

The Private Land Plan: Contexts and Challenges¹

By PHILIP G. TERRIE

Abstract

Beginning in the late nineteenth century and running up to the present, New York State has consistently demonstrated its interest in maintaining the forested character of the Adirondacks, irrespective of whether the land is owned by the state or by private individuals, clubs, or corporations. In the 1960s, this concern for protecting the natural character of the Adirondacks merged with the nation-wide drive to effect regional planning, a response to rapid, mostly uncontrolled loss of open space to sprawling post World War II suburbs. This movement became known as the "Quiet Revolution," following a report drafted for the Council on Environmental Quality in 1971 by Fred Bosselman and David Callies. This essay concludes by asking whether the Quiet Revolution, expressed in the Adirondacks in the Private Land Use and Development Plan, has accomplished its purpose.

Why has so much conservation and preservation energy been expended on the Adirondacks? What are some of the origins of a state-wide interest in what happens up here? What features of the cultural climate of mid-twentieth century America led in the direction of regional planning? What were the accomplishments and demerits of the Private Land Plan adopted in 1973? Where do we go from here? That's a long list, and I'll be constrained to aim only for a few high points.

Philip Terrie is professor of English and American Culture Studies at Bowling Green State University in Ohio. He is the author of several books and articles on the Adirondacks.

During the nineteenth century, the Adirondacks became one of America's sacred places.² This was a complex cultural phenomenon, born of the confluence of European romanticism, the rise of industrial capitalism, the emergence of a professional class with leisure time, and the increasing wealth of many (but hardly all) Americans. As transportation arteries improved, as comfortable hotel accommodations became widely available, and as a sufficient number of Americans possessed the disposable cash needed for vacations, tourist attractions developed.

American sacred places were seen as destinations for *pilgrims*, a term that nineteenth-century tourists often used to describe themselves; getting to these places and conducting oneself appropriately while there were freighted with cultural meanings. At these places, affluent Americans could restore body and soul via the redemptive powers of nature and by observing the rituals of touristic performance that became well understood throughout the professional classes. American tourists visited the springs of Virginia, the coasts and islands of Maine, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, the mountains of Vermont and New Hampshire, and the Adirondacks. Later, as transcontinental transportation improved, Americans discovered the spectacular scenery of the West.

In the Adirondacks, as with a few other sacred places, the holiness of the place led to early calls for protection against the ravages of an increasingly exploitative industrial culture. Albany journalist S. H. Hammond considered the combination of fragility and sacredness of the Adirondacks in the 1850s and concluded, "The old woods should

stand here always as God made them, growing old until the earthworm ate away their roots, and the strong wind hurled them to the ground, and new woods should be permitted to supply the place of the old so long as the earth remained. There is room enough for civilization in regions better fitted for it. It has no business among these mountains, these rivers and lakes, these gigantic boulders, these tangled valleys and dark mountain gorges."³

Recalling how the Adirondacks had become one of America's sacred places helps us to understand not only how the region was granted such significant protection in the Forest Preserve Act of 1885, the Park Act of 1892, and the constitutional provision of 1894 but also how the remarkable, path-breaking protections advocated by the Temporary Study Commission came to be included in that Commission's extraordinary list of recommendations. Just as at the end of the relentlessly exploitative nineteenth century, large areas of potentially useful land were not casually removed from the commercial domain, in the 1960s such far-reaching recommendations as those of the Temporary Study Commission were not promulgated for a woodlot; they were proposed because the Adirondacks was deemed holy ground.

