



UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

Pub. Lands

1966-67

For the record and mainly for internal use I have prepared a factual summary of the various actions undertaken during my Bureau of Land Management Directorship. Because of your long time interest in public lands and BLM, I am sending you a copy.

Since the matters described are quite recent and, in several instances, controversial, I would appreciate your treating this report as confidential source material; and would ask that you not refer to it directly or quote from it. Within these limitations you may wish to draw from some of the substantive material as background on public land matters of your concern. Too often a communication gap exists between internal administration of resource agencies and those who are genuinely interested in the programs and problems with which the agencies deal. This report may be a useful means of bridging this gap on BLM public lands matters and I hope it will be helpful to you.

Enclosure

REPORT AND SUMMARY OF ACTIONS IN THE BUREAU OF LAND
MANAGEMENT DURING THE DIRECTORSHIP OF
CHARLES H. STODDARD - JUNE '63 to JUNE '66

Major changes in organization and program direction occurred during the three years of my Directorship which are important to record for future use by BLM as it seeks to implement and modify future policies and programs. Personally, I feel the major changes in organization, goal clarification and in developing a system of land-use planning are well underway and BLM has now charted a systematic course.

THE BUREAU AND THE PUBLIC LANDS IN EARLY 1963

From the BLM's formation in 1946, by combining the General Land Office, Cadastral Survey, the Grazing Service and the O&C Forestry program, it was divided into separate and unilateral functional groups -- forestry, range, engineering including cadastral surveying, lands, minerals, plus protection, planning, legislative and administrative adjuncts. Systematic coordination among these functions was absent. Clear goals were not set forth, with the result that problems were handled on a case-by-case basis. No system or framework was available to guide decision-making or program direction. (This situation was underlined by a series of exceptionally well developed problem papers on individual case problems presented upon my arrival by Harold Hochmuth, Associate Director of BLM.)

The field organization consisted of State offices to which was delegated nearly autonomous powers, with the Washington Office in a weak oversight position. Historically BLM had a reputation of being an agency which merely processed requests for use of public land resources with a custodial -- not managerial -- viewpoint. This was the result of a history of political and economic pressures on decision-making. Strength of administration by BLM Directors was usually rewarded by transfers elsewhere or firing. A showing of strength meant controversy and in the Department of the Interior controversy has always been shunned whenever powerful interest groups brought on political pressure.

Field programs in 1963 and previously were usually in response to demands by interest groups: sums spent for so-called soil and moisture conservation largely went for livestock forage revegetation; land and cadastral surveying actions took care of applicants for Federal lands; forestry programs were largely timber sales; and range management efforts concentrated on allocating grazing privileges (adjudication). The BLM field District Offices were made up of specialists--engineers, realty, forestry, range, protection--each of whom worked in his own functions; left to the District Manager alone was the overall management of millions of acres. No system existed to give close on-the-ground supervision to all activities, uses and work projects on units of smaller size below the District Manager level.

PROGRAM AND ORGANIZATION CHANGES - 1963-1966

Although I was generally aware of the above state of affairs from previous association and study, they were brought into focus by Professor George Shipman of the Institute of Public Administration (University of Washington). He had been engaged by the Bureau prior to my arrival to make a study of organizational structure. After a ten day get-acquainted period, Dr. Shipman came in and described the divided, uncoordinated, unilateral structure of BLM and its case-by-case orientation, its custodial (as opposed to managerial) approach and its lack of a mission or goal. He went on, in effect, to say, "Unless you can spell out a goal, a set of objectives, I can't be of much value to you nor can I come up with any organizational recommendations. Organization must be tailored to mission."

I told Dr. Shipman that I had only some broad outlines of ideas on land-use classification, planning and multiple use management, but these might be sufficient to start with. The developments sketched in the following paragraphs will summarize the evolution of actions during my administration of the Bureau of Land Management.

Goals and Programs to Attain Them

BLM's administration of public lands was caught on a twin-horned dilemma between pressures for disposal and pressure for retention. Actually, since the 1920's disposal to the private sector has waned as the agricultural lands were taken, but in its place adjustments

and transfers to State and other Federal agencies continued at an unequaled pace and in an unplanned way. The Taylor Grazing Act used the term "pending final disposition" in authorizing interim management and a number of disposal laws remained in force -- Mining Act of 1872, several agricultural settlement laws, Small Tract Act, etc. -- all of which led to an uncertain future tenure and pressure to transfer lands to single purpose agencies -- Reclamation for reservoirs, National Park Service for recreation areas, wildlife lands to the States, etc. An administrative pattern made up of fragments, intermingled lands and blocks, clouded broad public understanding of these lands and left them largely under local interest-use and domination without national awareness of their existence.

To break this deadlock a system of land-use planning was needed. Such a system would employ known techniques of land classification to establish defined areas for multiple use management and to make other lands available to meet disposal needs. Thus, the central goal was to classify public lands susceptible to multiple resource use management and to identify those more proper for disposition and to obtain legislation to secure this objective. Defined boundaries, a name comparable to National Parks and Forests, colors on maps, signs at entrances and exists, etc., would finally give the public lands to be retained an identity not heretofore attained.

Related goals were to respond to needs to dispose of lands on the periphery of expanding towns and cities. A systematic plan and program for retained lands management must be developed while modern land-use planning and zoning techniques are applied to disposable lands.

