

**“Going Into a Place of Beauty:” Forest Preservation and Restoration at Emory**  
Whitney Easton, March 25, 2008

Each year meant a little bit more of attraction for me for the Emory campus. The plantings originally for the campus as it was laid out, were rather interesting and certainly attractive. The driveway, for example, that came up from North Decatur Road -- then a single road, by the way, wound through woods and over the bridges and on out -- was bordered with flowering shrubs and some evergreens. During the springtime and even during the winter when some of the evergreen shrubs were still there showing their leaves, but during the summer particularly, the flowering shrubs were just gorgeous. To simply drive up that little roadway and enter the campus going through across those two rustic bridges which have stood the test of time for these many years, gave you the impression of going into a place of beauty.

Woolford Bales Baker (1980), on Emory in 1919

## **Introduction**

Emory’s forests are one of the university’s great under-appreciated resources. They provide retreat for members of the Emory and Atlanta communities and beyond. They signal to visitors and remind community members that Emory is a place that has realized its obligation as a major university and is dedicated to a sustainable future—a place that makes the vision of a sustainable future part of its daily life, guiding principles, and core institutional values. Campus forests play a vital role in regional ecosystems, positively contribute to the poor air quality in Atlanta, and offer green respite to the community at large. They offer opportunities for recreation, serving as a positive channel for not only the body, but the mind and the spirit.

But Emory’s forests are also under threat from forces both within and beyond the university. They are threatened by invasive species, runoff from roads, and trends of global warming. They are threatened by Emory’s ethics of expansion and excellence, as the border regions of forests are encroached. They are threatened by our own human presence. It is vital in the process of creating a sustainable model for forest preservation and restoration on campus that past attempts—triumphs and failures, champions and curmudgeons, supports and roadblocks—are documented and given full consideration in the process of negotiation and planning.

## **Methods**

In order to form a history of forest preservation and restoration at Emory, I consulted five key individuals from February to April of 2008, in this order:

- James Johnson (Campus Services – Landscape Architecture)
- Chris Beck (Faculty member in Biology)
- Nancy Seideman (Communications - Public Relations)
- Tim Bryson (Librarian Woodruff Library)

- John Wegner (Faculty Member in Environmental Studies and Committee on the Environment).

A similar framework of questions was followed in each interview, with some minor variations specific to each interview. All interviewees were given a chance to review the report, and two informants asked for minor bits of information to be left out of the report, and those pieces do not appear below. The Ad Hoc committee on Environmental Stewardship website was also consulted at [www.environment.emory.edu](http://www.environment.emory.edu), and the documents outlined below were accessed through the website. This report was edited for clarity and consistency in 2017, to be part of an archive of Emory's sustainability history.

### **Timeline and Brief Outline of Key Documents**

- 1915** First campus plan designed by Henry Hornbostel.
- 1919** Professor Woolford Baker comes to Emory and eventually writes “Campus Development at Emory: A Historical Perspective” (1980). Baker becomes the first guardian of Emory’s forests (Wegner 2008).
- 1970** Professor Robert Platt and his Ecology class research and write “The Quality of Emory’s Natural Environment,” documenting deterioration of the campus’s natural environment and recommending the natural environment as a higher university priority in future policy and planning.
- 1986** “A Report on the Status of Forested Land of Emory University” by Professors W.H. Murdy and M.E.B. Carter (1986) was one of the first key documents in the area of forest preservation and restoration at Emory. The report records the location and status of campus forests and operates from the angle that “the near original hardwood forests should be preserved undisturbed, because they represent a unique and valuable resource of scientific, educational, and aesthetic value” (p. 1). They suggest that all forested land should be assessed methodically before plans are made for alteration or development. The work operates on and reinforces the premise that Emory has unique and valuable forest resources which require preservation and restoration. The report outlines the forests of Lullwater Estate, Wesley Woods and Peachtree Creek, Houston Mill House Forest, and a broader category of other forested parcels. By breaking up forest zones into three zones—near-pristine (red), mature hardwood forests (green), and altered land without rare forests (yellow)—Murdy and Carter form a sliding scale of recommendations based on the condition and prescribed value of the forested lands.
- 1998** Campus Master Plan.
- 1999** Starvine Way road through Lullwater controversy.
- 2001** Emory University Environmental Mission Statement was passed by the University Senate on March 27, 2001. The statement outlines steps to make environmentally sound principles a key

facet of the university culture through the avenues of teaching, research, service, and administration. Included in the overall vision is Emory as part of a forested ecosystem.