The idea of the Adirondacks as somehow different from the rest of New York, worthy of special concern, appears throughout the documentary record. When the Park Commissioners of 1872 recommended the establishment of an Adirondack Park, they observed, "After a careful consideration of the projected forest park, with its practical bearing upon the interests of the people of the whole State, we are of the opinion that

the protection of a great portion of the forest from wanton destruction is absolutely and immediately required.”⁴

Equally important, the state began early to show an interest in the fate of private land. Concerned about irresponsible logging, the Park Commissioners of 1872 wrote, “When we find individuals managing their property in a reckless and selfish manner, without regard to the vested rights of others, it becomes the duty of the State to interfere and provide a remedy.”⁵ In its *Annual Report* for 1890, the Forest Commission, charged by the legislature to administer the recently created Forest Preserve, observed the importance of protecting a contiguous, viable forest, what they envisioned as “one grand, unbroken domain.” The Commission acknowledged, however, that the state might not be able to buy the large private clubs, most of which had only recently been established. In that case, the Commissioners hoped that some legal instrument could be devised to secure public access to the clubs’ lands and forests.⁶ In addition to anticipating one of the uses of scenic easements, this confirms the State’s early assertion that private land in the Adirondacks possessed special significance.

It took many decades of ambivalence and uncertainty — until the 1960s, in fact — before the state seriously planned how it would address the importance of private land in the Adirondacks. But from the start, there was this clear understanding: whether for protection of an adequately functioning watershed, for saving a recreational retreat, for conservation of a future timber supply, or for maintenance of a region where consumptives might find some relief from the scourge of the nineteenth century, New York, as a collective polity, showed its concern with maintaining the forested character of the Adirondacks, irrespective of whether the land was owned by the state or by private individuals, clubs, or corporations. Of course, it was the very failure to decide what to do if and when the state abandoned its intent to own all the Adirondacks that

presented New York with the need to take another look at private property in the mid twentieth century.

Throughout the activity of the 1880s and ’90s, moreover, the fate of the Adirondacks was almost exclusively discussed and settled by people from outside the region. Governors, journalists, legislators, and tourists all had opinions about what should be done, but seldom was the voice of a year-round Adirondack resident heard. In the process of legislating protections for Adirondack Forests, local practices — including hunting and fishing for food rather than for sport and gathering fire-

**New York . . .
showed its concern
with maintaining the
forested character of
the Adirondacks
irrespective of whether
the land was owned by
the state or by private
individuals.**

wood — were severely restricted, or even prohibited — by a growing state bureaucracy.⁷ A pattern of resentment of what seemed like outside indifference to local needs was established.

The distance separating Adirondack reality, where the region was rigidly divided between Forest Preserve and millions of acres of private land, and the Adirondack dream of one contiguous, protected Adirondack Park, was mostly ignored for a half century. During this time, most of what was interesting in Adirondack legal and judicial history flowed almost exclusively from efforts to establish the constitutional status of the

Forest Preserve — what did “forever wild” really mean? — as a series of court decisions and opinions from Attorneys General stumbled toward clarity.⁸

Then came the protests of the ’60s, which began with revulsion against both the war in Asia and the failure of the country to live up to its ideals of equality and led to Earth Day: 22 April 1970, wherein 20 million Americans participated in an eclectic combination of teach-ins, guerrilla theater, street fairs, and environmental protest. This was the same year that legal scholar Joseph Sax, writing in the *Michigan Law Review*, argued that the historic Public Trust Doctrine, which traced its roots to the sixth century and the Code of Justinian and which had been used for a millennium and a half (though certainly sporadically and with mixed results) to protect those features of the natural heritage vital to the common welfare, should be reinterpreted and expanded to embrace all the things “so particularly the gifts of nature’s bounty that they ought to be preserved for the whole of the populace.”⁹

New York State was in the vanguard of the nation’s re-examination of its treatment of our natural heritage. In 1968, Governor Nelson Rockefeller had appointed the Temporary Study Commission on the Future of the Adirondacks and charged it to examine threats to the integrity of the northern forests.¹⁰

In the middle of December of 1970, the Temporary Study Commission sent 181 recommendations to the desk of Governor Rockefeller. These recommendations constituted the beginning of the modern era for the Adirondacks. While the completion of the Northway in 1967 helped bring this region closer to the population centers downstate and while a recreation boomlet had begun a few years earlier, it was the bombshell at the heart of the Temporary Study Commission’s plan for the future — the establishment of an Adirondack Park Agency and the delegation to the Agency of Park-wide planning authority for private lands — that made the Adirondack Park what we know it to be today.

