

Archived thesis/research paper/faculty publication from the University of North Carolina at Asheville's NC DOCKS Institutional Repository: <http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/unca/>

Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed:
The Impact of Community Response on Commons Environmentalism in Asheville, N.C.

History 452: Senior Thesis
Dr. Alvis Dunn
April 7, 2017

Catherine Euchner

Abstract:

In 1987 Powell Wholesale Lumber Industries Inc. and the Asheville-Buncombe Water Authority entered into a contract that traded \$57,400 for over 700,000 board feet that would be harvested in thirty-two months from the Asheville Watershed. The Asheville Watershed, also known as the North Fork Watershed, consists of 22,000 square acres south of Mt. Mitchell, the North Fork Natural Area, and North Fork Reservoir. Since the Asheville Watershed is a protected area of land, many people revolted against the idea of opening the land up to logging. Foremost among these groups was the Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed (CACAW). The small grassroots organization was successful because locals and tourists supported the commons of the Asheville Watershed and the Blue Ridge Parkway Viewshed. This union of stakeholders with CACAW proved successful and logging was not permitted on the Asheville Watershed again.

In 1987 Powell Wholesale Lumber Industries Inc. and the Asheville-Buncombe Water Authority (ABWA) entered into a contract that traded \$57,400 for over 700,000 board feet that would be harvested across twenty-seven acres in thirty-two months from the Asheville Watershed. However, the contract did not go as planned. The Asheville Watershed, also known as the North Fork Watershed, consists of 22,000 square acres south of Mt. Mitchell, the North Fork Natural Area, and North Fork Reservoir. Since the Asheville Watershed is a protected area of land, many people revolted against the idea of opening the land up to logging.

Locals, who were concerned with water quality, spoke against the logging in the name of safety. Some argued that it was not an environmentally sound practice to log on protected land. Employees of the Asheville tourism industry were concerned about the eyesore that clearcutting would create. Even tourists across the Eastern seaboard rose to defend the beauty of the Blue Ridge Parkway. First among these groups was the Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed (CACAW). The organization was founded by Monroe Gilmour and befriended by such famous entities as the Western North Carolina Alliance, Walton R. Smith, and Hugh Morton. Through public speaking, newspaper articles, and dramatic petitions, CACAW caught the attention of all the communities above. The small grassroots organization was successful because locals and tourists supported the commons of the Asheville Watershed and the Blue Ridge Parkway Viewshed. This expansive example of commons environmentalism is remarkable because of the diverse community of stakeholders that surround the communal land. This union of stakeholders with CACAW proved successful. After a contract revision, Powell Lumber collected their board feet and logging was not permitted on the Asheville Watershed again.

Gilmour collected six linear feet worth of material on CACAW and its assisting organizations. This collection, housed at the University of North Carolina at Asheville, holds

many of the group's communications with other entities including newspaper clippings, correspondence with the Water Authority, and town hall meeting minutes. The documents also include publications that mention clearcutting in the surrounding areas, not just those that spoke about CACAW. Monroe Gilmour, along with Samuel Lee Hensley, who has worked for the watershed since 1985, were both interviewed in 2017 to record their experiences.

Since only thirty years have passed since the impetus for CACAW occurred, published information on the group is scarce. Such a short timeframe does not allow for the development of many secondary sources. Instead, there are many relevant sources on environmentalism of the time. According to *Speaking Green with a Southern Accent*, environmentalism was still developing in the late 1980s. Due to a recent surge in the timber industry, the South was just then realizing the dangers of clearcutting and deforestation. Acts such as the Clean Air Act of 1963 had begun to crack down on our environmental impact on a national level. Wilderness had been officially defined by the Wilderness Act (1964). The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) then made it the duty of the government and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to regulate companies' pollution in 1970. A few years later in 1972, the Clean Water Act passed which required the government to monitor water pollution. All these major laws were still new and being tested. So, city level environmental concerns, such as clearcutting in the Asheville Watershed, were often left to state and local governments.¹

Many of these sources mention that other watersheds were also threatened by timbering. This information is supported by a document from the CACAW Collection. Robert W. Slocum Jr., Vice President of North Carolina Forestry Association Inc. wrote to the Chairman of ABWA,

¹ David A. Beaux, Gerald A. Emison, John C. Morris, and Rick Travis, "State Commitment to Environmental Quality in the South," in *Speaking Green with a Southern Accent*, ed by Gerald A. Emison and John C. Morris (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010), 19–34.

Ralph Morris, and stated that “You might be surprised to learn that some 130 water companies have an active forest management program on their watersheds that include clearcutting.”²

Another one of those sources is Suzanne Marshall’s book, *Lord We’re Just Trying to Save Your Water* (2002), which focused mainly on similar cases in northwest Georgia. Her extensive writing on the Southern Appalachian Forest Coalition (SAFC) even leads her to investigate campaigns against clearcutting led by the WNCA.³ Also happening in the same area was the development of the North Carolina Mountain Ridge Protection Act. As the first of its kind in the nation, this 1983 regulation was a comprehensive statute that limited construction on mountain ridges.⁴ This act was partially passed due to water concerns. Transporting water and sewage to and from high elevation buildings was predicted to have negative side effects on the water quality of the residents living below. Though CACAW did not deal with construction per se, the creation of this act was also heavily influenced by the tourism industry and concern for the Blue Ridge Parkway appearance.

Similar to Marshall’s book, Samuel P. Hayes’ *A Historical Perspective on Contemporary Environmentalism* (1998), found that different communities responded differently to environmental threats. Hayes investigated cases with varied community motives that are comparable to the community response surrounding CACAW. Specific to the Asheville Watershed, residential opinions were divided by motivation but in agreement on a solution. Some members of the local community had environmental concerns or concerns for the water

² Robert W. Slocum Jr., “Letter to Ralph Morris,” 9 June 1989, Box 3, Folder 3, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

³ Suzanne Marshall, *Lord, We’re Just Trying to Save Your Water* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2002).

⁴ Heath Jr., Milton S. "The North Carolina Mountain Ridge Protection Act." *North Carolina Law Review*, November 1, 1984. Vol. 63 No. 1, UNC School of Law. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

quality. Others who worked within the tourism industry in Asheville, worried how the clearcutting might discourage tourists from visiting the area because it was damaging the view from the Blue Ridge Parkway. Still, tourists who were not locally-based, held an opinion about clearcutting in Asheville. Hayes states that these motivations were so varied because they originated from a varied group of people who considered the commons, the Watershed in this case, valuable in different ways.⁵ An incredible attribute of CACAW was that the organization combined all these different interests and aimed them at the same goal: Stop the clearcutting.