**2002** The Lullwater Comprehensive Management Plan was submitted by the University Senate Committee on the Environment and the Lullwater Task Force Subcommittee in September of 2002 with a particular focus on the Lullwater forest. The document was based on the collaboration of many individuals, including representatives from Facilities Management, Biology, Health Sciences Center, Woodruff Library, Cross Country Track and Field, Radiation Safety, Architecture, Public Affairs, Grounds, Environmental Studies, and a student environmental intern. The plan has the noble goal of serving as “a living, breathing document that will be referenced often, augmented frequently with new research, and updated as the University fulfills its responsibility to take care of this land” (Lullwater Comprehensive Management Plan 2002:5). The Committee on the Environment and Lullwater Task Force Subcommittee began collaborating in May 2001 in order to inventory the forest, review existing data to determine usage patterns, examine current access guidelines, and ultimately propose a set of guidelines and recommendations.

Recommendations warranting priority action included restoring the stream that flows from Druid Hills High School, managing trail use, redirecting storm water drainage, repairing the dam at the north end of Candler Lake, and removing English ivy from most areas (Lullwater Comprehensive Management Plan 2002:7). The report was recommended to be presented for review and endorsement to the Lullwater Task Force and the Committee on the Environment and formally presented to President Chace. After these measures on campus, it was recommended that the report be shared with the larger Emory community and public (Lullwater Comprehensive Management Plan 2002:8).

“History of Lullwater” was researched and written by Librarian and Committee on the Environment member, Tim Bryson, in April 2002 and became part of the Appendix of the Lullwater Comprehensive Management Plan. The history gives a chronology of Lullwater and includes some photos. The history was formed in order to help guide the creation of the management plan and identify “the forces that have helped to shape and reshape the unique assets and identity of the land” (Lullwater Comprehensive Management Plan 2002:42).

**2004** Sustainability on Campus: “No Longer Waiting for Someone Else to Do It: A Tale of Reluctant Leadership” (Barlett 2004) features Emory forests and the Lullwater road debate.

**2006** The Sustainability Vision for Emory, part of the university’s strategic plan for 2006-2015, forms a set of guidelines for a healthy and sustainable campus (Report of the Sustainability Committee 2006). Forests, of course, are addressed in the vision. Area 1, Healthy Ecosystem Context, seeks a “restored and restorative human and natural environment.” One of the goals of Area 1 calls for a forested campus:

Restore the vision of Emory’s original landscape designer, Henry Hornbostel, for a forested campus environment in which people move from home and residence hall to work and study. Create a long range land use and landscape design that contributes to a healthy ecosystem and is consistent with inclusive policies for

access. Restore forested lands and control harmful invasive species on university campuses (Report of the Sustainability Committee 2006)

The Sustainability Vision suggests that a forested landscape was part of the initial vision of Emory, an integral part of daily campus life. People on Emory's campus should have ample opportunity to interact with the natural world, reflecting the stated values of "connection to place" and "stewardship." The goal in the Sustainability Vision also mentions the need to balance protection with access. A continued commitment to university-wide no net loss of forest cover is also encouraged in the vision. Another goal hopes for the removal of invasive species from all campus forests by 2015 (Report of the Sustainability Committee 2006).

Additional Documents:

- Campus Walking Tour: Peggy Barlett, Tim Bryson, William Buzbee, Eloise Carter, JoAnn Chace, Howard Frumkin, James Johnson, William Murdy, John Wegner.
- Land Classification Plan for Campus.

### **Taking Stock of Emory's Forests: The Land Use Map and No Net Loss Policy**

James Johnson, the current Landscape Architect, came to Emory in September of 1999 and remembers seeing signs of an interest in forest preservation, but it was not organized. Late in 1999, John Wegner, faculty member in Environmental Studies, asked James Johnson for some campus maps, divided into quadrants. "I didn't know him at the time and questioned what he was going to do with them," Johnson remembers. He found that Wegner was trying to take an inventory of campus land.