It's important to take a brief look at precisely what the Study Commission found and what it envisioned. "A crisis looms in the Adirondack Park," wrote the Commissioners. "Throughout this country unplanned development of both public and private land is despoiling resources once considered limitless." Noting that the Adirondack Park's capacity to provide sanctuary from modernity, in other words its role as sacred place, had largely escaped the worst of post World War II sprawl, they further observed, "Whether it will continue to be one depends on the foresight and resolve of all New Yorkers."¹¹ Widespread development of second-home villages, the construction of garish theme parks, strip mines — these and a host of other environmental disasters were possible and even likely given the *laissez-faire* attitude of the state toward the 60% of the Adirondack Park it didn't own.

The Study Commission's solution: "A massive state action program is necessary to make the Adirondack Park a viable and lasting entity. This program must be concerned with both the private and the public lands." They went on to note, "The key to maintaining the Park as a *lasting* entity lies in the avoidance of misuse by all landowners, large and small."¹² The Commission's charge boiled down to a twofold thrust: use regional zoning to limit inappropriate development on private land and promote careful expansion and consolidation of the Forest Preserve.

The work of the Temporary Study Commission, the establishment of the Adirondack Park Agency, and, especially, the very idea of regional planning were part of the new environmental consciousness of the 1960s and '70s, which the report of the Study Commission explicitly acknowledged: "The concern is nationwide. Significant action has been instituted in many state capitals. Can New York afford to ignore its Adirondacks?"¹³ In addition to concern about clean air and water and the many other issues that galvanized the first Earth Day, the notion of regional planning was gaining momentum.

In large part, the drive to effect regional planning was a response to rapid, mostly uncontrolled loss of open space to sprawling post World War II suburbs, of which Long Island's Levittown is perhaps the best-known example. Around virtually every urban center in the United States, Americans, abetted by miles and miles of the new interstate highway system, were building uncountable new houses; eventually, some people began to ask whether this was altogether a good thing.¹⁴ This movement became known as the "Quiet Revolution," following a report drafted for the Council on Environmental Quality in 1971 by Fred Bosselman and David Callies, at-

**At the same time that
land came to be
understood as more
than what it might
produce or sell for, its
finitude also
penetrated the public
consciousness.**

torneys and experts in American land use law. In addition to the well-known and path-breaking Hawaii Land Use Act of 1961, other important examples were both state-wide applications — e.g., in Vermont, Oregon, and Florida — and regional efforts, as in the New Jersey Pine Barrens, the California coast, and Lake Tahoe.¹⁵

The tentative steps toward regional land-use regulation and planning depended on a new concept of the term "land."¹⁶ As Bosselman and Callies have noted, up until the years following World War II, Americans stuck with a fundamentally nineteenth-century notion of the meanings of this much-freighted word. "Land" nearly universally implied something that enabled its

owner to make money, either through some sort of resource extraction or use or through sale or development. The post-war change of sentiment that brought wetlands into the classification of "land" and gave them "value" was thus a remarkable step. Obviously, this was at least partly a function of the emergence of the science of ecology, which dramatically helped to expand our awareness of just what constitutes such a slippery concept as "value." Where to the nineteenth-century farmer, value derived from the crops a parcel of land could produce or where to the logger value depended on board feet of lumber, by the mid twentieth century, value could also mean how a specific place fit into complex webs of interdependence, including its capacity to support wildlife, filter water, or add to the value of often distant other places. In other words, something that nearly everyone understands today — that places, just like all of the natural world, are interconnected — entered the culture of planning and land-use decisions and encouraged protecting, or at least planning for, regions as opposed to individual lots or neighborhoods.

At the same time that land came to be understood as more than what it might produce or sell for, its finitude also penetrated the public consciousness. When people see land as something finite, then the value of land is both increased and complicated. The culture of abundance that had characterized American thinking since the arrival of Europeans in the New World finally came to be challenged.¹⁷ All of this is part of the shift to seeing land as a resource as well as a commodity. So long as land was merely a commodity, zoning existed only to protect the commodity value of those land owners sufficiently powerful to exercise their will on local politics. Once it became a resource (while never really losing its commodity value), then environmental and social concerns entered into the realm of zoning. Where those responsible for zoning had previously asked only what will protect or enhance the economic value of this land,

they now began to ask what is the best use for this land? These new ways of understanding land manifested themselves from coast to coast: what happened in Hawaii or Oregon also came to pass in the Adirondacks.