Anne Whisnant's research in *Super-Scenic Motorway: A Blue Ridge Parkway History* better aligns with this thesis than Hayes or Marshall because it investigates how people reacted to changes to the Blue Ridge Parkway. CACAW was successful due to the massive amount of support it gained. This support first came from the local community and then a more wide-spread community of stakeholders who spoke in defense of the Asheville Watershed. The size of this wide-spread community is multiplied by every car that passes on the Blue Ridge Parkway, since the Watershed and North Fork Reservoir are viewable from there. This major tourist thoroughfare attracted large crowds and business for the local tourism industry, many of whom recognized the value of the scenery and environment. Whisnant mostly focuses on the construction of the parkway itself, but her research is a good example of how important the Blue Ridge Parkway and tourism industries are to both local and traveling people.⁶

The power of the stakeholder works very well with grassroots organizations because both seem to develop organically from commons environmentalism. "Discourses of Sustainability," the dissertation of Christopher Scott Rice is an investigation into three counties in the

⁵ Samuel P. Hayes "A Historical Perspective on Contemporary Environmentalism." In *Explorations In Environmental History*, ed by Samuel P. Hayes (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1998), 379–99.

⁶ Anne Mitchell Whisnant, *Super-scenic Motorway: A Blue Ridge Parkway History* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

Appalachian Mountains that harbored grassroots organizations like CACAW. These counties were Letcher County, Kentucky; Lee County, Virginia; and Athens County, Ohio.⁷ To be clear, none of the counties were Buncombe county nor did Rice focus on Asheville. In the interest of context though, Rice attempted to unite these situations by posing the same set of questions to each organization. For instance, he lays out one definition of sustainability inspired by the events in each county then judges the individual organizations against that definition. He also compares these grassroots organizations to mainstream environmentalism efforts, which are more successful.

The notion of commons environmentalism is best defined in Kathy Newfont's research. "At the most basic level, the word 'commons' can be employed to describe any significant set of resources that is communally owned, used, or managed."⁸ The Asheville Watershed is a commons because it is an area of land from which an entire community gathers a valuable resource. Though the Watershed does not fit into the four traditional types of commons outlined by Newfont, it is still a commons because the people of Asheville profit from the land as a water resource. The watershed is used communally and managed by a democratic, though appointed body, the ABWA.

Her book, *Blue Ridge Commons: Environmental Activism and Forest History in Western North Carolina*, investigates how commons create a special brand of environmentalism. CACAW is a case of commons environmentalism because it is a small, grassroots organization that grew out of a need to protect a commons area, the Asheville Watershed. Furthermore, the

⁷ Christopher Scott Rice, "Discourses of Sustainability: Grassroots Organizations and Sustainable Community Development in Central Appalachia." (PhD diss., University of Kentucky, 2002), accessed October 28, 2016, <http://0search.proquest.com.wncln.wncln.org/docview/251688367?accountid=8388>.

⁸ Kathryn Newfont, *Blue Ridge Commons: Environmental Activism and Forest History in Western North Carolina* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2012), 16

people who come forward to fight clearcutting in the Watershed are backed by a large variety of motivations which reflect their connection to the commons. However, according to Newfont, the word ‘commons’ only describes the physical land and does not include the community web that forms around the shared resource.

Still the presence of commons is very important to this thesis because it supports both the grassroots organization, CACAW, and existence of the stakeholder community. This society of stakeholders are the people who hold opinions and act as a result of their perceived entitlement to the commons. Newfont is fascinated with the wavering opinion of the stakeholders in Western North Carolina and how they do not correlate to typical environmental motives. Despite the mountain-man-tree-hugger stereotype, which Newfont seems determined to do away with, the stakeholders have very diverse connections to the land. There is a sense of ownership and entitlement within the stakeholders and, as Newfont found, the public can go either non-environmental or pro-preservation when it comes to restricting activity on that land. In many cases, some stakeholders lost access to the commons so that the area could become protected.⁹ In the case of the Asheville Watershed, the entire community lost access because the area is off limits to all recreational activities. The best way to enjoy this commons was to enjoy the high quality of water it provided or to travel the Parkway and enjoy the view. The stakeholder community that supported CACAW was so massive because the commons in question is also part of a valuable viewshed. The Asheville Watershed is easily visible from the Blue Ridge Parkway which attracts a large amount of tourists every year. There were many people who are not locally based but who felt connected to the commons because they travel the Parkway. However, the view from the Parkway is much larger than just the Asheville Watershed and

⁹ Newfont, *Blue Ridge Commons*, 251 – 70.

should be considered its own commons because it is valuable to a different society stakeholders. Those people who felt responsible for the viewshed of the Blue Ridge Parkway were brought together with those who felt responsible for the Asheville Watershed under CACAW. Whether for environmental or aesthetic reasons, the viewshed commons attracted a much larger audience and therefore, a larger system of support. CACAW, therefore is successful due to the massive directory of stakeholders that took interest in the clearcuts.

The story of CACAW is also evidence of the stakeholder community since the organization's success was dependent on activating a large system of support. Beginning in 1986, rumor of logging on the Asheville Watershed spread through town.¹⁰ The Asheville Watershed is a traditional watershed, meaning it includes every piece of land where water falls on and runs off into a common outlet, in this case, the North Fork reservoir. If you were to drive along the Blue Ridge Parkway, past the Asheville Watershed, you can see the small lake in the valley. The Watershed encompasses all runoff land, any surface water, like lakes or streams, and the underlying groundwater. The Asheville Watershed consists of 22,000 acres south of Mt. Mitchell. After heavy logging in the late 1960s the watershed was made a protected location and all recreational activities on the grounds became prohibited.¹¹

The suggestion of timbering on protected land immediately angered the public and stirred resentment toward local water authorities. Logging requires heavy machinery like skidders, bulldozers, log loaders, and trucks, that can damage the ground and plant life. The removal of trees can increase erosion and lead to water polluted with soil and debris. Samuel Lee Hensley, an employee of the Asheville Watershed since 1985 and the current supervisor, attests that “the

¹⁰ Samuel L. Hensley, interviewed by author, North Fork Watershed, January 26, 2017.

¹¹ Samuel L. Hensley, January 26, 2017

worst possible outcome from logging on a watershed is degradation of the water quality.”¹² One of CACAW’s major arguments rejected the idea that the Watershed was too delicate to bear public recreational activities and yet strong enough to endure logging with heavy machinery. Logging also removes animal habitats and can result in the loss of entire ecosystems.

“Clearcutting” refers to the practice of cutting all usable timber in a wanted space. This is also known as even-aged management. Subsequently, the process of clearcutting does not produce a beautiful view from the Blue Ridge. An alternative type of logging is all-aged management which means leaving proportional amounts of trees with different ages after harvest. When logging an area, the number of trees cut is not often used to measure the value of the wood. Instead, board feet, the amount of 12’x12’x1’ boards that could be cut from each tree, is calculated. The board feet and age of trees are usually calculated before cutting begins during a process called cruising where workers walk the specified area, measure, and mark trees for cutting. In the case of all-aged-management, this can be more intensive as every age of every trees must also be calculated. The term “harvesting” refers to the act of cutting and collecting lumber.

