Cold Run Seeps

Fairly mature woodland; open space for wildlife; water source for Cold Run; work with landowner to protect site.

Rebers Bridge Mesic Forest

Mature hemlock forest; protection of steep slopes and Tupehocken Creek; litter appears to be only problem.

Swamp Creek Seeps

Water flow and quality maintenance for Swamp Creek; wildlife habitat.

Vinemont Dale

Scenic ravine with bedrock outcrops mostly within SGL274; seek protection of adjacent land.

Weller Cemetery Seeps

Water flow and quality maintenance for Swamp Creek; wildlife habitat.

Editors Note: *The following letter was written June 16, 1992, by PLA member Harry Fox, Jr., to Chief Counsel Robert A. Berry of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Bureau for Historic Preservation. For further information regarding archaeological listings on private property, members may contact Mr. Fox at the number referenced within his letter.*

Mr. Berry,

Pursuant to our telephone conversation of Thursday, June 11, 1992, I am writing to inform you more fully of the specific facts concerning the Cooke Farm property in Greene Township, Franklin County. A site location map is enclosed for your information and referral.

The Cooke Farm has been in the same family for three generations and operated as a family farm throughout that time. The area marked on the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) map as a "known archaeological significant site" has been under tillage for the past 150 years.

According to information I received from Mr. Kurt Carr of the PHMC, this site was placed on the PHMC map in the following manner. An amateur history buff visited the site in 1976 or thereabout and conducted a search of the area for primitive artifacts. He has in his possession certain artifacts which he claims were found on the subject property.

Sometime thereafter, an employee or representative of the PHMC interviewed the amateur who conducted the search and was shown the artifacts and given information by the amateur who claims to have located them on the Cooke property. Evidently, this is all that is required by the PHMC to have a property put on the register of historic or archaeological sites maintained by the PHMC in their Harrisburg office.

I find this situation very troubling for the following reasons:

- 1) The amateur entered onto the property without the knowledge or permission of the owner. If he claims otherwise, I have the direct testimony of the current owner that will support my contention.
- 2) The artifacts, if indeed found at the site, were removed without the knowledge or permission of the owner, and again, this contention can be supported by direct testimony.
- 3) The information obtained without the consent and knowledge of the owner of the property was shared with a government official and/or an employee of the PHMC without the consent or knowledge of the property owner. In my estimation, this is a clear invasion of the right to privacy of the property owner.
- 4) This information was then placed upon a government record without the consent or knowledge of the property owner.
- 5) To my knowledge, no one from the PHMC made any attempts to notify the property owner, either before or after the inclusion of their property on the PHMC's map of known archaeological or historic sites.
- 6) If an owner pursues development of his property, then the designation of the property as a "known archaeological or historic site" entails a mandate for an expensive and time consuming study, the determination of which could result in an even more exhaustive and expensive study. The designation amounts to at worst a taking, or at least a partial condemnation or a diminution of value, rights and privileges of the property without any due process whatsoever.

I realize that there are many separate legal issues woven into the fabric of this specific case, the determination of which may not be easily attained. However, I think at the very least, a full and complete review of the methods which have been used to impose such a severe potential of loss of property rights upon innocent landowners is warranted.

At the very least, it seems to me that every property owner listed on the PHMC map should be notified through registered mail that their property is indeed listed on the PHMC map. Further, that letter should state what the potential ramifications of this designation are, and that property owner should have the right to have his or her property removed from the map. Additionally, I think it reasonable and fair that no property owner be subject to the PHMC mandates to conduct studies or site investigations until this review of the process is complete and a determination has been made by the DER, the PHMC and any other legal staffs or officers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who may have a legitimate input into the resolution of these issues.

Additionally, I assume that the information thus far collected with respect to these known sites is available to the public. That being the case, I will have a representative contact the PHMC in order that I may obtain copies of site location maps.

If I cannot get an adequate response and/or resolution of these issues through your office, I will make direct contact through my own expense and effort with the affected property owners in order to apprise them of the pertinent facts relative to their inclusion on the PHMC map. If necessary, a class action lawsuit may be undertaken in order to correct this gross injustice.

There are many other issues relative to the practical effect of the current implementation of the DER and the PHMC policy. I would be happy to discuss these with you, the PHMC, the DER or any representatives that you designate.

My concern is that a well intentioned effort to preserve the archaeological and historically significant sites located within the Commonwealth has become, through a convoluted process of bureaucratic machinations, an Orwellian intrusion into the private lives and into the property rights of innocent citizens totally unaware of what has occurred.

I appreciate very much your previously stated commitment to respond to these concerns at your earliest convenience. If you need additional information, help or any other input which I may contribute, you may reach me at 717/432-1490.

Fact Sheet

The National Park Service Natural Landmarks Program

By: Eric Veyhl

What is the National Natural Landmarks Program?

The Landmarks program evaluates and inventories "natural" areas ranging in size from one to millions of acres, and officially designates them as "nationally significant." There are 587 "designated" Landmarks and over 3,000 more "potential" Landmarks in an open ended "backlog," all encompassing over 90 million acres so far.

Who owns Landmarks?

Consideration of ownership is ignored in inventorying Landmarks, which are based on "ecological" areas. About half include private owners; the rest are already publicly controlled at some level.