Chris Beck, faculty member in the Biology Department, remembers the forests issue specifically coming to a head with the construction of Starvine Way and contention related to the road through Lullwater. Tim Bryson, a librarian with the Woodruff Library, has been at Emory for ten years. After writing "History of Lullwater" in 2002, he has an understanding of the historical background of forests at Emory, moving from Woolford Baker in the 1930s, to the growth of ecology in the 1970s with Professor Robert Platt, and the Murdy-Carter Report of 1986. He sees the formation of the Committee on the Environment in 1990 as a "milestone," with the shuttle road controversy highlighting the need for such a group. Bryson got involved with the Committee on the Environment by helping with the website. He sees the arrival of John Wegner to Emory in 1998 as a marker of Emory's increasing dedication to forest preservation and restoration.

The shuttle road is also the event that got Nancy Seideman, Associate Vice President for Communications, involved in sustainability at Emory. In her now eighteen years at Emory, Seideman had no interest in the environment before the shuttle road construction. She was responsible for handling the PR for the road construction, and she worked closely with the campus builders. She saw signs of a division on campus between the "environmental folks" and the developers and administration. The administration was working with the Committee on the Environment on the road construction and Seideman worked closely with Facilities Management and the planners, meeting with construction folks and Bob Hascall often.

“I have to admit that I initially thought the environmentalists were ‘unreasonable’ and the developers ‘slimy’...I really didn’t want to work on that assignment,” said Seideman, sharing her preconceived hesitations about the shuttle road controversy and sustainability as a whole. She began actually to think about the issues when she joined Wegner for walks through Lullwater. “That was the beginning of my education,” she says.

Seideman pauses to share some of the lessons she learned from John Wegner. She reminds me that Lullwater and Wesley Woods are really the only forests on campus that we have left. One hundred trees went down to build the beautiful Math and Science building (which ironically houses Environmental Studies). Another one hundred down for the Schwartz Center and the new Nursing School building on Clifton Road. They bulldozed a really nice knoll to build the Schwartz Center for the Arts, said Seideman. Baker Woodland is steadily hurt by surrounding development, mostly from road runoff. Building also cuts off animal migration. All of this, Seideman credits to learning from Wegner. “Before, I did not understand connectedness.” She applauds Wegner and Vice President for Campus Services, Bob Hascall, for having “brought us all together” on the shuttle road project. She also gives Turner Construction, the company Emory worked with on the road, approval for a job well done.

John Wegner elaborates on the construction of Starvine Way. The Committee on the Environment decided to study the proposal in detail, and the Murdy-Carter Report had already been adopted by the Committee on the Environment, which made it a policy of the Senate and, in turn, university policy. The Committee on the Environment set up a subcommittee to handle the shuttle road construction, which they “opposed on principle” (Wegner 2008). But the committee decided not to take a chance that the university might build the road anyway, so they decided to work with Facilities Management to help manage the “ecological impact on Lullwater” (Wegner 2008). The involvement of the committee meant that the university had to largely throw away their plans and start from scratch, since the original plan had the road cutting further into the forest. The road was redesigned, and the Ad Hoc Committee on Environmental Stewardship was also formed around the same time (Wegner 2008).

In January of 2000, a group of students, including Jacob (Jake) Halcomb, joined John Wegner and James Johnson in weekly walks of the campus forests. They broke the campus up and walked and inventoried to “evaluate the forests for character and condition” (Wegner 2008). The walks sought to fill a gap in the Murdy-Carter Report, which had only looked at certain forests and not at the vegetation of the campus as a whole (Wegner). They specifically wanted to determine what percentage of the campus was forested, built, or road in order to categorize the campus land into 10-12 types. This initial groundwork eventually became the Emory Forest Inventory, which had started with a conversation between Wegner and President Chace’s wife, JoAn Chace. They were talking about how zoning influences trees, and ways in which to manipulate the boundary lines to avoid having to replace trees. There was a question of how to account for trees removed by building projects on campus.