Yet the need for multi-use approach had long been recognized. Tightened up and more specific technical guidelines, using demonstrated techniques, were needed to replace relaxed standards locally determined. Forestry programs tied to allowable cut and range programs largely related to adjudication of grazing privileges have too often been, in fact, single-purpose objectives.

Under the headings and subheadings which follow, individual actions which were taken to attain objectives and to solve outstanding problems are set forth and described by topics. In October of 1965, I

sent to the field a Program Policy Guide which set forth goals and guides for achieving them. (Attachment A), now entitled "General Policy Statement - Manual # 1603." This was designed to pull together into a cohesive whole the several major moves and directions of the past two years.

Organization Structure

Following the analysis made by Professor Shipman, ^{1/} BLM went through a major Washington Office reorganization from a five functional and separate group structure to a basic staff and line structure. The line established was from Assistant Directors through the State offices to the districts. The resources staff was organized in two groups: Resources Standards and Technology (for renewable resources) and Lands and Minerals Standards and Technology (for classification and disposition of non-renewable resources). These staffs operate both in Washington and the Service Centers. The Resource Management Staff included the old functions of range, forest and protection and added soil, watershed and wildlife and recreation to broaden the spectrum of multiple use consideration required in public land management. In addition, an Office of Program Development replaced the old Planning Staff and was responsible to the Director's office for the purpose of developing new program systems. An Office of Legislation and Cooperative Relations was established to coordinate BLM's legislative recommendations--internally and externally--along with testimony on bills, to develop and improve relations with such groups as county and State land-use planning commissions, develop a systematic program with Soil Conservation Districts and to handle inter-bureau and inter-departmental matters of a wide variety.

The eleven State offices were transformed into line program management operations which also handled relationships with the State governments and supervised land offices.

Our proposal to establish three regional offices was never acted upon by Under Secretary Carver. He wanted me to secure clearance from the "Hill" which was nearly impossible. (Confusion

^{1/} See Shipman Report in BLM Files.

between the Land Offices which provided services to land users and State Offices which provided overall supervision of district activities was the source of misunderstanding). The savings in duplicated manpower would have been substantial and Under Secretary Carver had represented to the Bureau of the Budget that he could obtain such savings.

State offices are too often State oriented, not Federal, as was too clearly the case in Oregon. They fall more easily under the sway of State political leaders and special interest groups but once established it is almost impossible to change them.

In lieu of a regional set up, two Service Centers were established-- Denver and Portland--to provide additional technical staff by combining them with the field administrative services offices for better service to the State and District offices.

District offices had always operated on a staff basis (engineer, lands, range, forestry, protection, etc.) with the District Manager the only line officer for general program responsibility on several million acres. Although Dr. Shipman did not suggest division of the districts into more manageable segments, it appeared to me that other successful land management agencies had smaller areas with rangers in charge of all activities in the area. Consequently, re-organization anticipated moving toward four to six area managers (rangers) in each district, responsible for all user activities (grazing, logging, etc.) in their portion of the district. The area manager could draw on staff specialists in the district office for project design, etc. More active use supervision and better project performance were two immediate expected results. Insufficient manpower is the greatest obstacle to a full complement of area managers.

Due to the fact that much of the original Public Domain has passed from Federal ownership, we found some district offices set up in areas that had only small acreages of public lands. This situation was wasteful of manpower and money. We were able to consolidate a number of these with nearby districts. Further consolidations will likely become desirable in the future as BLM disposes of land under the Classification and Multiple Use Act.

Two full years were required to put into effect the reorganization, with much attendant agony and misunderstanding. It needs a few modifications (mostly in the Washington Office) but is generally performing as expected. Tom Floyd can be credited with the major reorganization responsibility and accomplishment.

LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

Except for the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 for grazing lands and the O&C Forestry Act of 1937, BLM was hemmed in by old disposal laws and special bills for relief of individual situations. To break this deadlock, BLM had been trying for Departmental approval of two bills--one to authorize multiple use, expressly, and another to authorize lands for sale where needed for urban-residential, commercial, industrial and related uses. Resistance to this developed because no method of classification was clearly set forth to show which law would apply to a given tract of land.

The deadlock was broken by providing classification criteria in the new Multiple Use Act which were required to be applied prior to division for retention or disposal. This new Classification and Multiple Use Law (P. L. 88-607) and its companion, Public Sale Act (P. L. 88-608) were given only until mid-1969 to function during the period of Public Land Law Review Commission's study. Both laws and the one setting up the Public Land Law Review Committee (88-606) were signed by the President on September 19, 1964.

BLM's major land classification effort based upon these laws can be expected to yield a solid body of recommendations for factually based retention of lands under Federal management and disposal of urban-border lands. This process is described in a later section.

LAND CLASSIFICATION AND OTHER LAND PROGRAMS

Maps and Land Status

Scattered about in District Land Offices were maps and records showing the location of BLM lands. However, no general maps showing the public domain lands were available. Here again, lack of identification made management supervision difficult -- particularly when most of the BLM lands were scattered.

In order to begin a system of land classification and land use planning I felt that maps were essential. Accordingly, I authorized a land status map for each State to be published for public use as well as for Bureau management. The maps were published in 1964-'65 and came through quite well. A wide variety resulted from our failure to set forth uniform standards (scale, color, symbols) for the individual State offices to use in putting their maps together. Wyoming and Oregon did the best work and the next group of maps should overcome initial deficiencies.