In the 1970s, before the formation of CACAW, there was a boom in the logging industry. Kathryn Newfont attributes this to a national demand for lumber at the end of World War II. Per Newfont, the influx of people coming home from the war lead to a migration within the country which led to the building of homes which required lumber. This boom was reflected in changes to Forest Service Protocol. Clearcutting became much more common than the previous all-aged management.¹³ By the time CACAW formed, similar problems had taken place

¹² Samuel L. Hensley, January 26, 2017

¹³ Newfont, *Blue Ridge Commons*, 251 – 70.

around the U.S. and in neighboring forests. For example, The WNCA, a major ally of CACAW, had already been involved with anti-cutting campaigns in other areas. The COWEETA research center was already developing research on the aftermath of clearcutting.¹⁴ This is all occurring when federal protection of land was still being legally developed. In the late 1980s, most environmental concerns of this size were decided on the state level by water boards.¹⁵ So, limited legislation confined this issue to the local government.¹⁶

The public originally became aware of logging on the Watershed through rumors believed to have started within Water Productions, the watershed management. In 1985, Samuel L Hensley was hired as an equipment manager at the Asheville Watershed. He believes he and the two other positions hired with him were preparatory steps to begin logging on the watershed. Before their intent to log, the Water Authority almost never intervened with watershed functions. Instead, the ABWA controlled the city-side of Asheville Water Productions, the body of people who control Asheville water supply from the Asheville Watershed, and the watershed staff were left alone to maintain the Reservoir.¹⁷ However, his hiring was a result of direct orders from the ABWA and shortly after Hensley began working for them, word broke about possible logging in the watershed. Hensley believes that the rumors which spread through the community began in-house. “A lot of people here were against it,” he said. The conversation quickly spread through town. It seemed no one was open to the idea of logging in the Watershed, though Hensley

¹⁴ Monroe Gilmour, February 2, 2017.

¹⁵ Beaux, Emison, Morris, and Travis, “State Commitment to Environmental Quality in the South,” in *Speaking Green with a Southern Accent*, 19 – 34.

¹⁶ Christopher J. Bosso, “Seizing Back the Day: Challenge to Environmental Activism in the 1990s,” in *Environmental Policies of the 1990's: Reform or Reaction*, ed. Norman J. Vig and Michael Kraft (Washington: CQ Press, 1997) 53 – 74.

¹⁷ Samuel L. Hensley, January 26, 2017

believed it could be done safely. “The worst thing you can do while logging is build roads. They cause the most ground damage. But since the Watershed was already heavily logged in the sixties, we had nearly fifty miles of roads at our disposal.”¹⁸ According to some documents, this number was as high as 100 miles of roads.¹⁹

Within a year, the rumors proved to be true. The project was originally approved by the ABWA, the predecessor committee of today’s Asheville Water Resources Board. However, the board that approved the project was not the same board that would carry it out. From the City’s perspective, the Water Authority was very split over the issue of logging on the watershed. In a response to a letter from Hayward Hargrove Jr., Professor at Montreat College in Black Mountain, Jesse Ledbetter explained that the original vote to allow clearcutting happened “several years ago,” and that the current opinions found that five out of the eight board members were against logging on the watershed.²⁰ This letter confirms that the water authority consisted of eight board members who were appointed rather than elected. This appointment means that the board members were not chosen by the community to serve on the Water Authority, but instead appointed by other government officials. The letter explains that the ABWA have always been against clearcutting anytime that it has come up, alluding to past attempts to clearcut. Ledbetter seems to argue that the contract with Powell Lumber was out of their hands because it was decided by their predecessors. During planning, project received little public critique and by

¹⁸ Samuel L. Hensley, January 26, 2017

¹⁹ Monroe Gilmour, "Clearcutting in the Asheville Watershed Not Over... Yet," *Green Line*, June 1989, D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804 (Box 6, Folder 8).

²⁰ Jesse I. Ledbetter, letter to Dr. Hayward Hargrove Jr., “CACAW Collection,” May 12, 1992, D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections (Asheville: University of North Carolina at Asheville) Box 1, Folder 3.

some counts only two people attended the town meeting where it was first discussed.²¹ The ABWA went ahead with plans and in December, 1987, the City of Asheville entered into a contract with Powell Wholesale Lumber Industries Inc. Despite the land's status as protected property, the accepted bid traded \$57,400 from Powell Lumber to the city of Asheville for 727,630 board feet.²² Powell Lumber had thirty-two months to cut and remove the timber from a 27-acre plot.²³

By the time trees began to fall, the public was already aggravated. Community-organizer Monroe Gilmour, who could see the clearcut perfectly from his neighbor's roof, was especially aggravated. Gilmour, who had experience with protesting and organizing, began to investigate the clearcuts. Those inquiries would eventually lead him to found Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed (CACAW). By 1988, a few concerned individuals had gathered under Gilmour. Though many local people supported CACAW, the organization had a very small vanguard. The grassroots organization challenged the local water authority by speaking at town meetings, writing letters to their representatives, working closely with the local newspapers, and even reached out to larger organizations, like WNCA, all to combat what they felt was a blatant abuse of power on the part of the ABWA.

Gilmour originally met the chair of the ABWA, Ralph Morris, during a public meeting. Upon being introduced, Gilmour recalls that Morris immediately said "you do not know what

²¹ Monroe Gilmour, interviewed by author, Black Mountain, February 2, 2017.

²² Samuel L. Hensley, January 26, 2017

²³ David Guggenheim. "Letter to Mr. E.D. Herndon." 4 May 1987, Box 3, File 4, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

you are getting into, this is the big leagues.²⁴” With a challenge set, Gilmour and CACAW began their attempts to communicate with the ABWA. These initial communications consisted of local citizens writing their representatives to ask for public documents, meeting minutes, and other evidence of who was making the logging decisions. Requests for documents were often followed up by inquisitive letters asking for explanation of the matters discussed.

CACAW remained a close-knit group yet their list of allies was extensive. Dr. Hayward Hargrove Jr., a prominent member of the community and Dean of Students at Montreat-Anderson College wrote many letters to the ABWA stressing the importance of scenery and water quality for his students.²⁵ He is also carbon copied (CC) on many formal requests for plans from the ABWA.