What is the program used for?

The Landmark evaluation process is a feeder program used to justify Federal, State or Local acquisition and control in order to preserve areas in a primitive state. The government tells the public that the program entails no restrictions on land use, claiming the program is to "honor" landowners who volunteer to preserve their land. Such cooperation, where it exists, is used to buy time while the National Park Service (NPS) and preservationists lobby for more direct control or acquisition. The National Parks and Conservation Association calls Landmarks "Ladies In Waiting."

How do they get control of the land?

The Landmarks program provides inventories and assessments used by other units and levels of government to justify taking control; it does not yet directly acquire or control land itself. The NPS seeks political action on "damaged" or "threatened" Landmarks through annual reports to Congress. It also uses Landmark evaluations for both "designated" and "potential" sites, in what it calls the "reconnaissance" phase of planning new areas for National Park System acquisition.

Landmark evaluations are also used to justify acquisition or condemnation by other agencies. Official claims of "national significance" are used politically to block permits required for land use and to influence restrictive zoning on the local and state levels. Use of Landmarks is affected by the *National Environmental Policy Act*, the *Mining in National Parks Act*, and the *Coastal Zone Management Act*. Preservationists and the NPS are lobbying for increased funding for acquisition and for the *National Heritage Conservation Act* granting direct federal and state control over sites declared to be "significant," together with buffer zones around them. NPS considers Landmarks to be "damaged" or "threatened," and therefore in need of intervention, if it suspects their natural features are or might be affected "by human activity, intervention, or intrusion."

Who runs the Landmarks program?

The Landmarks program has been run since 1961 by a small group in the NPS in collaboration with state and private preservationists, such as the Nature Conservancy, who make most of the decisions and write the evaluations. The federal bureaucracy designates the sites they choose as "nationally significant" and maintains the files. The program is thus a mechanism for preservation activists seeking an official sanction—via the official acceptance of environmental "studies" and arbitrary administrative decisions of "national significance"—for subsequent government control over other people's land.

Who are these people accountable to?

The Secretary of the Interior routinely approves the decisions by the NPS bureaucracy, which are based on the evaluations, covert monitoring and suggestions for new sites by environmental activists, euphemistically called "scientists." In 1990 the National Park Service Advisory Board was authorized to advise on new designations, but has no authority. Congress or other elected representatives have no role, and the NPS ignores landowner objections. The program ran until 1980 with no regulations at all, and since then has frequently been caught ignoring them.

Where do they get the authority to do this?

There is no legislation authorizing the program which started in 1961 in collaboration with The Nature Conservancy. The NPS claims authority under a memo of approval it requested from the Secretary of the Interior in 1962, and under the 1935 Historic Sites Act. NPS claims that natural areas qualify as "objects" under the Act's reference to authority "to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance." There is implicit Congressional sanction through references to the program and ongoing appropriation of funds. The Landmarks Program first wrote regulations for itself in 1980 (36 CFR 62).



How much money do they spend on this?


No one knows the total expenses since funding and personnel are quietly transferred from other NPS programs off-budget. The program also exploits funding for State Heritage Programs, which act as surrogates for NPS, and there is evidence that funds are channeled through The Nature Conservancy. Congress directly appropriated \$.9 million for 1992, a 5-1/2 fold increase over the previous year.

How are sites chosen? What is "national significance?"

Preservationists choose the sites as the ones they like the best. NPS has subjective criteria for "national significance" which is broad enough to encompass almost any politically motivated identification of natural features. Sites are supposed to represent the best examples of "natural themes" represented within 35 ecological "Provinces" mapped without regard to state or other political boundaries. Selections are claimed to be "scientific" because environmentalists make the decisions.

Can you prevent the government from putting your land into this program?

First you have to know that you are targeted. The NPS told Sen. Cohen (R-ME) in 1989 that it would "cease processing" any site as soon as it learns of landowner objections, but then refused to stop when landowners in Maine objected. NPS also told the Inspector General in 1991 that an evaluation would require landowner consent under new regulations. New regulations proposed in Nov. 1991, however, say the program will not "designate" land as part of an official "Landmark" without owner consent, but that under a double listing scheme they will continue to evaluate and designate sites as "nationally significant" in the Landmarks program regardless of owner consent. The procedures are being publicly challenged nationwide.



How do you know if your land is included?

If evaluators sense potential opposition, you usually aren't told. After 1980, the regulations required written notification of owners before an evaluation of their land begins and at two additional points in the process. Following public criticism of illegal secret evaluations, however, an Interior Inspector General audit reported in Dec. 1991 that the regulations are frequently ignored. NPS maintains a "Centralized Computer Listing" of targeted sites, but ownership and size statistics are understated. Names of owners are sometimes listed in evaluation reports, but NPS does not know who all the owners are and has maneuvered to block access to its lists under *Freedom of Information Act* requests.

Hasn't anyone complained?