These tectonic changes in what zoning meant — combined with the political, social, and environmental turmoil in New York — constituted the context for the Temporary Study Commission and its recommendations. Locally, we had the construction of the Northway, the explosion in second-home development in Vermont, the growing affluence of a mobile and acquisitive middle class, and the same concern with enjoying and protecting nature that gave us the Quiet Revolution. Joining the regional-zoning movement constituted the latest chapter in the long saga of New York's efforts to protect the forested character of the Adirondacks.

The critical question here, of course, is whether the Quiet Revolution, in the Adirondacks or anywhere else, in fact produced the results its advocates hoped for. We know that many states and regions established some form of regional planning. We know that commissions were set up, maps drawn, professional staffs appointed, and budgets approved. We know that regulations and bureaucracies proliferated. But was the sprawl contained? Was open space protected to the extent that environmentalists and other concerned citizens anticipated? Did the Quiet Revolution accomplish anything?¹⁸

When Nelson Rockefeller signed the 1973 law approving the Private Land Plan, he declared, "The Adirondacks are preserved forever."¹⁸ A few years later, Richard Booth and Ted Hullar, academics looking at the Park Agency's impact, wrote that New York had "established the most comprehensive regional land use planning and control framework yet developed in the United States."²⁰ Not quite.²¹ The Plan was a bundle of compromises from the start, before it even arrived at the New York legislature, where it was further compro-

mised in the battle between environmentalists and entrenched interests determined to see as little control as possible imposed on local land use.²²

As a result of the legislative tussle, the plan encourages over-development of the shorelines; we have lots of an acre and a half on previously undeveloped lake-shores, often with only 100 feet of shoreline (often creatively measured).²³ Where the plan submitted to the legislature recommended — generously, one might say — minimum lot widths of 200 feet in low intensity areas, 250 feet in rural use, and 300 feet for resource management, the plan approved by the legislature and signed by the governor relaxed these to 125 feet for low intensity, 150 feet for rural use, and 200 feet for resource management.²⁴ On most of the lake shores that remained relatively undeveloped in 1973, this change has made an enormous difference, and the saturation point

**Once [land] became
a resource (while
never losing its
commodity value),
then environmental
and social concerns
entered the realm
of zoning.**

has been reached. Likewise, the rules for setback, on-site sewage disposal, and felling trees allow further deterioration of some of the Park's most sensitive areas. Formerly natural shorelines are now lined with houses and septic systems.

Lands classified as Moderate Intensity are overdeveloped, e.g., Brantingham Lake, parts of Upper Saranac Lake and

Lake George, the Fulton Chain, the Chateaugay Lakes. In many places, re-development is occurring, as old camps are razed and replaced by 5000 square-foot McMansions. Similar problems occur in the back country. The Private Land Plan defines Rural Use areas and states quite clearly that "These areas and the resource management areas provide the essential open space atmosphere that characterizes the Park."²⁵ The issue of the Park's character is fundamental. Is it adequately protected? If a landscape traditionally devoted to agriculture, as in Warren County or along Lake Champlain, is carved up into lots for seasonal homes (that in turn become retirement homes) is the essential character of a Rural Use area being preserved?

On some lakes, where the shoreline has been developed just about as far as the plan permits, the houses are moving up the slopes. Mountainsides that for generations have presented forested slopes of unbroken green to canoeists, hikers, and motorists are now becoming pockmarked with opulent palaces of ostentation.

We have areas of sprawl, zones where moderately priced homes in wood lots are becoming de facto subdivisions, through the cumulative effect of individually approved single-family dwellings constructed year after year. Road-side development appears out of control: e.g., Old Forge to Eagle Bay, Warrensburg to Johnsburg, Saranac Lake to Ray Brook, and the westward thrust from Lake Placid. This is more than merely an aesthetic issue — what does this trend mean for century-old vision of vast, intact northern forest?