The groundwork for the inventory created the basis for the land use maps of campus. “I have walked many, many, many miles,” says Wegner. The work of Wegner and Johnson has become the document that guides forest protection on campus and was adopted by the Board of Trustees

in 2005 or 2006. It has become the most important tool for protecting forests on campus, applied three times so far: in the land swap to build the Ronald McDonald House, the mixed use development, and the new bookstore in the B Jones parking deck (Wegner 2008).

In 2001, President Chace asked Vice President Hascall to develop a No Net Loss policy, a step which Chris Beck calls “fundamental.” After the expansion of the Business School, which caused the destruction of many trees, Wegner wrote an email to the Committee on the Environment expressing his concerns that Emory was becoming an urban campus like Georgia Tech or Georgia State. JoAn Chace gave a copy to her husband, and the next day Wegner had several high ranking individuals placing pressure on him. The “upshot” was that President Chace directed Facilities Management to come up with a No Net Loss policy of forest canopy. James Johnson and John Wegner worked on developing the algorithm, which was stricter than the DeKalb County tree ordinance, a “joke” in comparison (Wegner 2008).

There were meetings to talk about how the county views trees and to work out an equitable way of accounting for trees. Wegner had Johnson write the policy, a process which took six months and was finished in late 2001. This became the Emory Forest Policy. It was presented to the Committee on the Environment and the President’s Cabinet. Although it never became official policy, FMD decided to utilize it on all new building projects. “Through its use, it became de-facto policy for the university” (Johnson 2008). It became the standard practice as the campus moves through building projects. John Wegner mentions that at one point in contracts, if a contractor killed trees within a certain protected zone, they would be charged a thousand dollars per inch in diameter of tree lost. He is uncertain whether or not this strategy is still in use.

### **Upgrading the Master Plan**

Some people from Campus Services were also working on updating the guiding principle of the Master Plan, including Jen Fabrick. The 1998 Master Plan had a section on “sacred space” areas, and some from the college wanted the guiding principle rewritten because “sacred” was too ambiguous. The Master Planning team was given the task of categorizing Emory’s land and deciding whether land can be developed. James Johnson was the key person from Campus Services, and he worked with a sub-committee from the Committee on the Environment, including John Wegner, Chris Beck, Bob Kibler, and Don Shure.

The Forest Inventory was used as a starting point, and John Wegner later did a more in depth study and wrote a more detailed report. Negotiation took place to define the categories and some people wanted to keep them as simple as possible: “Develop” or “Non-develop.” Eventually the group settled on five categories which we currently use: developed, managed, conserved, preserved, and restricted. They delineated each area of campus property and created a draft which was revised with the Master Planning Committee. There was a process of negotiation for a few months, and eventually the plan was finalized and the Campus Master Plan was updated.

According to Nancy Seideman, the administration has really changed with President Wagner and Vice President Mike Mandel since the road building incident. Now there is “no conflict for me to be a VP PR person and also be environmentally active.” In fact, people generally encourage that

sort of involvement, said Seideman. She sees the Lullwater Management plan as a key document to ensure the health of Lullwater. She took part in a lot of the writing for the document, which helped her to realize her role. She recalls checking up on the progress of the road during its construction. When she looked to see how the road was progressing and saw red clay upheaval, that was the moment when she asked, “What have we done?” “I think that moment transformed me—that’s when I became an environmentalist,” she shares. Seideman went on to become the President of the Friends of Emory Forest.

The Friends of Emory Forest emerged concurrently with progress on the Master Plan. The group started with JoAn Chace’s concern about Emory’s land and forests. She wanted a group dedicated to such issues and met with Jimmy Powell (then Superintendent of Roads and Grounds). He had just started working at the university, and the group asked if he would join. Dr. Garland Perdue was the first President of Friends of Emory Forest, and he really had a sense of Emory’s history since he graduated from the college (Johnson 2008). The group had a mission to protect and enhance the forests and started developing work days (2-3 times a year). They had some momentum going, and also arranged plantings. With the different presidents of Friends of Emory Forest, the group’s mission has been revised over the years.