To carry out the purposes of P.L. 88-607 and 608, BLM published regulations and proceeded to test the Act out in 18 prototype western communities with the cooperation of the National Association of County Officials and the local County Boards. ^{2/}

The Public Sale Act prohibits the sale of any public lands under its terms "until zoning regulations have been enacted by the appropriate local authority." The Classification and Multiple Use Act provides for a system of hearings and notices respecting public land classifications. Taken together these two laws were an excellent launching point to introduce President Johnson's "creative federalism" into public land management. I therefore issued instructions for the pilot county demonstrations and later made certain the regulations provided a system of public meetings and hearings on the classifications. Thus we attempted to institutionalize public participation in the land management decision-making process.

BLM personnel spent many hours in consultation with local leaders, and public groups were invited to participate in open hearings at which reviews and revisions were made in BLM's tentative land classifications for retention and multiple use management or disposal. For the latter classification, local land use plans and zoning ordinances were required prior to Federal disposal. ^{3/}

^{2/} BLM Instructions Attached.

^{3/} See NACO Public Land News Letter, Attached.

The classification procedures essentially were adapted from Wisconsin rural land planning and zoning techniques and those of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics-County Land Use Planning Committee work of the late 1930's. In essence, these involved preliminary staff studies with resource inventory data on maps with ownership status shown. Tentative staff recommendations for retention and non-retention areas are presented to a variety of local interest groups to obtain viewpoints and suggestions with respect to classification. As of this writing (June 1966) the first two of these have been completed and published in the Federal Register (copies attached). 4/

It is roughly estimated that 150 million of the 175 million acres of public domain in the Western States will be placed in the multiple-use retention category. Our hearings showed that interest and resource user groups desired to have continued access to the resources and could not agree on disposal, since their use would be excluded by a non-Federal owner. Continued Federal ownership with managerial responsibility in a public agency, and with taxes and other overhead costs seems to be the local concensus for the great majority of lands.

An opportunity to create a whole new system of publicly managed lands similar to the National Forests is open to the Public Land Law Review Commission from these areas classified for retention. Citizen awareness of public lands comes about by boundaries, colors on maps, names such as National Forest and National Park, signs at entrances, rangers, management plans, etc. This would be my recommendation for Type I classes as set forth on maps in the Office of Program Development in BLM.

For lands classified as disposable, a new concept was incorporated at the request of NACO and, with my endorsement, into the Public Sale Law of 1964. This is the requirement of local planning and zoning as a condition prior to transfer. The law did not set up standards for satisfactory zoning; in effect it said no zoning - no disposal. The effect to be expected will be to get land into well-planned uses and hopefully keep it there. BLM urged communities to incorporate open space and public uses in their plans--parks,

4/ Requirements by law and regulation.

green belts, school and other municipal grounds, for well-balanced community life.

Other land actions in process or completed, including cutting off BLM's retail real estate (small tract subdivisions) in March of 1965, recommending that applications under the Desert Land and Original Homestead Acts be withheld until our land classification system was operative. All agricultural disposals should be handled under the 1964 Public Sale Act and prior homestead acts repealed by the Congress.

Minnesota Lands and Islands

Scattered lands of some 40,000 acres containing a few small blocks of several thousand acres were remaining in the public domain in 1966. A preliminary review by a consultant revealed that there were also at least 5,000 islands in Minnesota's 10,000 lakes which never had been surveyed and were still federally owned. To inventory these and develop an orderly plan for the disposal and/or management of the fragmented lands, a special appropriation was made available to BLM in fiscal year 1967. An office is being established in Duluth for this purpose as I write this report (June 1966). Senators Hart and Mondale and Congressman Blatnick were instrumental in support of this program. Another Minnesota project which I encouraged BLM to undertake was the application of the recently developed method of pothold blasting using ammonium nitrate fertilizer and diesel fuel was tried out in a large block of unproductive Koochiching County bog to create open water area for ducks.

BLM-Forest Service Boundary Adjustments

National Forests in the West were created largely out of public domain lands from which the choicest forest lands were withdrawn for the National Forest system. Remarkable accuracy in drawing the boundaries was achieved by Pinchot's foresters, with a very few exceptions where isolated (and difficult to administer) small units were set aside. Some outer boundaries were raggedly drawn. Administrative problems developed which could be trimmed up by adjusting boundaries. About a dozen such situations were identified in 1961-1962 but implementation broke down at the field level. In late 1963 I reinstated negotiations (Federal agencies on matters of

this sort are often like foreign nations negotiating trade agreements in Geneva) and the first such transfer took place in Montana in the Spring of 1966. ^{5/} Others in New Mexico, Colorado, California, Idaho are in process--some waiting enabling legislation in States where additions to national forests require legislation.

Alaska

The confusion over where State selections would take place on public lands leaves BLM uncertain as to where future management commitments should be made. This situation is still unclear. If the Alaskan Federal Field Committee for Development Planning can project likely areas where development will occur and highways leading to them, the State could then select lands around these areas leaving other lands for multiple use management. The Alaska BLM office has developed suggested projections for the Federal Committee's consideration with proposed blocks of land for designation under the Classification and Multiple Use Act.

MINERALS

BLM's minerals activity can hardly be called a program. No management of the mineral resources on public lands can be said to exist. Mining claims under the 1872 Act are not filed with the Land Offices until the claimant seeks a patent (deed). But hundreds of thousands of claims constitute an option over the Government's title to millions of acres.