Public complaints following the discovery of secret and unwanted Landmark evaluations in 1988 led to a national moratorium on the program in Nov. 1989 when Sens. Cohen and Mitchell demanded an immediate review of program irregularities. Journalists such as national environmental columnist Alston Chase and the Better Government Association of Chicago, and the TV documentary produced by Preview Media have exposed the program. The Interior Inspector General concluded in its Dec. 1991 report that "The property rights of over 2,800 private landowners may have been infringed upon because the Park Service did not properly conduct the evaluation, nomination, and designation process." Congress, however, naively believes NPS assurances that it only needs more money—and continues to provide it.

What Can You Do?

The Federal bureaucracy and its environmental surrogates have an empire building "mission" mentality to control every so-called "significant" region in the nation. They will continue to ignore and abuse the civil rights of landowners until Congress reigns them in. That won't happen until enough members of Congress see their constituents objecting. Most Congressmen do not yet realize there is a problem, partly because they naively believe NPS and preservationists' whitewashes of National Park Service abuses. YOUR CONGRESSMEN NEED TO HEAR YOUR VIEWS so that they realize there is a problem.



Credit:

Land Rights Letter,
Sharpsburg, MD

Eric Veyhl is chairman of the Washington County Alliance in Maine and serves on the Board of Directors of the Maine Conservation Rights Institute.

If You Like Wetlands, You're Gonna' LOVE Scenic Rivers

On August 5, 1992 U.S. Representative Peter Kostmayer, D-Bucks County, introduced H.R. 5778, legislation to study over 600 miles encompassing portions of 27 streams throughout the Commonwealth for possible protection under the Wild and Scenic Rivers program. This was in addition to 3 rivers already designated for study status under two separate bills, H.R. 1323 and H.R. 3457. What could this study and possible designations mean for private property owners across the state? PLA explored these concerns by hosting an educational meeting on August 25 with guest speaker Charles Cushman of the National Inholders Association. Chuck has had significant national experience regarding land use issues, including scenic river designations and has successfully organized national campaigns opposing designations leading to aggressive federal land acquisitions.

With passage of these designations, impact of land use controls may prohibit or greatly restrict the harvest of timber, agricultural use and irrigation, mining, quarrying of sand and gravel, new construction of any structure and subsequent reduction in the value of property resulting in erosion of the real estate tax base. Through other designations across the nation, property own-

ers have become painfully aware that 50% of the land in a one-half mile corridor can be condemned under the National Scenic Rivers Act, additionally diminishing private property rights. Documentation also exhibits that remaining portions of private land can be controlled through scenic easement practices. Legislative enactment also enables federal authorization to acquire up to 100 acres per mile, which could affect the tax base for local communities. Currently in Oregon, 41 scenic river designations have been implemented across the state resulting in NOT ONE timber sale within those corridors since 1988. Since passage of the Lower Wisconsin Scenic Riverway in 1989, a governing board must issue a permit before individuals may erect a birdhouse or birdfeeder, a clothesline, swing set, or any other structure within view of the river.

Cushman said property owners need to become involved by notifying their senators and congressional representatives of their opposition to such designations. He stated that past experience of landowner involvement in the political process has been the key to defeating designations or at least making them "livable" by having their concerns addressed in the early stages. To date, this type of action has proven the most

successful measure landowners can and must undertake to eliminate further intrusion by government regarding private property rights. Also, when speaking to congressional offices, individuals should consider requesting a copy of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act for their own review and understanding.

Without YOUR direct involvement to notify legislators of your opposition, severe land use restrictions may be included within the corridors of the following rivers, as they are included in proposed legislation.

- Beech Creek
- Brandywine Creek
- Brokenstraw Creek
- Clarion River
- Conewago Creek
- Conneaut Creek
- Delaware River
- French Creek
- Kinzua Creek
- Lehigh River
- Kettle Creek
- Dry Run
- Double Run
- Mill Creek
- Muddy Creek
- North Fork
- Sinnemahoning Creek
- Slippery Rock Creek
- Hell Run
- Stony Creek
- Swatara Creek
- Upper Little Swatara
- Lower Little Swatara
- Tionesta Creek
- Tulpehocken Creek
- Valley Creek
- Wissahickon Creek
- Wolf Creek
- Yellow Breeches Creek
- Youghiogheny River

For further information...

or documentation of scenic river designations, please contact the PLA office at **814-796-3578.**



Chuck Cushman (pictured above) served as PLA's guest speaker on Scenic River designations on August 25 in Meadville, PA.

Unified Sportsmen of Pennsylvania;

The REAL Pennsylvania Sportsmen Define Their Stand

Editors note:

In June of this year, the Philadelphia Inquirer conducted an in-depth interview with PLA regarding its purpose and its networking abilities with the national property rights-wise use movement. The article, entitled "It's landowners vs. environmentalists in battle for the land" discussed many issues, several of which depicted sportsmen as the "hook and bullet crowd" of whom were divided in their support for landowner rights. Following its publication, Philip Kloss, president of the Delaware chapter of the Unified Sportsmen of Pennsylvania (USP), wrote the Inquirer to "set them straight" on sportsmen's support. It should also be noted that the USP are, and have been, long time supporters of PLA. For a copy of the Inquirer article, members may contact the association office.