Should we be concerned about the cumulative effect of all the successive developments on a watershed, a forest, a shoreline? What is the cumulative effect of one septic tank after another on an Adirondack pond? Each one may seem to offer little threat to water quality, but what happens if every possible lot is developed over a period of thirty years, especially when on-site sewage disposal occurs in soils unable to handle it?

In 2000 and 2001, permits for more than 1500 new houses were issued in the Adirondack Park. Of these, only 15% needed to receive a permit from the Adirondack Park Agency. This followed a decade — the 1990s — during which more than 8,500 new dwellings were authorized throughout the Park, most of which did not fall under the purview of the Park Agency.²⁶ In three decades, the number of houses inside the blue line has increased by 50%. Does the Private Land Plan stipulate too many development activities as outside Agency jurisdiction?

Has the time for revisiting the Private Land Plan arrived?

While most of the controversy during the last thirty years has swirled around the Private Land Plan and the whole touchy topic of state regulation of private land, there have been dramatic announcements of major additions to the Forest Preserve, and we should not overlook their contribution to the continuing efforts to protect forest integrity in the Adirondacks. The Temporary Study Commission made it clear that enlarging the Forest Preserve was high on its agenda, declaring in one of its recommendations (number 27), "Priority should be given to the acquisition of forest preserve land within the Adirondack Park."

By the time of the Study Commission, hopes to enlarge the Forest Preserve, having departed from the dream of owning the whole Park, focused on key parcels of environmentally and aesthetically significant forest lands, lake and river shores, and high elevation slopes and summits. In 1972, the state bought the Santanoni Preserve, a 12,500 acre gem of lakes and forests in Essex County, just south of the High Peaks.

In 1978, the state bought just over 9,100 acres in the High Peaks from the Adirondack Mountain Reserve. In 1979, the Adirondack Nature Conservancy helped the state to protect some 15,850 acres of spectacular lakes and forest in the Nehasane tract. And in 1982, 5,900 acres of the Wilderness Lakes Tract north of Stillwater passed to state ownership.

In 1997 came the purchase from the Whitney family of 15,000 acres in the Town of Long Lake, including the lovely Little Tupper Lake and nine other ponds along with thousands of acres of forest.

**The Plan . . . was
further compromised
in the battle between
environmentalists and
entrenched interests
determined to see as
little control as
possible imposed on
local land use.**

The following year, again aided by private money, the state worked out an intricate scheme for protecting, via a combination of outright fee acquisition and conservation easements, 139,000 acres owned by the Champion International Corporation. Just this year, the Open Space Institute orchestrated the sale of critical lands in the High Peaks owned by National Lead.

This is a stunning, and far from complete, list of Forest Preserve acquisitions, accomplished by cooperation between state government, with the involvement of both main political parties, and private capital. I've run through them because they are so dramatic and also because they remind us that we really have two Adirondacks. The Forest Preserve is getting better and bigger through major additions, while significant parts of our private land, subdivided and developed, slowly degrade. This continuing bifurcation of the Park perfectly illustrates the fundamental American ambivalence toward nature: we want wilderness and profits, nature and exploitation of nature.²⁷ In the Forest Preserve we have nature, and on much of the private land in

the Park we have, often unfettered, laissez-faire individualism.

As seemed so often the case during the last century, the Adirondack Park is heading in two different directions. The state is adding to the Forest Preserve, and wilderness (or potential wilderness) is being protected for the people of New York. Year by year, piece by piece, there is more protected, public land in the Park. Lands that had been locked up in the hands of woods-products companies or wealthy families are accessible to the public, owned and enjoyed equally by a Buffalo taxi driver, a Lake Placid restaurateur, or a Wall Street lawyer. In a nation succumbing to the relentless pressures of suburban sprawl and industrial pollution, the Adirondack Forest Preserve resists the tide, holding out hope and redemption to another generation of Americans.