Likewise, mineral leasing is handled largely by servicing the applicants. The Geological Survey exercises the mineral classification authority for the Secretary. This prevents BLM giving effective direction to location, rate, and timing of mineral leasing. An atmosphere for the cooperation of the two agencies in the exchange of information has been absent. Recent efforts have opened the way.

Putting all mineral activity under a Leasing Act comparable to the 1920 Act would provide for a consistent system more satisfactory to

^{5/} Publication in Federal Register, Attached.

government and the industry. A special law passed in 1950 for Minnesota (where the 1872 Act does not apply) makes all minerals on Federal lands leasable. That would be my recommendation to the Public Land Law Review Commission.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Initial field trips in the early summer of 1963 indicated that resource project work varied considerably, was carried on without systematic technical guidelines from Washington or State offices and was heavily user oriented (carried out by user request rather than program need). Some areas of range improvement were seeded up and down the hill--not on the contour, thus actually encouraging erosion. Large solid blocks of pinon juniper and sagebrush were cleared to make way for equally solid blocks of grass--leaving few edges for wildlife, little protection against the wind for the soil, no shade or cover for livestock or wildlife and aesthetically offensive. Complaints came from those who objected on the latter grounds and BLM responded with a traditional defense that complainants really didn't know what a fine thing BLM was doing. I issued instructions requiring (1) work on the contour, (2) leaving edges, islands and strips to break the monotony and vary the landscape, and (3) providing cover.

About the same time I instructed the field to establish conservation practices demonstration areas which were called, as a result of staff consensus, Resource Conservation Areas (RCA's). This name never described my original purpose in having them established. I would suggest this name be used for retention blocks -- Type I areas.

Range Management

Up to 1963 BLM's grazing "management" consisted largely of "adjudicating" (bringing numbers of livestock under permit) in line with estimated range carrying capacity. A grazing management system employing modern range management techniques, such as proper turnouts and removal, rotation grazing, coordination with grazing on adjacent National Forest and private lands, etc., was largely lacking. Glenn Fulcher, a professor of agricultural economics from the University of Nevada with experience in BLM, agreed to head up our Range Staff. Having been critical of our range program--or lack of it--he was confronted with a reality. Fulcher brought in Gus Hormay, a Forest Service researcher, who had developed a "rest-rotation" grazing system designed to bring about range

re-establishment in over-grazed areas without reseeding. Fencing, allowing grass to form seed on selected pastures, with later moving of livestock to trample seed for germination and more rest were the keys to this method which had been demonstrated to be successful in several extensive field trials. As Hormay explained it with slides, first to BLM people and later to ranchers, enthusiasm grew and requests to try it came in droves. As of this writing at least one rancher per district has a rotation plan under practice.

Forestry

Our forestry program on public lands was geared to the estimated allowable cut. Foresters were hired, timber sales made and budgets determined on this basis. The major difficulties were several--BLM often had to replant at greater cost than the timber sales brought, planting failures were not uncommon on lower slope BLM timber (National Forests were usually above us) and frequently active local markets were not available. With the coming of PPBS these deficiencies showed up. BLM revised its program to sell timber only by request (if available) to confine sales--cutting areas to small openings so as to allow for natural reproduction.

The Western Oregon Timber program and related controversy is the subject of a separate attachment. The GAO report will throw a good deal of light on this subject which has largely generated heat so far.

Recreation

For some years evidence of use of certain areas by picnickers and campers as well as general use of public lands by hunters indicated a need for managing recreationists' use. This was best done by establishing basic facilities in camping grounds to prevent unsanitary conditions and fire risk from campfires. Under the 1962 Accelerated Public Works Program, BLM constructed a number of these; other areas needed similar facilities but funds were unavailable because the Congress questioned BLM's authority for recreational programs. The express listing of recreation in the Classification and Multiple Use Act and the extensive legislative history on recreation resolved the matter affirmatively. An initial appropriation of \$750,000 was authorized for "sanitation and protection" facility construction in the 1965 budget year.

Some obvious sites had been located and designs were ready but no system of planning future recreation sites by timing construction to growth in visitor use. I am not sure whether the Bureau has yet done anything on this.

Soil and Watershed Conservation

It was evident shortly after June 1, 1963, that much of the Soil and Moisture funds were allocated to range improvement--not to eroding lands nor as an effort to restore overgrazed lands. A special Frail Lands Study (suggested in 1961 by Clarence Forsling), undertaken jointly in 1964 by Cyril Jensen and Forsling, identified about 45 million acres of public lands on which accelerated erosion was taking place. ^{6/} This problem had long been a vexing one which had led to a good deal of public criticism of the Bureau. When the problem and a program of fencing to exclude grazing, promote revegetation and provide small upstream retention structures came to the attention of Senator Metcalf in 1964, the Senate appropriated \$6 million which emerged as \$3 million of additional funds to start a genuine erosion control effort. That such a program would be successful was clear from the pilot effort on the Small Indian Wash watershed on the outskirts of Grand Junction, Colorado. Work begun in the fall of 1963 on this badly beat-up and barren area and with the help of rains in 1964-'65 was covered with a fine stand of grass and other protective vegetation by June 1965.

On areas chosen for the frail lands effort a directive was issued for all work to begin at the top of the watersheds and work downhill taking one small watershed at a time and to rigidly control livestock when the latter were an erosion factor. My assistant, Bob Wolf, was instrumental in getting Congressional support for this program.