Philadelphia Inquirer:

I would like to clarify one important issue. Sportsmen are not divided and second we resent the term and perception as being the "hook and bullet crowd," a name hung upon us by extreme environmentalists. Additionally, the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs (PFSC) is not the representative of, or speak for, Pennsylvania hunters, trappers, and fishermen. The PFSC are representatives of the National Wildlife Federation which funds and regulates its activities in conjunction with the Sierra Club and other strict environmental organizations.

We also agree with the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, are in complete accord with their views and issues as expressed by the fifth amendment on property rights and have been associated with them since their inception some years ago.

The Unified Sportsmen of Pennsylvania, the Commonwealth's major sportsmen's organization, is twice the size of PFSC and has been the sportsmen's spokesperson for over seven years.

We also agree with the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, are in complete accord with their views and issues as expressed by the fifth amendment on property rights and

have been associated with them since their inception some years ago.

Pennsylvania sportsmen own over 1,300,000 acres of game lands through the Pennsylvania Game Commission program, in addition to hundreds of thousands of acres owned privately by individual sportsmen and sportsmen's clubs. We will do whatever is necessary to protect our property rights from extreme environmentalists who are trying to steal property under the guise of environmental laws which they are trying to shove down the throats of the American people.

Sportsmen are the true conservationists and have been for over 100 years. Pennsylvania sportsmen asked for and created both the Pennsylvania Game Commission and Pennsylvania Fish Commission, both of which are funded exclusively by sportsmen with monies generated through license fees and excise taxes paid when purchasing hunting and fishing supplies. Not one single penny comes from regular taxes to fund either of these commissions. Sportsmen are willing and proud of their donations to these conservation efforts not only here in Pennsylvania, but across the entire USA. Billions of dollars have been spent by sportsmen on worthwhile wildlife propagation and conservation practices for over 100 years. The so-called environmentalists spend little or nothing; 90% of their donations go for salaries and lobbying, very little for actual conservation and wildlife resources.

Pennsylvania sportsmen owe these private landowners due consideration of their rights and stand ready to protect these rights from those who wish to abuse the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

The conservation-minded hunter, trapper, and fisherman believes in a balance with nature and people and have set seasons and bag limits for the taking of game and fish to protect wildlife resources and its habitat. This is stated in our game and fish codes and policies to assure the wise use of resources for future generations. We put our money where our mouth is when needed and will do whatever is prudent and necessary to attain the end results.

The sportsmen of Pennsylvania recognize that 90% of the game harvested in our state under the PGC management program is harvested from private lands, not game lands.

Pennsylvania sportsmen owe these private landowners due consideration of their rights and stand ready to protect those rights from those who wish to abuse the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Phillip Kloss, Founder, USP
President, Delaware County Chapter.

Look What's New!...

A New Logo

Members should be aware of the new design now being used by PLA. The new logo reflects more of what PLA is all about... private land and the protection of private property rights. The definitive Pennsylvania "keystone" has been incorporated as continued recognition of our unique state.



Wetland reform by the 102nd Congress suffered a near fatal goring by political forces just days before certain enactment. For more than two years, wetland reformers led by Congressman Jimmy Hayes (D-LA), and Congressman Thomas Ridge (R-PA), had maneuvered the Comprehensive Wetland Conservation and Management Act (HR1330) through a perilous political process.

No environmental issue has been more contentious during the last few years than the conflict between the property rights of private landowners and the alleged 'public resource' - wetlands. Current policy allows the Corps of Engineers to declare private property to be a wetland - whether it is wet or not - and thereby prevent the owner from using the land under penalty of fines up to \$25,000 per day and/or jail. John Poszgai is currently serving a three-year jail sentence for challenging the Corps' authority to declare private property to be "waters of the United States."

The Hayes-Ridge reform bill would classify wetlands by their environmentally functional value. Wet wetlands would be better protected than is provided by current law, and dry wetlands would be protected according to their environmental value. Most importantly, the bill provided for compensation when private landowners were denied use of their property - as the Constitution requires.

Throughout the 102nd Congress, support for the wetland reform measure grew as hundreds of grassroots organizations persuaded their representatives to co-sponsor the bill. By the end of July, more than 200 Congressmen had indicated their intent to

support the bill. Only 218 votes were needed to assure passage. The bill stalled in committee. Key committee chairmen refused to schedule the bill for a committee vote. Powerful environmental organizations such as the National Wildlife Federation, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, the Environmental Defense Fund, and others, solidly opposed the reform measure.

In an intense round of negotiations, compromises were reached in late July which assured that the measure would clear committee and reach the House floor for an up or down vote on the wetland issue. The week of August 10 was targeted for the floor vote.

Suddenly, on August 10, Congressman Robert Roe (D-NJ) Chairman of the powerful House Public Works and Transportation committee, announced that the wetland issue would not be addressed in this session of Congress. Why?

Since the 1988 campaign, Senator Albert Gore has not spoken a word in public that has not been approved by his handlers, the National Wildlife Federation, the Sierra Club, and the leaders of the "green machine." When Al Gore was tapped to join the Democratic ticket, Bill Clinton relinquished the reigns of environmental policy to Gore.