At the same time that the publicly owned Forest Preserve expands, private lands, especially river and lake shores, are degraded. The political establishment tries to satisfy environmentalists through Forest Preserve acquisitions and business interests through benign neglect of the historic vision of a protected, unbroken northern forest. When the Park Agency sent its recommendation for the Private Land Plan to the New York legislature in March of 1973, it observed, "The Park's extraordinary diversity and quality of lakes, ponds, rivers, streams and wetlands [note the priority given to bodies of water], of plant and animal life, of lofty mountains and gentle valleys and other natural resources, its vast expanses of forested open space, its capacity for a variety of outdoor recreational activities, and its historical heritage and key historical sites are of statewide, national and indeed international significance.... The challenge of the present is to use them wisely in order to insure their preservation for many generations to come."²⁸ Has this challenge been truly met? If the Adirondacks is truly one of America's sacred places, is it time to think again about how to deal with the money changers in the temple?²⁹

Over the last thirty years, there has been a lot of talk about how the Adirondacks could be a model for the world, a place where protected wilderness exists side by side with human culture — in healthy, productive, mutually supportive ways. Surely, one sign of this putative health is the character of the Park, taken as a whole. An improved, enlarged, well-guarded Forest Preserve — wonderful as that certainly is — does not signify a Park that is itself healthy and adequately protected. In its report to the legislature, the Temporary Study Commission declared, “Unguided development on the 3,500,000 acres of private land will destroy the character of the entire Park if immediate action is not taken.”³⁰ Can we accurately say that the “character of the entire Park” has been appropriately protected since 1973? The lake and river shores certainly have not been. What will we say of the roadsides and uplands thirty years from now?

If the Adirondacks is a model for the world, and if the character of the entire Park measures the success of that model, then who other than the Adirondack Park Agency can best promote a vision of the region that conforms to the hopes of New Yorkers expressed over the last century and a half? These hopes embrace the idea of the integrity of the Adirondacks — that is, the *whole* Park — as fundamental to the welfare of the whole state. Much has been accomplished. The Forest Preserve is a treasure. On lands both private and public, forests have recovered and the reliability of the watershed is no longer in doubt. The essential idea of regional planning, inspired and encouraged by the Quiet Revolution and inscribed in the Adirondack narrative by the legislature thirty years ago, is now accepted as a permanent feature of Adirondack culture. If Tom Bissell can acknowledge that at least some of the Agency’s efforts to protect open space have been appropriate, as he did to a Syracuse reporter last spring, then it looks like the premise of regional planning has reached its critical (in both senses of the word) constituency.³¹ There

are significant examples of proposals for development where deleterious impact was deflected by the Park Agency, where a development plan was rejected and then molded into a new plan with considerably less negative impact — Oven Mountain Pond, for example, or Paradise Point on Tupper Lake. And it’s crucially important to note that Ton-Da-Lay and Horizon have not knocked again on the Adirondack door. But much remains to be done. Is this an opportune time for taking yet another look at the historic vision of protecting the character of the entire Adirondack Park?

NOTES

¹ This article is a slightly edited and shortened version of a talk delivered at “Looking Forward 30 Years,” a conference in Lake Placid, 2-3 October 2003, on the 30th anniversary of the Adirondack Park Agency and the Private Land Use and Development Plan. See http://www.apa.state.ny.us/Current_Activities.htm.

² See John F. Sears, *Sacred Places: American Tourist Attractions in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

³ S. H. Hammond, *Wild Northern Scenes: or Sporting Adventures with the Rifle and the Rod* (New York: Derby & Jackson, 1860), p. 83.

⁴ *First Annual Report of the Commissioners of State Parks of the State of New York*, p. 5.

⁵ *First Annual Report of the Commissioners of State Parks of the State of New York*, p. 19.

⁶ New York State Forest Commission, *Report for 1890*, pp. 57, 77, 87-88.

⁷ See Karl Jacoby, *Crimes Against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2001), pp. 29-47.

⁸ Graham, *The Adirondack Park*, pp. 164-71, 184-207.

⁹ Joseph Sax, “The Public Trust Doctrine in Natural Resource Law: Effective

Judicial Intervention,” *Michigan Law Review* (1970), quoted in Mark Dowie, “In Law We Trust,” *Orion*, 22 (July/August, 2003), 18-25.