Along with community members, several organizations linked resources with CACAW to assist in their fight. The Western North Carolina Alliance was instrumental throughout CACAW’s lifetime. Before clearcutting began on the Asheville Watershed, the WNCA was already fighting logging in other protected areas. In 1991, Mary Sauls Kelly wrote to a Mr. Wood, who is likely Richard A. Wood Jr of the ABWA, to explain the position of the WNCA on clearcutting in the Watershed. Kelly laid out a plan that she based on the federal act National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and similar systems in other North Carolina counties. She asserted that multiple schemes for environmental management of the area should be drawn up and voted on by the public. She also advised against all previous plans and accused the water authority of practicing bad democracy. Listed in her carbon copies (CCs) were several other major players: Harold Huff, Buncombe County Commissioners, NCDA Forestry Commission,

²⁴ Monroe Gilmour, interviewed by author, Black Mountain, February 2, 2017.

²⁵ Hayward Hargrove Jr, letter to Norma Price, CACAW Collection, May 6, 1992. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections (Asheville: University of North Carolina at Asheville) Box 1, Folder 3

CACAW, and Citizens for Safe Drinking Water.²⁶

The North Carolina Heritage Program (NCHP) also played a major role in educating and supporting CACAW's arguments. The NCHP encourages voluntary protection of Natural Areas by public and private owners.²⁷ A portion of the Asheville Watershed, called the North Fork Natural Area, was admitted to the Heritage Registry in 1982. Provided by Anne Prince of the NC Heritage Program in her letter to Dr. Richard Maas of UNC Asheville's Environmental Studies Department, a registry draft and packet was meant to educate CACAW on the status of the North Fork Natural Area. The packet detailed the area and included the species that qualified it for registry.²⁸ The North Fork Natural Area in the Asheville Watershed was home to 12 populations of special status plant species, eight populations of special status animal species, and "occurrences of old growth and high quality natural communities... lower parts of the natural area contain some occurrences of High Elevation Red Oak Forest, Chestnut Oak Forest, and Cove Forest natural hardwood communities." Among these populations "the most significant (was) the southern Appalachian subspecies of the Northern Flying Squirrel (*Glaucomys sabrinus coloratus*)...it apparently requires both spruce-fir and northern hardwoods forest as habitat."²⁹ It is uncertain whether or not the Water Authority allowed clearcutting on the natural area but the

²⁶ Mary Sauls Kelly, letter to Mr. Wood, "CACAW Collection," March 29, 1991. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections (Asheville: University of North Carolina at Asheville) Box 1, Folder 3.

²⁷ North Carolina Natural Heritage Program. "The North Carolina Registry of Natural Heritage Areas," Box 3, Folder 2, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

²⁸ "North Carolina Registry of Natural Heritage Areas: Letter of Intent and Agreement to Register and Protect a Natural Area." 1987, Box 3, Folder 2, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

²⁹ "North Fork Natural Area" in Letter to Dr. Richard Maas from Anne Prince, 4 September 1992, Box 3, Folder 2, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

document does show intent to protect the area. Prince wrote that the “Registry of the North Fork Watershed would essentially be a written commitment on the part of the city of Asheville and the NC Natural Heritage Programs to work together towards the preservation of the watershed for its natural values.”³⁰ The registry form states that “specifically, the owner agrees to: Maintain the forests communities of the designated natural area in their natural conditions, Permit scientific monitoring and inventory of rare species populations, Manage the upper elevations of the North Fork watershed for protection of water quality, protection of old-growth forest conditions, and preservation of biological diversity.”³¹ CACAW thought it was not safe to destroy the environment surrounding such delicate communities that supported the Northern Flying Squirrel and twenty other special status species.

After several attempts to persuade the board to end the clearcutting, CACAW went public in April of 1988. The organization turned to the papers and began appealing to the people. Some of their methods included town hall meetings, petitions, and continuous news coverage. The battle between the ABWA and CACAW became obvious on May 26, 1988 during a public panel held by the grassroots organization in the Black Mountain Public Library. The WNCA showed their support by using the event as their monthly club meeting and helped assemble a panel of forestry experts to discuss the clearcutting that had begun. This panel included Haney Wilson, Walton R. Smith, Karin Heiman, and Hugh Morton. The meeting was very well attended by the community but Gilmour recalls that the highlight of the evening was when a bus of timbermen

³⁰ Anne Prince, "Letter to Dr. Richard Maas," 4 September 1992, Box 3, Folder 2, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

³¹ “North Carolina Registry of Natural Heritage Areas, Box 3, Folder 2, CACAW, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

fresh from their day's shift arrived.³² Powell Lumber had sent the men to attend the panel discussion in what Gilmour considers a blatant act of intimidation. The timbermen attended the meeting as citizens but their presence heated the debate. As the meeting began, CACAW members rolled a 2100 name petition down the center aisle, displaying in length the number of citizens opposed to the clearcutting.³³

Gilmour wrote that the meeting "helped galvanize and solidify what our argument was and gave us the credibility with Hugh Morton that (we) have a point and public decision makers should pay attention."³⁴ Hugh Morton added a lot of publicity and status to the event. Morton inherited Grandfather Mountain in 1952 after the death of his grandfather. He is well known for developing the Western North Carolina peak and increasing tourism to the area.³⁵ According to meeting minutes he spoke on the importance of the tourism industry as he had observed it for many years. His concern over the clearcutting rested on the fact that destroying the Blue Ridge Parkway scenery would jeopardize business in Asheville.³⁶ The meeting cemented CACAW as an influential opponent and further divided the citizens from the timbermen.

After the Black Mountain Public Library Panel, CACAW soon became regular local news. In addition to their support and participation in CACAW, the local and tourism communities responded in mass through letters to the editor of the *Asheville-Citizen Times* and other newspapers. Those people who lived locally were concerned about their water quality,

³² Monroe Gilmour, interviewed by author, Black Mountain, February 13, 2017.

³³ Monroe Gilmour, "Clearcutting in the Asheville Watershed Not Over... Yet," *Green Line*, June 1989, D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804 (Box 6, Folder 8).

³⁴ Monroe Gilmour, February 13, 2017

³⁵ Grandfather Mountain. Hugh Morton Biographical Notes. <https://grandfather.com/hugh-morton-biographical-notes/> (accessed April 19, 2017).

³⁶ Morton, Hugh. Meeting Minutes of CACAW Community Meeting. May 26, 1988. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 2, Folder 1).

since they depended on the watershed for its resources. They also were concerned about the aesthetic impact that clearcutting might have on local tourism industries because the plot could be seen from the Blue Ridge Parkway. Many tourists shared these concerns and felt that their enjoyment of the Blue Ridge may be in danger if clearcutting were allowed to continue. Letters came from CACAW members like Betty Jordan who wrote to say she felt that the newspaper was favoring the timbermen by only publishing their views and by publishing photos that did not reveal the true damage to the watershed.³⁷ This accusation is interesting because it is made by both sides; CACAW accused the paper of supporting the timbermen while the Watershed accused the paper of supporting CACAW.³⁸ Another example is the letter from Art Shuster who wrote the *Asheville-Citizen Times* in 1992 to argue against the notion that the watershed was a multiple use area. Since the area had been protected, the public no longer had regular access to it and were forbidden to carry out any recreational activities on the property. This point was brought up repeatedly by CACAW because it made no sense to their supporters how the land could be too delicate to allow hikers but resilient enough to withstand logging machinery. This was the primary instance of the stakeholders feeling robbed but the accusations of theft were reported in several situations.³⁹ Some believed that the money being spent on logging would not turn enough of a profit to be viable and therefore should have been spent on more important projects.⁴⁰ The letters to the editor showed that the stakeholders felt that not only was their

³⁷ Betty Ballew Jordan, "Only Help Watershed Now Needs is Protection from Timbermen," *Asheville-Citizen Times*, August 24, 1991. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections (Asheville: University of North Carolina at Asheville) Box 1, Folder 3.