Now consider the fact that President Bush proposed regulatory reforms to the wetland policy that were very similar to the reforms contained in HR1330. The day that Bush announced his proposed reforms, the "green machine" unleashed a deluge of criticisms claiming that Bush wanted to destroy the Everglades and turn over half the nation's wetlands to developers. The "green machine"

activated its puppet press to denounce Bush for renegeing on his "no net loss of wetlands" statement. Actually, Bush's proposal would have simply restored federal jurisdiction over wetlands to the same level it was when he made the statement in 1988. The "green machine" was responsible for vastly expanding federal jurisdiction in 1989, by supporting administrative changes in the federal rules.

In Gore's 1990 Senatorial election, he received 42% of his campaign funds, nearly a million dollars, from political action committees (PAC's). Mr. Gore, now in charge of environmental policy for the Democratic Presidential Nominee, could not let a Democratic leadership in a Democratically controlled House of Representatives, pass a wetland reform measure that would achieve in law what the "green machine" so harshly criticized the President for proposing. No democratic Congressman will yet confirm (or deny) the direct intervention by the Clinton-Gore campaign. Direct intervention by the Presidential Campaign, however, is about the only force strong enough to allow Congressmen to suddenly abandon previously agreed to positions without suffering immeasurable loss of credibility among their colleagues.

Wetland reform can be salvaged in 1992 only by direct intervention by the voters. Every Congressman should be deluged with constituent demands for a full House vote on HR1330. Congressman Roe, as Chairman of the committee of jurisdiction, should have to shovel his way through the mail. Constituent votes are the only medicine strong enough to cure the addiction to PAC's disease with which Mr. Gore is apparently afflicted. Without massive voter intervention, wetland reform will not occur in 1992.

PLA Talks Wetlands With Washington

On June 8, 1992, PLA and its national affiliate the Environmental Conservation Organization (ECO) took their message on wetland reform to key Washington legislators and their staffs. With reauthorization of the federal Clean Water Act expected in the near future, PLA and ECO appealed to those Congressional offices holding seats on the committees of Public Works & Transportation, Merchant Marine & Fisheries, and House Interior. Part II of "Wetlands, Our Environment, Whose Prop-

erty?... A Call To Action" was shown to those in attendance, as well as messages calling for action by these committees to release for a vote by the full House of Representatives, H.R. 1330, The Comprehensive Wetlands Conservation & Management Act.

Lee Forsgren, legislative assistant to Congressman Don Young (R-AK), stated that although there was tremendous support for wetland legislative reform and H.R. 1330 in particular, the environmental movement has been

very successful in lobbying key Representatives who maintain control in the committees of jurisdiction. PLA reiterated the need for comprehensive reform in the near future, pointing out that thousands of individual property owners across the U.S. continue to suffer from outrageous bureaucratic controls, loss of property use, and in many cases, loss of their land due to Congress moving too slow in reaching reforms which would address the rights of property owners.

Dollars Make A Difference

Many thanks are extended to all members who have renewed their support through membership and additional monetary contributions. As with any organization, its strength lies in the unwavering numbers of loyal members providing financial backing to pursue its goals. Members should note the organizations, businesses and corporations who have voluntarily chosen to support PLA with needed dollars by joining or renewing as a corporate, business or associate member. PLA also urges members to patronize these property rights supporters by looking for membership decals displaying their PLA support.

Corporate Members

Gold Club Members

Troyer Potato Products, Inc.
Robert Brace & Sons, Inc.
Buchanan Ingersoll, P.C.

Sustaining Club Members

Rochester & Pittsburgh Coal Co.
Brookville Wood Products
Scott Campbell
K & J Coal Company, Inc.
Gas Field Specialists

Business Members

Woodberry Development, Inc.
Voelpel Farms
Nickerson Farms

White & Associates
Karl Pourbaugh
Laura D. Coal, Inc.
Timber & Land Company
Canterbury Coal Company
Forest Land Services
Rolling Rock Farms
North Cambria Fuel
Alemus Farms
Walker Oil Products, Inc.
Thomas Construction, Inc.
D. W. L. Coal
D. M. Boyd Company
James Farmakis
H & H Materials, Inc.
TDK Coal Sales, Inc.
Cubbon Lumber
Dunn Brothers
Gerald F. Fisher Real Estate
Richard Hipwell
Meadville Red-Mix
Lauger Farms
Cochran-Zandi Lumber
Joseph W. Arnold
Mealy Excavating & Construction, Inc.
R. Scott Miller, Allegheny Forestry, Inc.
Mead Lumber Company
Steve Duda
Michael Halliday, Esq.
Northwestern Rural Electric
Stutzman Lumber
Mick Brothers Lumber
Cory Peat Products Company
Skellon Dairy Farms
Pennock Sales & Service
Ed Morris Timber
Marine Bank, Waterford Office
Jim Brozell Contractors
Glenn Troyer Farms, Inc.