Soil Conservation District agreements had lagged despite Secretary Udall's new push for them due to lack of understanding of how to adapt them to the BLM program. Public lands are often intermingled with private lands, all part of a larger unit of land needing conservation measures. It seemed logical that coordinated planning and application of conservation measures could be more effective if

^{6/} Forsling Report in BLM Soil & Watershed Staff Files.

applied to a geographic unit regardless of ownership. Lawrence Thorderson of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts served as a consultant to assist in clarifying and implementing in the field SCD agreements. In addition to the signing of 100 Soil Conservation District agreements during my three years in BLM, I also concluded a joint planning agreement with the Soil Conservation Service.

Damage to the public lands by oil and gas geophysical exploration crews had plagued the Bureau because it lacked authority for their control. Bulldozed roads off the contour disturbed surface vegetation, leading to serious erosion. Open "shot holes" became a hazard to man and beast and a major source of trouble. After a number of meetings with the oil and gas industry (which urged "self-regulation") agreement was reached on regulations defining responsibility of geophysical exploration crews to advise BLM District Managers in advance, to keep damage to a minimum and to replace "divots" torn up in their work. The final regulations are now being published and will be tested for their effectiveness as soon as published. 7/

Regulation of surface disturbance on strip mining coal and phosphate leases was the subject of regulations revision attendant to the amendments to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 expanding the acreage of leases. Considerable effort was spent overcoming certain key Geological Survey people who felt our proposals too stringent. Their ultimate effectiveness will be a key test of the Department's efforts to carry out the President's Natural Beauty program.

Wildlife Management

Although the Bureau has had authority for managing wildlife habitat under the Taylor Grazing Act, no active program was in operation nor were funds directed to this purpose. A number of wildlife trained men in BLM spent little time in habitat work while considerable criticism was directed at the Bureau for failure to include wildlife projects in its program. Controversies over spraying sagebrush

7/ First draft published September 4, 1965, in Federal Register.

needed for winter deer browse, over fencing excluding antelope and others, continuously developed between BLM and the States and sportsmen-conservation groups. And as usual the Bureau's responses to criticism was on the defensive--rationalizations rather than coming to grips with the problem.

With the coming of Bob Smith, Arizona Game and Fish Director, in early 1964, BLM was able to gain prestige, content and direction to its wildlife program. Al Day, former Fish and Wildlife Service Director, acting as a consultant, spent the winter and spring of 1966 examining BLM's wildlife program needs and has laid out a program for the future--habitat improvement, location of trained wildlife managers in districts with heaviest wildlife resource, and a variety of special projects including stream improvement work in western Oregon where logging debris affects valuable spawning grounds of the salmon and steelhead. The wildlife program needs Secretarial support to gain ground. 8/

Redwoods, Natural Areas and Archeological Sites

Throughout the public lands are about 150 small areas of ecological interest and archeological interest too valuable for scientific interest to be abused through overuse. Likewise about a dozen tracts of remnant Redwoods--usually surrounded by cutover lands-- remained scattered over northern California coast counties. Inventories carried on in 1964 revealed that special precautions should be taken for their protection. Accordingly, ten Redwood tracts and 18 natural areas in other western States were given protective withdrawal status until a long term program for their administration could be formed. The Redwoods will be of future local interest and value as remnant samples of the *Sequoia sempervirens* in areas where commercial logging will have removed most of the other old growth stands. 9/

Multiple Use Management Plans had never been instituted in BLM because of the single purpose (functional) approach--range, forestry, etc. With the new unit management under the C. & M.U. Act a change

8/ See Day Report in BLM Wildlife Staff Files.

9/ Protective Withdrawal Notice from Federal Register.

was in order. After considerable effort and innumerable conferences, Bob Jones (Chief of the Office of Program Development) came up with a draft in the spring of 1965 which was not accepted by the field. However, revisions and better understanding plus a less complex approach have produced a workable multiple use unit plan as set forth in the attached manual release # 1605 entitled Unit Resource Analysis. I hope that this will be a working document--not gather dust; it is the only means for integrating all project work and land use into a management system.

NEW EMBLEM

The tired old emblem of user groups--the logger, cowboy, oil driller and engineer--produced a poor image, never had Bureau acceptance and was too "busy" for reproduction. Accordingly, a contest was held and after over 100 submissions a combination of ideas of Clayton Anderson and Bob Wolf with artist Roy Preudhomme produced the winning emblem--a winding river, grassland, a conifer tree and a mountain (snow capped as a result of Mountain Climber Udall's suggestion). This emblem expressing BLM's resource base was instantly popular and now graces signs, offices, car doors, etc. (copy attached)

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Most personnel actions and assignments were on the basis of individual appraisals with "pirating" and "slave market" characteristics because neither a career ladder nor personnel system existed within BLM. Men could only look for advancement through currying favoritism with superiors, outstanding performance or possessing some specialized knowledge. No clear in-service training program existed to equip men for assignments and men returning from graduate schools were assigned without careful planning for their future and their development as career employees.

Efforts got underway to provide a career ladder up the line for the resource-generalist-administrator or up the staff for the specialist-silviculturist, watershed, range, etc. Training and selection is now done objectively but the utilization of highly trained graduate students is still poorly handled. The training program needs to be geared to training men for specific purposes.

Lacking any trained land use planners, I instituted in BLM a special program at the University of Wisconsin in regional planning, to include land economics, resources policy, landscape, land use and planning and city planning.