### **Roadblocks, Barriers, Milestones, and Support**

Roadblocks and barriers presented themselves in various forms throughout the process of change at Emory. Key people involved in the change process saw “people’s perception of land” as a complicating factor—even people who consider themselves to be environmentalists sometimes see land as something to be exploited. Often, land with only trees “doesn’t have a value—if people can’t get in to see the trees, it’s not worth having [the land].” Tim Bryson says that “apathy is another challenge”—to get people to “realize the value and raise it as a priority in the community at large.” There does seem to be a shift in the administration’s appreciation of the forest and campus land for trees. And environmentally-minded recreationalists are starting to understand the environmental consequences of the recreational uses of land.

Communication barriers during the construction of Starvine Way between those interested in preserving Emory’s natural environment and those who were more interested in the built part of campus were also identified as a problem. Early miscommunications and an adversarial relationship between the Committee on the Environment and Facilities Management were seen, including “yelling and screaming” at meetings (Wegner 2008).

The Board of Trustees also wanted to avoid restricting its future generations of trustees by saying how much the campus may be built out. It took a change in administration to create a commitment and overturn the notion of it being a bad thing to restrict the growth of construction in future generations (Wegner 2008).

But improvements have been seen since the initial barriers. Lines of communication are much more open, and the university has initiated renewed commitment to preserving forested areas. Most key change-makers see fewer barriers now. Funding is still an issue and are needed for both management costs and to staff human intervention. Of course, it is difficult when there are

“competing priorities for Emory funding.” The will and university-wide leadership is present to implement the Lullwater Plan, for example, but the financial resources are not in place.

Internal supports have also been varied. James Johnson sees that key people in all sectors of the university have been involved—faculty, staff, students, administration. The Environmental Studies Department and the Committee on the Environment both involve a wide spectrum of the university. Johnson thinks “where the university is today is dependent upon the Committee on the Environment.” It has been an important part of the university over time. Chris Beck also sees the Committee on the Environment as fundamental and sees importance in some of the early statements made by the Ad Hoc Committee. More recently, the Office of Sustainability Initiatives has been important. Beck sees the lines of communication with the administration as predating the Office of Sustainability; the Office of Sustainability was a “further beneficial development” but was “not driving the changes in the first place” (Beck 2008). When Beck was new on campus in 1999, he saw how the shuttle road opposition “coalesced faculty, students, staff around these issues.”

James Johnson commiserates with the administration’s tough job. “Once you explain value to them and the virtue of having a forested area, I think they come to understand it.” They don’t always remember what an impact land can have on students. Alumni have a memory of what was here—and if the landscape of the university changes too much, they lose that connection. Administration is not a roadblock, you just need to “creatively approach them.”

Tim Bryson applauds the University Senate for supporting the Committee on the Environment, which he sees as the most important environmental group on campus so far. The environmental considerations of Campus Services have improved since 1999, especially under Bob Hascall. They now bring projects to the Committee on the Environment for review. Members of Committee for the Environment have varied, and over the years there have been between 15 and 30 members. Bryson sees the importance of departmental support within the university. It has been important that members of committees are allowed by their departments to attend meetings and support their work. When Bryson was the Chair of the Committee on the Environment, for example, the library was supportive of his new role.

Executive Vice President Mandl was identified as a key supporter at the administration level. John Wegner’s appointment as Chief Environmental Officer was also a milestone. People in certain campus offices have also been supportive, including Jimmy Powell in Roads and Grounds, James Johnson in Architecture. Bryson reflects, “There’s been quite a lot of support both individually and institutionally when you think about (which I hadn’t until now).” Nancy Seideman sees the Lullwater Management Plan as an especially important document for creating plans and definitions, which had not before existed. “I give a lot of people credit,” she says—President Wagner, Mike Mandl, John Wegner, Bob Hascall, Tim Bryson.