Ronald Finch
Lynn S. Hollis, Surveying
Waterford Hotel
Russell's House of Furniture
Hurst Potato Sales
Ted Ethridge Lime Spreading
Loper Farms
Port Potato Farms
Jerry Port
Ray Showman Jr. Excavating
Troyer Construction Equipment Co.
Green Meadows Farms
Mountain Aviation
LeBoeuf Plant Foods
Paul L. Skal
Presta Contractors Supply
Clifton Manor Restaurant
Murosky Builders
Erie Fire Equipment
Tim Shafer & Sons
Perry Construction Group
Cooney Brothers Coal Company
Herman Espy/Espy Farms
J. Paul Espy
Kane Hardwood
Novosel Lumber
Frank Novosel
Larry M. Wolfe
Hapburnia Coal Company
Sylvan Glen, Inc.
Harry H. Fox
Mount Parnell Fisheries
Brent L. Hershey
J & L Shafer Farms
Sunrise Ventures, Inc.
Edward Davallus
Timberland Ltd.
Nelson Trucking

Associate Members

Woodward Associates

Unified Sportsmen of PA
Allegheny Hardwood Utilization Group
Pennsylvania Independent Petroleum Producers
Babylon Hunting Club
State University of New York at Syracuse
Industrial Oil & Gas Associates
Builders Association of Metropolitan Pittsburgh
James S. Stuft
Harley and Bird, Inc.
Brenton Holter
Allegheny Valley Realtors
Valley View Development
McLaughlin Peat
Frank L. Pollock Jr.
Peter Biebel
Harry Chapman
Wayne L. Lillie
Holland Metro Inc. Realtors
Dwyer-Young Development, Inc.
PA Mining Professionals
Blue Mountain Snowmobile Club
Hardwood Lumber Manufacturers Association
PA Coal Association
PA Potato Co-Op
PA Association of Realtors
R.H. Bommer - C.E. Geesaman
Green Laurel Hunting Club
PA Land Improvement Contractors of America
Holiday Pocono Civic Association
Mobile County Landowners Association of Alabama
Colorado Ranchers & Farmers for Property Rights
Richard Gilmore, Esq.
Robert R. Eakin
Ray Belchner

If your Association, Business, or Corporation has been inadvertently omitted or listed incorrectly, please contact our office so that we may rectify your affiliation.



Representatives from state and national organizations, as well as legislative offices, attended the June 8th Washington luncheon. Shown above from left to right are: Lee Forsgren, office of Rep. Don Young (R-AK), Ellen Young, office of Rep. Tom Ridge (R-PA), Henry Lamb, Environmental Conservation Organization, Marge Carrico, National Wetlands Coalition, Joey Findley, office of Rep. Jimmy Hayes (D-LA), Paula Easley, Municipality of Anchorage, Lisa Blackwell, National Association of Realtors, Rhonda McAtee, Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, Paul Kamenar, Washington Legal Foundation, Mark Maslyn, American Farm Bureau Federation, & Juch White, Tennessee (seated).

Huntingdon County Landowner Says...

"Private Property...Entry With Permission Only"



Landowner Herman Espy stands beside a sign depicting policies he wishes recreationalists accessing his property abide by.

Private Property. That's what landowner Herman Espy has reiterated to fishermen accessing his land for years. Since 1921, the Espy family has politely and patiently put up with hundreds of fishermen and recreationalists "helping themselves" to the use of his private property. Now, after years of litter and abuse from outsiders, he has had enough.

Herman's land abuts what is known as the Little Juniata River, a prime stream known for its beautiful scenery and prime trout fishing. And Herman's property is particularly appealing to fishermen due to his efforts of private stewardship. The property is meticulously maintained, with open spaces of grassed areas mowed up to the stream's edge and sediment and erosion control measures long ago being implemented. An attractive



Pictured above is the meticulously maintained property of Herman Espy, located along the Little Juniata River.

spot for hundreds of fishermen and recreationalists, his land has long been freely accessed without permission.

In the spring of this year, however, Herman decided to "take control" of his land. Tired of the intrusion, litter, and "expected" use of his property, he decided to limit the number of individuals accessing his land by establishing the Little Juniata Fishing Club. Dues paying members are entitled to access of his land and the enjoyment of great trout fishing. Needless to say, this met with disapproval of many fishermen and recreationalists, who for years, had selfishly expected automatic access and use of Herman's property. In June of this year, those same fishermen staged a protest against Herman for exercising his constitutional right of denying or limiting land access by marching downstream and standing in front of Herman's property.

Herman was aware of the planned demonstration and had on hand many landowners and other supporters for news media covering the event. Included with these supporters were PLA representatives Keith Klingler and Bob Brace, along with PLA counsel John Ward of Harrisburg. The demonstration remained peaceful with a strong message being sent by both sides. The fishermen, demanding use of the stream and showing their discontent with limited land access and the landowner, exercising his right to privacy by controlling land access.

PLA's counsel, John Ward, summed up the situation in interview's with the media by stating "Mr. Espy is not quarrelling with the use of the stream by canoes or boats, if in fact, it is a navigable waterway; however, there is a question regarding use of the stream by individuals wading or fishing on foot and Mr. Espy certainly has the right to deny free access from the stream or use of his property as access to the stream."

Pennsylvania Landowners' Association - Working for YOU

Your PLA Board of Directors and volunteer members work hard at representing you, our member, at both state and national functions. Take a look at where you've been represented during the last couple of months!