Minority group employment in BLM lagged. This was partly because of inertia and a lack of people trained in the fields needed by BLM. My efforts were devoted in part to encouraging young Indians in areas near BLM operations plus recruiting from southern Negro agricultural schools.

BLM professional employees were discouraged from participating in professional societies and seldom given expenses. I revised attitudes to allow expenses for participants and administrative leave for attendees--and encouraged membership.

In several memoranda I have encouraged the employment of sub-professional aides and technicians as a means of spreading the span of professional manpower. Until 1964, BLM personnel officers and professional resource managers maintained a feeling that sub-professionals diluted the professional level quality of BLM. It became clear that non-professionals could help the effectiveness of professionals.

District Managers Meetings

A major problem in any large organization is communication and personal contact between the central office and the field forces. Directives, memoranda and telephones are useful but gaps and misunderstandings develop. The Bureau of Land Management has regularly had State Directors quarterly meetings but with a variety of new programs, several new legislative authorities and organization changes direct face-to-face meetings with the District Managers (who in the final analysis must carry out the programs) seemed necessary.

Accordingly, in the spring of 1964 all were convened for a four-day session in Denver as the new programs began to be developed. Two years later as the programs were in initial stages of operation the District Managers were called together -- one group in Portland and the other in Denver. Principal subject was implementation of the Classification and Multiple Use Act through local meetings to decide which areas to be classified for retention and which ones for disposal or non-long term retention. Both meetings generated an interest by field people and provided for direct exchange of ideas.

Natural Resources Manager Series

Modern resource administration is extremely complicated. It requires not only technical expertise from many disciplines but also knowledge of social sciences. Management of people's use of resources is a central responsibility of the field man. But it also requires administrators who can blend all disciplines into unified management. In my opinion the Bureau of Land Management has some of the best technical personnel available to bring all of their skills to bear on a single problem area.

An organization of specialists (foresters, range, wildlife, soil conservation, mining and civil engineers, etc.) also needs generalist managers who can fit the specialists into a working team.

During my tenure as Director of BLM I sought to encourage such men in the Bureau and to give them a separate career ladder for advancement. In this way I was able to develop a strong team that was effective in the development of a total land resource program. To secure a place equal to that of the specialist for the resource generalist administrator I encouraged our personnel people to work with the Civil Service Commission in development of a Natural Resources Manager Series. As of July 1966 this was well toward completion.

COOPERATIVE RELATIONS

Because of BLM's intermingled land ownership pattern, it was unequipped to be a self-sufficient agency in land management. Fire protection, soil conservation, grazing regulation, road building, land use planning and other activities on public lands were all related to similar operations of other Federal and local government functions. Although "hit-or-miss" local arrangements existed here and there, no systematic cooperative machinery for working relationships existed in BLM. Accordingly, a Branch of Legislation and Cooperative Relations was established under Jerry O'Callaghan to undertake the following: (1) Coordination of BLM management with other agencies' programs, e. g., joint conservation land use planning with the Soil Conservation Service on intermingled private lands through, (2) Agreements with local Soil Conservation Districts; (3) Joint BLM-county land use planning systems to carry out the Classification and Multiple Use Acts' directives for retention determination and zoning for disposal under the Public Sale Act; (4) Coordination with HUD's Sec. 701 Planning Assistance Program to states and local governments; (5) International technical assistance programs through AID in land reform and land management; (6) Coordination and management of local, State and National Advisory Board functions; (7) Better liaison with citizen conservation organizations and user interest groups; (8) Legislative reporting to the Department's Legislative Counsel; and (9) A variety of special problems of liaison and coordination not provided for or arising from time to time.

The Foreign Aid Program -- The Bureau of Land Management had cooperated with the Department of State in its AID (Agency for International Development) program for a number of years largely by supplying men for overseas technical assignments. I found that our participation in this program had been relegated to a section in our Personnel Division. Much of the efforts had been dissipated in responses to local and immediate need. There had not been concentrated effort toward either establishing a method for underdeveloped countries to install public land management or to increase food production through land reform.

I felt that more would be accomplished in the long run through organized efforts to establish the land management units in underdeveloped countries. Many of these underdeveloped countries have non-agricultural lands that are capable of greater productivity (hence similar to those under BLM jurisdiction). Most have need for land reform on agricultural lands. The experience of our surveying personnel was needed to establish land surveys and title system for land reform projects. In addition, a few

of our technicians could design public land management programs on units of non-farm forest and rangeland. It was plain, however, that still more proposals to train native personnel in vocational and technical levels of management were suggested for pilot units.

We instituted two other types of training: On-the-job training for local personnel under BLM instructors and a technical exchange program through which we brought some of their best talent to the United States. Both programs were designed to train capable local people to work with the forest and range resources in their own country, using U. S. experience as appropriate. ^{10/}A more detailed program now being tried out by Jorgensen in Northeast Brazil is set forth in an attachment.