Seideman comments on the present concern about boundaries. When we see trash in the stream, we realize it’s not us, but it’s from upstream, she tells me. “It really is important to work with the communities—that’s sustainability,” says Seideman. Building on the perimeter of Lullwater (for example, the Ronald McDonald House) “casts shadows on the land,” disrupting plant growth and animal life. The fringes are often hurt—roads damage something like 50 feet into the forest,

mostly because of runoff (and she, of course, recommends consulting Wegner about the specific statistics). She pauses, looking across North Decatur Road to trees: “Don’t let anything tell you this is forest...this is green space,” she tells me. Seideman sees the present as an important time in which we will see “whether the university will keep its commitment.” She expresses her trust of Mandl’s commitment. “I hate the word compromise...too many times environmentalists are made to compromise—and now we have nothing left,” she says.

The No Net Tree Loss Program, which John Wegner, James Johnson, and Bob Hascall worked on, was also really important, according to Seideman. Support from the administration was identified as a key factor, for their resolutions guide the campus’s development. Seideman reemphasizes the importance of the shuttle road controversy, calling it “the beginning of everything.” She says that good did come from it. She won a PR award for her work on it, but it sits on her desk and she hasn’t been able to frame it. She really seems to have mixed feelings about the road and says so. She tells me that John Wegner has a piece of wood on his desk from one of the trees that was cut down to build the shuttle road. She calls Wegner a friend now, and thinks it is significant and interesting that they keep those two mementos on their desks as reminders of that period. Seideman says she will always see it as a road, not “Starvine Way.”

Student support and concern for the future was also identified as a support. The creation of the Ad Hoc Committee created a key system of support, “working at the grassroots level to build up environmental awareness” (Wegner 2008).

Currently, in line with the No Net Loss Forest Policy, a tree bank is being established, a bank account for tree replacement. When the No Net Loss calculations are done, if the number of replacement trees exceeds the number that may fit on a given site, the project puts money into the tree bank account to cover the cost of the additional trees to be planted. A Legacy Tree Program is also being started in order to maintain and care for significant trees elsewhere on campus; John Wegner showed me a sketch of the water oaks in front of Glenn Memorial Church on North Decatur Road.

Tim Bryson and others have no complaints about the current state of administration support. Support from the administration has evolved and removed a lot of obstacles. “We really can’t complain, we just have to compete with everyone else for the pool of funds,” says Bryson. He calls Mandl and Wagner “the most responsive leadership over the past 20 years,” a trend which “reflects the evolution of society at large and increasing awareness” (Bryson 2008).

Seideman says that taking part in the process of forest restoration and preservation at Emory “makes me feel like I’m part of life,” like she has some “role in the continuity of life.” She tells me that she was at first spoiled in Lullwater—she enjoyed the woodpeckers and the logs in the pond. But one day, the log submerged and the woodpeckers went away. She tells me that she discovered that things really do evolve, and we can play a role in that evolution. “I’m very proud of Emory,” says Seideman.”...[I]t all grew out of Lullwater.” After the road controversy, she did PR for a lot of environmental initiatives, from green buildings to alternative transportation. She is “proud of the university for supporting this before it was fashionable...for supporting it because it was the right thing to do and we did it.”

## Analysis and Conclusions

The shuttle road controversy was mentioned by all five informants as a key turning point in forest preservation and restoration at Emory. Some emphasized the camaraderie the controversy encouraged, while others underlined the process of negotiation and communication that took place. John Wegner mentioned that the plan approved by the Committee on the Environment actually ended up cutting down more trees than the original university plan would have. But, he realized the importance of avoiding the edge effect, which the university plan would have increased. He predicted that in the long run, many more trees would have died had they followed the university's original plan for the road which cut farther into the center of Lullwater. This negotiation process is a good example of the constant tradeoff between short term gains and long term, lasting success.

I was surprised to find that quantitative indicators seem to be useful in the process of preventing forest loss and promoting replacement of trees on campus. I initially thought that it would be difficult to ascribe quantitative value to the campus forests and enforce policy through such an avenue. But John Wegner calls the No Net Loss Policy an algorithm and refers to making calculations based on the formula. He also makes reference to charging contractors based on the inches in diameter of trees destroyed. The idea of the tree bank account is also grounded in quantitative thinking. It is difficult to discern the impetus for quantitative indicators in forest policy, whether they arose as a natural strategy of designers who are based in the fields of architecture and field biology or as a product of administrative pressure for quantitative figures.