- Washington, D.C. - legislative lobbying
- Crawford County Sportsmen's Clubs - guest speaker with Rep. Teresa Brown
- Citizens Advisory Council - testimony presented on wetlands
- House Minority Appropriation and Conservation Committee - testimony regarding OER and environmental policies.
- Media Interviews - Philadelphia Inquirer; Erie Times; Venango newspapers; National Snack Food Association; WJET-TV; WICU-TV; WPSX-TV; WTAJ-TV; WFLP-1530 AM; Erie; WHYY-FM, Philadelphia; USA Radio Network News, Dallas, Texas; Cable Interview, Rep. Teresa Brown.
- Natural Heritage Inventory Meetings - representation at public meetings, as well as with Erie County Department of Planning and Western PA Conservancy.
- County Fairs
- AG Progress Days, State College, PA - Promotional Exhibit
- Educational Wetlands Seminar - co-hosts PA Environmental Council and PA Landowners' Association.
- Scenic Rivers Educational Seminar - PLA host with Charles Cushman, guest speaker, National Inholders Association.
- PA Chapter of the Association of Consulting Foresters - State College, PA, guest speaker
- Public meetings regarding sale of President Oil Company property to Western PA Conservancy.

PLA continues to work hard on behalf of private property rights. However, with a limited staff and the efforts of volunteers being so largely depended upon, it is difficult to respond to all of the significant requests received weekly by PLA. Only through additional dollars can PLA continue to spread the representation of private property rights with the addition of paid staff giving their full time efforts to our cause. Educational seminars, literature, and video productions also spread the word of property abuses and legislative efforts needed to change them. But all these efforts require funding. Do you know of someone who is not yet a PLA member? Or a business or corporation owning private property or supportive of our cause? If so, solicit their financial backing by urging them to become a member or contribute a donation. PLA operates under a 501(c)(6) tax exempt status and their generous gift or membership is deductible as a business expense.

Legal Briefs

High Court Says "Government Must Pay"

A Victory for David Lucas!

Any law or regulation that deprives an owner of all economically beneficial use of property constitutes a compensable taking, unless the use is prohibited under the state's common-law property or nuisance law, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled June 29 in a 6-3 decision (*Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*).

This was a victory for David Lucas, owner of two beachfront lots who was told he could not build two homes on the lots after the state amended its beachfront management act. The decision is particularly relevant to current federal debates over Endangered Species Act reauthorization and wetlands regulations. The ruling is also expected to "cause a lot of heartburn among state and local governments," according to Paul D. Kamenar, executive legal director of the Washington Legal Foundation. "State government's will have to re-examine all their environmental laws that require a landowner to keep property in its natural state," he said.

The high court remanded the case back to the South Carolina Supreme Court to prove that building a house would constitute a "noxious use." Kamenar believes the state will not prevail on remand. "It faces a very heavy burden," he said, "because the state must show that what Lucas plans to do is a public nuisance under common law, that is, the action would cause direct and immediate harm to others."

Pennsylvania Property Owners Win Wetlands Case!

Robert and William Ramagosa Jr. were acquitted of all charges on May 18, 1992 that they had violated the federal Clean Water Act. The two Pike County brothers had created ponds and lakes in a wetland area for which the U.S. government filed criminal charges. The case was considered a major test of federal law governing wetlands.

John Duffy, counsel for the Ramagosas, stated in his closing argument that the government's case was a "tempest in a teapot" that would have appalled George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. Duffy and co-counsel Joe Green also argued that the government had led the Ramagosas to believe that lake building was not regulated and further argued that the land

was private and the government was poking its nose in an area where it did not belong.

Robert and William Ramagosa Jr. consistently maintained they had not violated the law and, in fact, had done nothing but enhance and improve the area by constructing beautiful ponds and lakes capable of supporting habitat for a host of wildlife animals. The case marks another significant victory for property rights; however, the Ramagosas still face civil penalties by the state. A separate court action still pending will determine the outcome under state law. Congratulations to these supporting PLA members for their hard work in pursuing justice! To send congratulations, or to inquire more fully regarding case specifics, members may contact the Ramagosas at 717-686-1203.

Minnesota Landowners Receive \$933,921 For Wetland

In a recent ruling by the U.S. Claims Court, the federal government was ordered to pay Minnesota landowners \$933,921 for denial of a Clean Water Act permit. The case, known as *Formanek v. U.S.*, involved a 112 acre parcel of which 45 acres was considered a "calcareous fen plant community."

The court ordered Ray Formanek and other property owners to convey to the United States a parcel of private property which lies within the Savage Fen Wetland complex in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. It went on to state that the denial by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers of the landowners' permit application to place fill material on the wetlands to build an access road for proposed development had a severe effect on the economic value of the property. The court also said the landowners successfully showed that the highest and best use of the property before the Corps denied the permit was as a multi-lot industrial development, which the court concluded had a fair market value of \$933,921. The court discounted the fact that environmental groups had made two offers to buy the property for environmental purposes and concluded that without the possibility of development there could be no competitive market for the property. It also went on to reject the government's argument that there were other economically workable possibilities available for the land, finding that the uses suggested by the government were improbable. "Even if plaintiffs were able to develop a portion of their land, it is far from certain that a market would exist for an industrial lot surrounded by land rendered undevelopable by government action," the court said.