BLM-Citizen Group Liaison -- Although the public lands are a part of the heritage of all Americans there was at the time that I became the Director of BLM many people in the eastern part of our country who were little concerned about this great national resource. Most still have never heard of the Bureau of Land Management and if they thought of public lands at all they associated the term with land under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service or the Forest Service. I felt that 460 million acres of public land was a valuable national asset and that all the people should be involved in the decisions regarding their future uses. Through the BLM Cooperative Relations and Information staffs I tried to broaden the base of public participation in public land problems. Through several briefing sessions we were able to establish liaison between the Bureau and through the national conservation organizations the larger segments of the general public that they served. As a result of these efforts I believe that there are more people aware of the public lands today and greater support for BLM programs has been aroused.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Job Corps

For a number of years in the 1950's and early 1960's I worked with the then Senator Humphrey on a proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps. When I became Director proposals for the establishment of a Job Corps were pending before the Congress. From the start it had been assumed that BLM would participate in the program as a means of restoring large areas of damaged land to productivity. In the summer of 1964 I gave

^{10/} Rural Development proposal attached.

BLM the use of my camp at Wolf Springs Forest for Job Corps supervisors training. The Job Corps became a reality in the fall of 1964 and BLM's first Job Corps Center was established at Tillamook, Oregon in February, 1965. Five BLM centers had been established when I left BLM. On the whole we were pleased with the result achieved in these centers.

The quarrel that I had with the Office of Economic Opportunity was with the process of screening applicants that were sent to the BLM centers. BLM had worked hard for many years to establish a favorable relationship with the communities in which we operated. I felt that this relationship could be jeopardized through excessive misconduct on the part of trainees. To prevent this in early 1964 we requested OEO to set up screening procedures that would eliminate the incorrigible or at least give the Center Directors authority to remove these boys from the centers. My recommendations for better screening and an orientation center were largely ignored with the predictable result that we received a number of trainees who needed rehabilitation before going to camp. There were a number of serious incidents which could have been avoided. Then, too, the presence of these misfits created conditions that interfered with the morale of other trainees and required long hours of overtime effort by the Center Director and staff at the expense of their general responsibilities.

My efforts during 1965 to get this problem corrected by screening and reception centers by the Office of Economic Opportunity to correct these problems were not successful; I issued an order for our own screening at the centers. This resulted in a controversy with OEO. But recently OEO's Job Corps Director told me that my position has been vindicated by events and that authority to discipline in the camps has been delegated to the Camp Directors.

Public Land Access -- The issue of public access to the public lands has been a perennial problem for BLM. With increasing pressure from a recreation-minded public the problem has assumed more and more importance. The problem reflects a conflict between a public demanding multiple use of the land on one hand and the traditional users on the other. Often "base ranchers" of privately owned bottom land would block sportsmen access to large blocks of public land lying immediately behind. Many of the ranchers have, over the years, come to feel that their tenure on a specific part of the public domain was a matter of right, closely akin to rights of ownership. In many cases public land had been posted by licensees and there were cases where hunters or other would-be users were blocked by gates on private roads approaching public lands. In bringing the practice of actual public land use into closer harmony with

the multiple use philosophy, I sought to end these abuses of license privilege and to insure the right of reasonable use for all. A study by Jack Berryman of Utah State University is being followed by another contract with ERS of the Department of Agriculture on this subject. When a formula is found, public access should be written into grazing permits and leases as a condition of the privilege. As a start the Rawlins District Manager worked an agreement with cooperative private land owners that opened 700,000 acres of intermingled private and public land to hunters. The benefits were largely nullified however when Wyoming sportsmen uncovered that we did not know that one of the big sheep ranchers had built 70 miles of unauthorized sheep tight fence across antelope migrations.

Establishment of Boise Fire Control Center

Wild fires constitute one of the biggest protection problems that faced the Bureau. Through the years both forest fires and range fires have hampered the development of public lands. The greater percentage of fires could be handled within the district with district personnel but there was a need for a source of support for the exceptional fire. When these fires broke out, there was a need for many men and sophisticated equipment. I felt that this could best be provided through a fire control center. This center was established at Boise, Idaho.

The duties of the center were threefold: (1) to become the center for the development of fire control technology and to train Bureau personnel in fire suppression techniques, (2) to supply support services to the districts on request for fire suppression, and (3) to coordinate BLM's fire control program with adjacent Federal and State and private efforts.

The center opened June 1965 and is being given an opportunity to prove its effectiveness in the current bad fire season (1966).

Other Miscellaneous Items

1. A new financial management system was instituted in 1965 which greatly improved fiscal control (John Dawson's work).
2. A computer center for data processing -- both administration and eventually for programs -- was established in Denver (Hochmuth).
3. As Interior's member of the President's Quetico-Superior Committee I was able to resolve a long suspended mineral proposal in the Superior

National Forest: All pending mineral exploration and lease applications in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area were rejected and all applications in the multiple use area of the Forest were allowed. We thus reaffirmed the principles of separation of multiple use from wilderness preservation areas through classification and zoning.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON UNFINISHED AND CONTINUING
MATTERS

The truism that no job is ever finally done applies to BLM's change in program directions. Many matters, just described, are in the pipeline and will need strong and continued management to take form and reality--a few others are not yet ready for action.

a) Classification of lands into multiple use management units under the C&MU Act. All 150 million acres in the larger and better blocked areas should be reviewed locally and readied for recommendations to the Public Land Law Review Commission.

b) The absence of a coordinated Federal land management system with lands fragmented among BLM, NPS, BR, BSF&W and FS leaves the user public highly confused and the agencies uncoordinated in their management. Attached is the unacted upon suggestion which has been pending for over one year.

c) Public Land Law Review Commission--Recommendations should be prepared for Departmental transmission to the Public Land Law Review Commission. Under Secretary Carver approached the Bureau only once and that was for a description of problems--no suggestions on the future have been asked for.

d) Suspending by moratorium all agricultural entries until land classification is completed under (a).

e) A grazing fee at a more realistic level (in process).

f) A realistic timber appraisal formula -- recommendations have been signed by me and sent on to the Bureau of the Budget.

g) Some sealed bidding to offset single bid timber sales where GAO alleges possible collusion.

h) The operation "clean up" on the public lands begun by Weiler in Arizona needs to be carried on throughout the West.

i) Availability of Geological Survey data on mineral findings for use by BLM (G.S. has been reluctant to do this over the years).

j) Coordination of administrative supervision by USGS with BLM over mineral extraction which disturbs surface watershed values.