¹⁰ Graham, *The Adirondack Park*, p. 236.

¹¹ Temporary Study Commission on the Future of the Adirondacks, *The Future of the Adirondacks: The Reports of the Temporary Study Commission on the Future of the Adirondacks*, 2 vols. (Blue Mountain Lake, NY: The Adirondack Museum, 1971), vol. 1, p. 26.

¹² Temporary Study Commission on the Future of the Adirondacks, *The Future of the Adirondacks*, vol. 1, p. 26; emphasis in original.

¹³ Temporary Study Commission on the Future of the Adirondacks, *The Future of the Adirondacks*, vol. 1, p. 32.

¹⁴ Adam Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 15-43; Frank J. Popper, “Understanding American Land Use Regulation Since 1970,” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54 (Summer 1988): 291-301.

¹⁵ Rutherford H. Platt, *Land Use and Society: Geography, Law, and Public Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1996), p. 347-50; Adam Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside*, pp. 221-53.

¹⁶ The following section is indebted to Fred Bosselman and David Callies, *The Quiet Revolution in Land Use Control* (Washington, DC: Council on Environmental Quality, 1972), and their discussion of the key issues that came to define the “Quiet Revolution,” pp. 314-26.

¹⁷ See David Potter, *People of Plenty: Economic Abundance and the American Character* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954).

¹⁸ Frank J. Popper, “Understanding American Land Use Regulation Since 1970,” 291-301.

¹⁹ Quoted in Graham, *The Adirondack Park*, p. 253.

²⁰ Richard S. Booth and Theodore L. Hullar, "Has the Adirondack Park Agency Made a Difference?", *Amicus Journal* (Summer 1980), p. 12.

²¹ The following discussion of problems with the Private Land Plan depends, in part, on conversations with Peter Bauer, 20 August 2003; with Richard Beamish, 3 September 2003; with David Skovron, 24 September 2003; and John Collins, Peter Bauer, and Brian Houseal, 25 September 2003.

²² See Richard A. Liroff and G. Gordon Davis, *Protecting Open Space: Land Use Control in the Adirondack Park* (Cambridge, Ma: Ballinger, 1981).

²³ Liroff and Davis, *Protecting Open Space*, p. 30.

²⁴ Adirondack Park Agency, *Adirondack Park Land Use and Development Plan*

and *Recommendations for Implementation* (Ray Brook, NY: Adirondack Park Agency, 1973), p. 7, and Liroff and Davis, *Protecting Open Space*, p. 37.

²⁵ State of New York, *Adirondack Park Agency Act, As Amended Through the Close of the 1998 Legislative Session* (Printed 17 May 1999), p. 14.

²⁶ "Over 1,500 New Houses Permitted in 2000-2001," *The Park Report: Newsletter of the Residents' Committee to Protect the Adirondacks* 8 (December 2002-January 2003), 3. For the development figures for the decade of the 1990s, see The Residents' Committee to Protect the Adirondacks, *Growth in the Adirondack Park: Analysis of Rates and Patterns of Development* (North Creek, NY: The Residents' Committee to Protect the Adirondacks, 2001).

²⁷ Cf. Michael K. Heiman, *The Quiet Evolution: Power, Planning, and Profits in New York State* (New York: Praeger, 1988), esp. "Critical Area Protection and the Ideology of Nature," pp. 187-237.

²⁸ Adirondack Park Agency, *Adirondack Park Land Use and Development Plan and Recommendations for Implementation*, p. i.

²⁹ In a sophisticated Marxist interpretation of Adirondack history, Heiman argues that the notion of the Adirondacks as a sacred place is a social construction, designed to serve the needs of urban elites, *The Quiet Evolution*, pp. 213-16.

³⁰ Temporary Study Commission on the Future of the Adirondacks, *The Future of the Adirondacks*, vol. 1, p. 6.

³¹ Hart Seely, "How much development is too much?", *Syracuse Post Standard*, 10 August 2003.



Spring turkeys.

PAT HENDRICK