Court Upholds Jail Term For Environmental Engineer

A federal appeals court recently ruled that an environmental engineer was properly convicted and sentenced to serve six months in prison for knowingly filling wetlands without a permit. In *U.S. v. Ellen*, the U.S. Court of Appeals

for the Fourth Circuit affirmed William B. Ellen's conviction and found that the district court properly applied the federal sentencing guidelines in deciding a period of incarceration. It found that the jury had heard sufficient evidence to conclude that Ellen knew he was working in a wetland. If Ellen knew that the area was a wetland, then he could not claim that the criminal nature of his conduct was unforeseeable, the court said. Ellen has since appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The owner of the property, Paul T. Jones II, pleaded guilty of negligently filling wetlands, was placed on probation for 18 months, was ordered to pay \$2 million in fines and restitution, and was ordered to restore the area and place a conservation easement on 2,500 acres of the property to protect it from development. His conviction and sentence were not involved in Ellen's appeal.

For further information regarding this case, members may contact Peggy Reigle, Chairman of the Fairness to Landowners Committee, in Cambridge, Maryland at (410) 228-3822

Government Loses Appeal in Florida Rock v. U.S.

Property owner receives \$800,000 reimbursement for legal fees!

In the well known case of *Florida Rock v. U.S.*, a U.S. Claims Court has ordered the government to reimburse the owners of Florida Rock Corporation over \$800,000 in legal fees incurred in their defense for alleged wetlands violations.

A permit denial by the U.S. Corps of Engineers to utilize private property considered to be wetlands was found to be a taking under the U.S. Constitution's fifth amendment. The government was ordered to pay in excess of \$1.2 million to Florida Rock for economic losses. Thereafter, the U.S. appealed the decision and lost. Florida Rock then filed for cost reimbursement related to their legal defense and were awarded costs.

Municipalities May Lose Millions In Real Estate Taxes

In a recent decision that could cost municipalities millions of dollars in revenue, a state tax court has changed the way New Jersey's wetlands may be taxed. The case involves an undeveloped 240 acre tract of wetlands in East Rutherford, New Jersey. Judge David E. Crabtree ruled that because federal and state regulations restricted the development of wetlands, the tract must be taxed as undevelopable land, not on the basis of its potential commercial value. Judge Crabtree reduced the assessed property value from \$20 million to \$1 million dollars. Inherently, this decision affects more than New Jersey law, as ramifications may have national impact because wetlands are controlled under the Federal Clean Water Act.

PENNSYLVANIA LANDOWNER BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Keith Klingler
President
Titusville, PA

Robert Bruce
Vice President
Waterford, PA

Rhonda McAtee
Executive Director
Waterford, PA

Lorraine Bucklin
Asst. Executive Director
Hathecroek, PA

Nancy Cubbon
Oil City, PA

Harry Fox
Dillsburg, PA

Hank Ingram, Esq.
Pittsburgh, PA

Scott Miller
Warren, PA

Mark Troyer
Waterford, PA

Mike Wise
Waterford, PA

REGIONAL DIRECTORS

Herman Espy
Spruce Creek, PA - 814/632-8087

Eva Foster
Weston, PA - 215/399-1846

Mark Madison
Marienville, PA - 814/968-9941

Bob McColly
Ligonier, PA - 412/238-2880

Tedd Ochs
Lucinda, PA - 814/744-9301

Victoria Pozsgai-Khoury
Morrisville, PA - 215/295-9554

Greg Snowman
Coudersport, PA - 814/274-9335

Eric Thomas
Greve City, PA - 412/436-7291

Mary Wirth
Kane, PA - 814/837-8944

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.

"And it comes with a guaranteed exemption from the clean water act..."

Please Enroll Me As A Member Of PLA To Help Secure The Right Of The Individual While We Respect The Environment

COMPLETE THIS STRUCTURE
PLEASE CALL PLA OFFICE
FOR UPDATED INFORMATION

Name _____
Address _____
City, State, Zip _____
Phone # () _____
Fax # () _____
Acres Owned (if applicable) _____
County _____

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

Individual membership \$25.00
Any individual supportive of private property rights.

Associate membership \$50.00
Not-for-profit organization supporting property rights issues.

Business membership \$100.00
Any business entity supporting the free enterprise system and the principle of private ownership.

Sustaining Associate Membership \$250.00
Inclusive of any corporate not-for-profit organization.

Corporate Membership -
Any corporation supporting the above classifications.

Sustaining	\$ 500.00
Silver Club	\$ 1,000.00
Gold Club	\$ 5,000.00
Platinum Club	\$10,000.00

Wetlands Videotape (VHS) Part I Part II
"Our Environment, Whose Property?"
\$15.00 Donation each
Please send me a copy of this limited edition PLA videotape.

"Posting For Support" program — Yes, I wish to become a participant in this program. Please send me _____ signs. I have enclosed 60¢ 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 additional contribution of: _____

YES! I wish to subscribe to ECO-LOGIC, the monthly publication of the Environmental Conservation Organization. I understand ECO is a national property rights organization of which PLA is affiliated. I have enclosed \$15.00 for this annual subscription.

PLEASE NOTE: All Business and Corporate members will receive 12 complimentary issues of ECO-LOGIC with their paid membership dues.

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 quarterly 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, 814/796-3578.

Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, Inc.

P.O. Box 391
Waterford, PA 16441

Address Correction Requested

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