³⁸ Samuel L. Hensley, January 26, 2017

³⁹ Art Shuster, "Watershed Cannot Support Timber Cutting," *Asheville-Citizen Times*, March 2, 1992, D.H. Ramsey Library (Asheville: University of North Carolina at Asheville) Box 1, Folder 3.

⁴⁰ Blanton Wright, "City Siphoned Water Profits," *Asheville-Citizen Times*, Wednesday 18, 1992, D.H. Ramsey Library (Asheville: University of North Carolina at Asheville) Box 1, Folder 3.

watershed being damaged but other aspects of the city were being neglected.

Under the growing pressure of CACAW and the increased public exposure, logging was paused in 1988. Loggers at the Watershed reported their progress in monthly updates sent to the Department of Human Resources. It is noted in these files that “considerable opposition by local residents to the clearcutting project has been generated during the past six months.”⁴¹ By unanimous vote on May 23, the Buncombe County Commission passed a resolution encouraging the ABWA to buy out what remained of the contract with Powell Lumber.⁴² Hensley says that the uproar from the community persuaded the Water Authority who was reluctant to make the offer. However, Powell Lumber, who was angered by CACAW’s actions, was determined to finish the contract. Hensley said “they wanted to prove that logging could be safely done on a watershed.”⁴³ Instead, the two entities renegotiated the contract and Powell Lumber adopted a different approach. They moved their focus to plots of land that were not visible from the Blue Ridge Parkway. The new agreement stated that the remaining board feet would be harvested in several smaller plots rather than continuing to cut the original 27 acres.⁴⁴ Instead of clearcutting, Powell adopted an all-aged management style for the remaining acres which, in addition to leaving trees of every age in the plot, required a 100% cruise. Foresters had to walk through the plot and measure every tree for board-foot to estimate how much usable lumber could be

⁴¹ E.D. Herndon, “Letter to W.E. Venrick,” 16 May 1988, Box 3, File 4, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

⁴² Monroe Gilmour, "Clearcutting in the Asheville Watershed Not Over... Yet," *Green Line*, June 1989, D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804 (Box 6, Folder 8).

⁴³ Samuel L. Hensley, January 26, 2017

⁴⁴ Betty Ballew Jordan, “Only Help Watershed Now Needs is Protection from Timbermen,” *Asheville-Citizen Times*, August 24, 1991. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections (Asheville: University of North Carolina at Asheville) Box 1, Folder 3.

harvested. Since the Powell Lumber plots were so controversial, every single tree in each plot had to be accounted for. Hensley was one of the workers to participate and he still recalls how the mass amount of hard work often felt unappreciated by the community. “It was depressing to work there during that time. You did so much hard work and it was totally thrown out,” he says.⁴⁵

The renegotiation of the contract between Powell Lumber and the ABWA marked an important evolution in CACAW. The original contract had called for about 27 clearcut acres, but only 19 had been completed. The remaining board feet came from scattered plots that ranged from 1.3 to 9 acres each and were placed so that they could not be seen from the Parkway.⁴⁶ Logging picked back up in May of 1990.⁴⁷ Though clearcutting was no longer taking place, CACAW did not disappear. Instead, they continued campaigning and resolved to halt all cutting in the Watershed. Hensley recounts that they began by only wanting to stop the clearcutting, but when they were denied the opportunity to stop all cutting, they changed their goal.⁴⁸

The group’s opponents were still active as well. The executive vice president of North Carolina Forestry Association Inc. wrote a short but potent letter to Ralph Morris in 1989 to express how disappointed he was that the ABWA could be persuaded by a loud citizen-based group and not fact. “It is a shame when ignorance and fiction overcome science and fact. But that has apparently happened with the timber harvest plan on the Asheville watershed. A few vocal

⁴⁵ Samuel L. Hensley, January 26, 2017

⁴⁶ David H. Walker, “Letter to Mr. E.D. Herndon.” 14 May 1990, Box 3, File 4, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

⁴⁷ Bob Holmes. “Letter to Mr. E.D. Herndon.” 10 May 1990, Box 3, File 4, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

⁴⁸ Samuel L. Hensley, January 26, 2017

people have been able to stop a very sound program of timber harvesting with nothing more than their voices – no science to support them.” He stated that he had witnessed the job done on Asheville’s watershed and considered it “excellent” work.⁴⁹

In response to these remarks, several members of the NCFA left the organization. Among these was renowned forester Walton R. Smith who responded to this letter by saying “Apparently, your influence has caused the Board to issue policy statements more or less condemning those of us who look to something different from almost total even-aged management in hardwoods.”⁵⁰

As CACAW continued to speak publicly and petition the water authority, reports of a fake petition copy began to circulate. 1991, David Guggenheim, a pro-logging forester employed by Water Productions, was asked to leave a WNCA Forest Management Task Force Meeting for his possible participation in the scam. Elmer Hall later commented on the event in the Asheville Citizen-Times by saying “that Guggenheim claims that the organization doesn’t believe in democracy. What a hoot!... If we had real democracy, the public would have voted out Guggenheim’s clearcutting brand of ‘scientific’ forestry long ago. He and the timber industry have lost the argument in the public and have now turned to infiltration, misleading ads, and intimidation tactics.”⁵¹ CACAW members and the Water Authority continued to go back and forth until the logging ended several years later.

⁴⁹ Robert W. Slocum Jr., “Letter to Ralph Morris,” 9 June 1989, Box 3, Folder 3, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

⁵⁰ Walton R. Smith, “Letter to Mr. Robert W. Slocum Jr.,” 6 July 1989, Box 3, Folder 3, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

⁵¹ Elmer Hall and Asheville Citizen-Times. “Timber Industry Spy” in Monroe Gilmour’s letter to Bjorn Dahl, 21 May 1991, Box 3, Folder 3, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

Within six years of its inception the contract between Powell Lumber and the ABWA was finished. A task that should have been accomplished within thirty-two months extended into the next decade. The actions of CACAW guaranteed that the area was protected from any further harvests. At the end of it all, 58.2 acres were partially logged but the view-shed from the Blue Ridge Parkway was left to regrow. The story of CACAW ends with the final cut. Without an official law, community and public pressure stoked by CACAW ensured that no logging has taken place on the Watershed since.