(Completed) -- August, 1966

Post Script

THE OREGON CONTROVERSY AND THE REAL ISSUES

Two episodes were played up prominently in the Oregon press:

- (1) The proposed Point Reyes (Sweet Swap Exchange)
- (2) The charges of a Bolle-Baker-Stoddard spy plot against Getty did not just happen.

The episodes were cleverly exploited by a special interest group to embarrass me publicly to the point where Secretary Udall would have to remove me. At the same time the group hoped to keep Getty. A part of their designs has succeeded. I have been removed from a job I never sought; a job that I predicted in writing at the time I took it would end approximately as it did; a job I nevertheless worked hard at for three years.

My removal has other implications which cannot but have a serious and unfavorable effect upon field officials on the firing line. A public official who must make a tough decision with a resource user -- trespassing, overgrazing, timber cutting enforcement -- who does not have the full backing of his policy level superior soon identifies himself with the clients' interest, not the public interest. This is what happened to Getty and is a basic cause of BLM's unhappy history -- that is tenure dependent upon abiding by the needs of powerful interest groups.

In another set-to in Oregon in 1959 Getty's predecessor, Virgil Heath, was summarily removed from the State Directorship. It is generally thought in the Bureau of Land Management that it was at the behest of the livestock interests.

An enterprising student of public administration, could he ferret out the details of the campaign for my removal and Getty's retention, would reveal how little protection the civil servant has where local partisan politics and the special demands of well defined and powerful groups becomes entwined with the local administration of natural resources.

While it is certainly serious enough that civil servants are led to believe that it is desirable or even necessary for them to engage in currying favor with local powers, with all the dangers to their careers attendant thereto, it is the public's interest which carries the important consequences. Far reaching judgments on natural resources, which could determine the course of a State's economic destiny for generations, are made in the atmosphere of a barroom brawl.

No such study has so far been made. There is enough on the record now from which such a study could be launched.

In Oregon a group whose top staff is composed of former BLM employees has long attempted to dominate and harrass BLM's timber management in Oregon, a fact which is common knowledge within BLM but little understood outside. Simply stated, the tap root of this domination and harrassment is a milling capacity in western Oregon in excess of the allowable cut from Federal lands.

As I will discuss, two major actions by the administration, one by the GAO, an arm of the Congress, and the administration of two older laws were considered inimical to this segment of the timber industry. As far as I know in every case where such laws or policies were inimical to this segment of the timber industry, Getty did not identify himself with the Department and the Bureau. Getty consistently interpreted attempts by the professional staffs in Washington to engage in a professional dialogue on these important matters as lack of confidence in him based on a desire "to get him."

1. Multiple Use Classification and National Park Exchanges

The Multiple Use and Classification Act provides for classification of larger blocks of public domain for retention and multiple use management. It also provides for the identification of public lands, such as scattered outlying tracts, suitable for disposition. This includes disposition by such exchanges as those authorized in the Point Reyes Act.

In the Point Reyes exchange matter Mr. Getty has charged that "Stoddard pretty well directed him to" misclassify lands in a retention block. The GAO investigation will prove this to be a complete fabrication.

The exchange has been called off. Nevertheless, a policy question remains: To what extent should public domain lands subject to the Classification and Multiple Use Act be managed under the terms of the Oregon and California Act by administrative fiat of the State Director in Oregon?

Public land administration is unduly complicated. Hopefully the Public Land Law Review Commission will have come recommendations. In the meantime the legal posture of the public lands in western Oregon is this: They have been withdrawn from general disposition by a Presidential Order (E. 6910). They are administered under the Taylor Act and the Classification and Multiple Use Act.

In 1962 BLM's State Director, Oregon, with the permission of the Assistant Secretary of Public Land Management (as provided in the Departmental Manual) filed an application of withdrawal covering 300,000 acres of public lands in western Oregon removing those lands from application under the agricultural settlement laws. To this day the proposed withdrawal has not been acted upon with a "yes" or "no" from the Secretary of the Interior. However, under regulations of the Department withdrawal application once it is filed in the land office affects the lands just as if it had already received the approval of the Secretary.

Mr. Getty and his staff in Oregon were so enamoured of their handiwork that in their minds the withdrawal application was taken as the final position of the Secretary. They, of course, ignore that the Secretary has never finally acted on the application. They ignored the Classification and Multiple Use Act passed by the Congress and signed by the President which should override in time and in legal standing the application for withdrawal.

In other words the administration of public lands has been so sloppy that a State Director was making disposition of public lands that at the least were reserved for the Secretary of the Interior and possibly the Congress, i. e., he was permitted to extend the terms of the O&C Act to the public lands in western Oregon which the statutes place under the Taylor Act and the Classification and Multiple Use Act.