Nancy Seideman particularly alludes to what Alan Fricker calls the “nonmaterial side of life...the intuitive, the emotional, the creative, the spiritual” (2006:193). One gets the sense that actively taking part in forest preservation at Emory signaled a much greater turning point in her life, as she credits the forests with awakening her to the connectedness of natural systems and the continuity of life. It was the education and participation components that grew Seideman's lasting interest in campus forests. Seideman was most eager to share her personal satisfactions in her work on forest preservation, whereas other informants seemed to focus on the more tangible measures of accomplishment, such as creating documents for policy change. Considering Seideman's reactions, it is easier to see how “quality of life, well-being, belonging, relatedness, and harmony” might line up with the more empirically-grounded measures of the other key change makers (Fricker 2006:197).

Fostering greater participation in forest restoration from a wider sector of the university and community might be a valuable next step, since problems of apathy and perceptions of land were mentioned. Both signal possibilities for an experiential education component, geared toward students, faculty, and staff. John Wegner expressed great satisfaction in helping to educate his colleagues in Campus Services during and since the road construction, and sees the rewards of his efforts in current interactions with them. Could similar rewards be reaped if education and cooperation were incorporated on a larger scale throughout the university? The Campus Walking Tour might be a good way to involve more of the university in the educational component of forest preservation, at least encouraging a greater knowledge of campus forests, if not an active interest and behavior change.

With the use of the No Net Loss Policy and the Lullwater Comprehensive Management Plan, change on the material level in practices is beginning to be evident. Changes in interactions seem to follow, as the Committee on the Environment is increasingly involved in building policy and the administration has become increasingly receptive to their recommendations. Many informants assure that the will is present in the administration. But, it remains to be told whether or not changes on the ideological level will occur, which would require a value shift in Emory's vision of excellence away from outward growth and toward the Sustainability Vision's idea of "restored and restorative human and natural environment" (Report of the Sustainability Committee 2006). Perhaps this process has started with Vice President Mandl and President Wagner, as they convince the trustees to put some limitations on outward growth.

The case of campus forests brings to light the inherent contradiction between an economy and society based on expansive, constant growth and the idea of sustainability. Higher education in the United States is a culture which involves 3,700 institutions, 800,000 faculty, \$85 billion in endowments, and \$185 billion in expenditures. In many ways, the success of the university seems to be based on growth—depending, of course, on the measures of success. Growth-related excellence undoubtedly plays into standard university rankings, which are so often seen as the most readily useful measure of institutional success. If Emory is to compete, must Emory grow? Can Emory compete in a new way? How much of a reorganization within and beyond the university culture would be necessary in order to control growth and preserve the natural landscape of Emory?

### References Cited

- Baker, Woolford B. 1980. Campus Development at Emory: A Historical Perspective. <http://www.environment.emory.edu/ecology/baker.shtml>. Accessed March, 2008.
- Barlett, Peggy F. 2004. No Longer Waiting for Someone Else to Do It: A Tale of Reluctant Leadership. In, *Sustainability on Campus: Stories and Strategies for Change*. Peggy F. Barlett and Geoffrey W. Chase, eds. Pp. 67-87. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Beck, Chris, 2008. Interview.
- Bryson, Tim, 2008. Interview.
- Fricke, Alan. 2006. Measuring Up Sustainability. In, *The Environment in Anthropology*. Nora Haenn and Richard R. Wilk, eds. Pp.191-202. NYU Press.
- Johnson, James, 2008. Interview.
- Lullwater Comprehensive Management Plan, 2002. Emory University. [www.emoryforest.emory.edu/lullwater/lcmpfinala.pdf](http://www.emoryforest.emory.edu/lullwater/lcmpfinala.pdf) - 177k - 2004-09-27.
- Seideman, Nancy, 2008. Interview.

Sustainability Committee, Emory University, 2006. Sustainability Vision for Emory.  
[http://sustainability.emory.edu/cgi-bin/MySQLdb?VIEW=/viewfiles/view\\_press.txt&pressid=220](http://sustainability.emory.edu/cgi-bin/MySQLdb?VIEW=/viewfiles/view_press.txt&pressid=220).

Wegner, John, 2008. Interview.