Though the group was small, their influence and methods seemed to stretch across the Eastern seaboard and pulled support from tourists all over the country. That massive stretch of influence is a truly remarkable component of CACAW. Like many grassroots movements, the group did not have a large vanguard, but it had a wealth of support from an area much larger than the local community. The CACAW organization owes their success to the impact of that large group of stakeholders who felt responsible to protect the Asheville Watershed, a commons environmental area. The value of the Watershed was recognized and shared by this large group. They felt that their stake in the land, whether environmentally or tourism motivated, entitled them to say if the area could be logged. Each stakeholder felt they ought to protect their Watershed and CACAW presented an outlet for that devotion. The group appealed to the stakeholders of a commons that supported several large communities. This meant that not only were the local residents involved, but anyone who regularly traveled the Parkway felt they also had a right to participate. Without the diverse motivations of the people involved, CACAW would not have made the lasting impact that can still be seen in policy today.⁵²

During the time of clearcutting, ABWA received multiple letters from the tourism

⁵² Samuel L. Hensley, January 26, 2017

industry. David R. Bruce, the director of a nearby boy's camp, pleaded with the Water Authority not to continue cutting since the scenery available at his camp was one of his biggest attractions.⁵³ In 1991, the chair of the ABWA received a letter from the National Audubon Society (NAS) located in Alabama. 600-members-strong, Peggy Lasher explained the organization's disappointment in the ABWA and how they so enjoyed visiting the Blue Ridge Parkway regularly.⁵⁴ They wrote about their concerns for the environment, water quality, and wildlife but mourned the beauty of the area more than anything. The influence of tourism and response of tourists to clearcutting on the Asheville watershed is an example of both the extent of this grassroots-organizations influence and reverence for the commons.

The topic of this paper is not so much about the property as it is about the communal reaction and therefore, the opinion of the public. There is no doubt that some members of CACAW felt cheated because they were denied access to the same land that was now being timbered. This is evident in the primary CACAW papers as well as in Newfont's book. Per her analysis of commons environmentalism, CACAW can fully harness the power of the commons because it marries grassroots organization with a "commons-based anti-clearcutting" opinion.⁵⁵ What is incredible is the invisible community web that CACAW was able to access. The group's pull on these stakeholders is entirely dependent on the strength of their stake in the land. Had the Asheville Watershed not appealed to so many people and had its beauty not been recognized by the masses, it is likely that CACAW's fluctuating vanguard may never have taken root.

⁵³ David R. Bruce, letter to Norma Price, *CACAW Collection*, May 6, 1992. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections (Asheville: University of North Carolina at Asheville) Box 1, Folder 3.

⁵⁴ Peggy Lasher, letter to Richard A. Wood Jr., "CACAW Collection," September 13, 1991. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections (Asheville: University of North Carolina at Asheville) Box 1, Folder 2.

⁵⁵ Newfont, *Blue Ridge Commons*, 251 – 70.

Primary Sources

Bruce, R. David. Letter to Norma Price. "CACAW Collection." May 6, 1992. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 1, Folder 3).

In this collection, there are a lot of letters to Norma Price (should research her position in ABWA). R. Bruce is writing as a member of the Asheville-Buncombe Water Authority (should research structure of water authority since this letter is the first to reference members speaking amongst each other) and signs the letter as *director* but does not signify any other title. Bruce runs a local camp and is primarily concerned with the preservation of the land's visual value. It is also worth mentioning that he references the Asheville/North Fork Watershed (research connection to Asheville Watershed). He then requests a copy of the prepared management plan and CC's Robert Brown, Jesse Ledbetter, Richard A Wood Jr, Ernest Ferguson, and Dr. Rick Maas.

Gilmour, Monroe. Interviewed by Catherine Euchner. 94 Penland Cove, Black Mountain. February 2, 2017.

Gilmour, Monroe. Interviewed by Catherine Euchner. Ramsey Library, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, 28801, February 13, 2017.

This interview was conducted for this paper alone and has all of the required Ramsey Library Special Collections Oral History paperwork to accompany it. Hopefully, these will be added to the CACAW Collection at the end of the semester. In the first interview, Gilmour discusses the basics of CACAW. He explains briefly how it was founded and some of the major events that happened. In the second interview, which is notably shorter, he more specifically talks about the Black Mountain Public Library Meeting hosted by CACAW. The panel that was organized by WNC Alliance consisted of forestry and botany experts plus local celebrities.

Guggenheim, David. "Letter to Mr. E.D. Herndon." 4 May 1987, Box 3, File 4, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

David Guggenheim, a forester hired by Water Productions, wrote to Mr. E.D. Herndon, who was with N.C. Department of Human Resources Division of Health Services at this time, to explain that logging had officially begun on the Asheville watershed as it was previously discussed. His letter reveals important dates necessary to the narrative of this essay.

Hargrove Jr., Hayward. Letter to Norma Price. "CACAW Collection." May 6, 1992. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 1, Folder 3).

This letter reveals the background of one of the events most prominent allies, Dr. Hargrove. Hargrove is the Dean of Students at Montreat-Anderson College in Montreat and a Black Mountain property holder. He speaks as though he has just heard about the possibility of timbering, which we know from Ledbetter's letter was decided years before. He is concerned about the impact clear-cutting could have on the school as well as water quality and wildlife.

Hensley, Samuel Lee. Interviewed by Catherine Euchner. North Fork Watershed. January 26, 2017.

This interview was conducted for this paper and is accompanied by the necessary Ramsey Library Special Collections paperwork. Hopefully, this interview and those with Gilmour will be added to the CACAW Collection at the end of this semester. Hensley worked for the watershed throughout the time of CACAW and generally disagreed with the groups goals. He provided a very detailed story with extra documentation. His input is very revealing of what was happening in the minds of the timbermen.

Herndon, E.D., "Letter to W.E. Venrick," 16 May 1988, Box 3, File 4, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

I wanted this quote from a very brief report sent between employees at North Carolina Department of Human Resources.

Holmes, Bob. "Letter to Mr. E.D. Herndon." 10 May 1990, Box 3, File 4, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

Bob Holmes, the superintendent (super) of Asheville Water Productions, the team on site at the watershed, wrote before Walker to the DEHNR to explain what was taking place on the watershed. In a page he brought Mr. E.D. Herndon up to date on the logging project there.

Kelly, Mary Sauls. Letter to Mr. Wood. "CACAW Collection." March 29, 1991. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 1, Folder 3).

Kelly writes to a Mr. Wood (who may be Richard A Wood Jr., a common name among these documents) to explain the position of the North Western Carolina Alliance on clear-cutting the watershed. Kelly lays out a plan that she based on the federal act NEPA and similar systems in other NC counties (research counties to find context on other clear-cutting events). She asserts that multiple schemes for environmental management of the area should be drawn up and voted on by the public. She also advises against all previous plans and calls them bad democracy. Listed in her CCs are Harold Huff, Buncombe County Commissioners, NCDA Forestry Commission, CACAW, and Citizens for Safe Drinking Water.

Lasher, Peggy. Letter to Richard A. Wood Jr. "CACAW Collection." September 13, 1991. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 1, Folder 2).

This letter to the Chair of Asheville-Buncombe Water Authority in 1991 speaks for the whole 600 member National Audubon Society against clear-cutting (check proper spelling) in the Asheville watershed. The NAS were notable allies of the CACAW organization. The letter argues that clear-cutting would have a negative impact on the water quality, wildlife, and appearance of the watershed.

Ledbetter, Jesse I. Letter to Dr. Hayward Hargrove Jr. "CACAW Collection" May 12, 1992. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 1, Folder 3).

This letter was written in response to another letter sent by Dr. Hargrove (whose name appears in a lot of these documents and should be researched more) to a board member of the Asheville-Buncombe County Water Authority, Norma Price. Ledbetter responds by saying that they have always been against clear-cutting the watershed and have opposed it *every time it has come up* (allusion to earlier attempts to clear-cut) over their 5 ½ service. Per the letter, the original vote to allow clear cutting happened "several years ago." They also present an uncommon argument that it is far costlier to repair erosion than it is financially beneficial to timber the area. They conclude that 5 of the 8 board members opposed clear-cutting.

Morton, Hugh. Meeting Minutes of CACAW Community Meeting. May 26, 1988. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 2, Folder 1).

The meeting that these notes were taken from is likely the ignition of CACAW's influence. This meeting was supported by WNC Alliance and the Forest Industry even shipped in loggers fresh from work to attend the meeting. This is when the dramatic petition was rolled out. Hugh Morton spoke in defense of the Tourism industry, which he has been observing for years.

North Carolina Natural Heritage Program. "The North Carolina Registry of Natural Heritage Areas," Box 3, Folder 2, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

A pamphlet printed by the NCNH about their program and how to become a Heritage Area. The pamphlet is undated but talks about the founding of the NCNH and intentions. I think this will be important when defining what the NCNH is.

"North Carolina Registry of Natural Heritage Areas: Letter of Intent and Agreement to Register and Protect a Natural Area." 1987, Box 3, Folder 2, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

Provided by Anne Prince in her letter to Dr. Richard Maas, this draft of the registry of the North Fork Natural Area and section of the Watershed is intended to be added to the NC Registry of Natural Heritage Areas. This is unsigned and undated, though Prince's letter states that it is five years old. It is uncertain whether or not the Water Authority allowed clearcutting on the natural area but it does express intent to protect the area. CACAW thought it was not safe to destroy the environment surrounding such delicate communities as those that supported the Grey Flying Squirrel and 20 other special status species in the area.

"North Fork Natural Area" in Letter to Dr. Richard Maas from Anne Prince, 4 September 1992, Box 3, Folder 2, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

Asheville, Asheville, NC.

Provided by Anne Prince, NC Heritage Program, in a letter to Dr. Richard Maas of UNC Asheville's Environmental Department. This document lays out the exact location of the North Fork Natural Area (not entire Watershed), ownership, land use, significance, and description. The area in question is part of a chain of Heritage protected sites along the local mountains. The document also recommends the North Fork Natural Area be added to the North Carolina registry of Natural Heritage Areas at the request of the Asheville Water Authority and National Heritage Program.

Prince, Anne. "Letter to Dr. Richard Maas," 4 September 1992, Box 3, Folder 2, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

This letter was sent to Maas, Environmental Studies Program at UNCA, after a phone discussion. Stapled to it was the description of North Fork of Natural Values that had been recently updated and a draft copy of the registry form that was presented five year prior. Prince, protection specialist with NC Heritage Program, believes these documents prove that the city of Asheville intended to protect the watershed. This letter also expresses the opinion of the Heritage Program on clearcutting in the Asheville Watershed, at least from Prince.

Slocum Jr., Robert W. "Letter to Ralph Morris." 9 June 1989. Box 3, Folder 3, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

The executive vice president of North Carolina Forestry Association INC, wrote a short but potent letter to Ralph Morris, the Chairman of the Asheville-Buncombe Water Authority to express how disappointed he was that the ABWA could be persuaded by a loud citizen based group and not fact. He stated that several other states and watershed have successful clearcutting campaigns and that the job done on Asheville's watershed was "excellent."

Smith, Walton R., "Letter to Mr. Robert W. Slocum Jr." 6 July 1989, Box 3, Folder 3, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC.

The infamous forester, Walton R. Smith, writes to discontinue his membership of the North Carolina Forestry Association in response to Robert W. Slocum Jr's comments on clearcutting in the Asheville watershed and those who oppose it. Smith argued that plenty of well trained and educated foresters recognize the problems of clearcutting the watershed and support of uneven-aged management.

Walker, David H. "Letter to Mr. E.D. Herndon." 14 May 1990, Box 3, File 4, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

David H Walker, a Forest Management Technician with the Asheville Watershed, contacted Mr. E.D. Herndon, Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources Division of

Environmental Health, to explain why reports of logging on the Asheville/North Fork Watershed had not been reported regularly. He gives several reasons including that he did not know he was supposed to report and that “terrorists” have targeted the watershed. At this point in time, logging has resumed on the watershed property after being temporarily halted so that contract negotiations could take place. He does not list CACAW as a reason for the timbering halt, but he expresses frustration with local “extremist” environmentalist groups whose threats have caused the head logger and a warden to stay on the grounds each night.

Primary Sources: Newspapers

Gilmour, Monroe. "Clearcutting in the Asheville Watershed Not Over... Yet." *Green Line*, June 1989. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 6, Folder 8).

This “report from CACAW” follows the order of events closely. Gilmour is writing to Green Line to update members of the community on the current state of logging on the watershed. He reminds people of the comments made by Ralph Morris over ‘beating a dead horse,’ and encourages people to continue in support of CACAW so that “the horse can finally rest.”

Hall, Elmer and Asheville Citizen-Times. “Timber Industry Spy” in Monroe Gilmour’s letter to Bjorn Dahl, 21 May 1991, Box 3, Folder 3, Citizens Against Clearcutting the Asheville Watershed Archives, D. H. Ramsey Library Special Collections, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC

Elmer Hall wrote to the Asheville Citizen-Times to express his shock at David Guggenheim’s displeasure with the WNC Alliance. Apparently Guggenheim, who was a pro-clearcutting forester who had been advising the Water Authority and Watershed employees according to Gilmour, was asked to leave a meeting of WNC Alliance Forest Management Task Force, which he disclosed in a letter on April 28, 1991. Hall states that this action was taken because Guggenheim and “his timber organizations” circulated a copied petition to confuse the public after anti-clearcutting groups had circulated a petition of their own.

Jordan, Betty Ballew. "Only Help Watershed Now Needs is Protection from Timbermen." *Asheville Citizen-Times*, August 24, 1991. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 1, Folder 3).

A news clipping from the letters to the editor section of the Asheville Citizen Times from Betty Jordan, a CACAW member who argues that the paper has been publishing only articles from timbermen (those articles haven’t appeared in the collection yet). She testifies that “the Asheville-Buncombe Water Authority tried to cancel the timbering contracts last year, the proposal that these timbering contracts uphold clearly states that the Asheville watershed will be virtually turned into a tree farm.” She also condemns the paper for releasing photos that do not honestly show the damage inflicted by clear-cutting.

Shuster, Art. "Watershed Cannot Support Timber Cutting." *Asheville Citizen-Times*, March 2, 1992. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 1, Folder 3).

Shuster argues against the assumed belief that watersheds are “multiple use areas” even though citizens are not allowed on the land for fear of water contamination. He may be feeling the sense of theft because of being removed from land by the government that Newfont references. He openly questions the ability of foresters (specifically Walker) to analyze the situation without bias. He does not reference his own qualifications but this is concrete evidence of the commons environmentalism Newfont described.

Wright, Blanton. "City Siphoned Water Profits." *Asheville Citizen-Times*, Wednesday 18, 1992. D.H. Ramsey Library Special Collections. University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804. (Box 1, Folder 3).

This news clipping discusses how a group of local citizens seem to agree that cutting on the watershed cannot be for environmental benefit. Instead it must be for financial gain. The men continued to talk about how there is not much money in timbering by the log and the money spent timbering is better spent on other things that need repair. The clipping is rather short and without context.

Secondary Sources

Bosso, Christopher J. “Seizing Back the Day: The Challenge to Environmental Activism in the 1990’s.” in *Environmental Policies in the 1990’s: Reform or Reaction*, edited by Norman J. Vig and Michael E. Kraft, 53 – 74. Washington, DC: CQ Press. 1997.

Once again, this collection of essays is all about providing context and it is on an even larger scale. This work covers the development federal environmental policy by working backwards from the then current policy in 1997. This essay specifically speaks on how the role of states is expanding to include environmental justice, policy making, and business greening. With the two citations above, I have covered an environmental policy analysis of the Asheville region, the Southern states, and the federal Government.

Breaux, David A., Gerald A. Emison, John C. Morris, and Rick Travis. “State Commitment to Environmental Quality in the South.” in *Speaking Green with a Southern Accent*, edited by Gerald A. Emison and John C. Morris, 19-34. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books. 2010.

This book seems the dance around my topic but like Hays collection, this volume offers context on the local are. Instead of focusing on Asheville though, this volume covers the whole southern united states. Since clear-cutting was occurring all along the Appalachian Mountains at that time, it is worth considering. It is also a very recent work but makes several references to the development of Environmentalism in NC.

Grandfather Mountain. Hugh Morton Biographical Notes. <https://grandfather.com/hugh-morton-biographical-notes/> (accessed April 19, 2017).

This website is published by Grandfather Mountain and has a biographical note list of Hugh Morton’s life. The information was very straightforward and was necessary to explain how he brought status to CACAW’s argument.

Hays, Samuel P. "A Historical Perspective on Contemporary Environmentalism." In *Explorations In Environmental History*, edited by Samuel P. Hayes, 379 – 399. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. 1998.

The full collection spans four decades of environmental policy. This essay focuses on the impact of environment in the residential mind and how the fluctuation of values can aid or harm the environment. This is a much need background source that may provide context. I believe this volume will be helpful as I try to pinpoint exactly how Asheville citizens thought about the CACAW movement instead of falling back on the modern interpretation of Asheville as a green city.

Heath Jr., Milton S. "The North Carolina Mountain Ridge Protection Act." *North Carolina Law Review*, November 1, 1984. Vol. 63 No. 1. UNC School of Law. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The 1983 Act was the first of its kind in the nation. No other state had a comprehensive statute regulating construction on mountain ridges. Heath explores the climate that produced this new type of bill and how tourism in particular played a part in its development. This is very similar to CACAW because it involves water concerns, tourism, and aesthetic value of the land.

Marshall, Suzanne. *Lord, We're Just Trying to Save Your Water*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida. 2002.

This book follows events that are occurring at the same time as the battle between CACAW and the Water Authority. Marshall covers environmental developments in the southern states with a focus on Georgia. Not only is the timeliness of this book relevant but it also focuses on the challenges presented with water preservation. This is a welcome contrast to the other sources which mostly focus on logging and clearcutting since this thesis investigates both.

Newfont, Kathryn. *Blue Ridge Commons: Environmental Activism and Forest History in Western North Carolina*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press. 2012.

This book was heavily recommended by Professors and Special Collections Archivists for my topic. This books revolves around what Dr. Newfont calls 'commons environmentalism' in the Blue Ridge Mountains and Western North Carolina. Though her research shows strong opposition to many environmental movements, she closely analyzes the apparent success of any side aligned with residential movements. This book is my main secondary source.

Rice, Christopher Scott. "Discourses of Sustainability: Grassroots Organizations and Sustainable Community Development in Central Appalachia." (PhD diss., University of Kentucky, 2002) accessed October 28, 2016.
<http://0search.proquest.com.wncln.wncln.org/docview/251688367?accountid=8388>.

This is the thesis paper of Dr. Chistopher Scott Rice, submitted to the University of Kentucky where he now teaches. His paper considers the challenges of initiating environmental change and community development. Specifically, the paper analyzes several Appalachian communities who have influential grassroots organizations (GROs) and assesses the success of community

sustainability programs in the case counties. The topic is so close to mine that the bibliography alone would be enough reason to consider this source.

Whisnant, Anne Mitchell. *Super-scenic Motorway: A Blue Ridge Parkway History*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

This book was also directly suggested by a professor. Dr. Anne Mitchell Whisnant is a graduate and professor at UNC Chapel Hill, where her book was published. Her specialization in U.S. National Parks is clearly expressed in the academic volume where she debunks the idea that the National Parks along the Blue Ridge were always untouched places of peace. This is a very investigative history of the roadway that runs right by the Asheville Watershed. A study of the Blue Ridge and of tourism in Asheville is important context to my topic.

Timeline created with Knightlabs

https://cdn.knightlab.com/libs/timeline3/latest/embed/index.html?source=10qf0dk6ixWz7PQ6X-8ck02CBN6EtvbCZz0vAraQJmLo&font=Default&lang=en&initial_zoom=2&height=650