



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices

F76LP

Jolie
1
F76LP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE

LAND-USE PLANNING MATERIAL

PREPARED FOR THE

NATIONAL RESOURCES BOARD

LANDS COMMITTEE REPORT

1
f76Lp

SLIDES

The following will be filed in the collection of lantern slides:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Present Dominant Ownership of Forest Land	18
Recommended Dominant Ownership Of Forest Land	19
Present Dominant Intensity of Management of Forest Land	20
Recommended Dominant Intensity of Management of Forest Land	21
Present and Recommended Federal Forests	23
Present Condition of Forest Land	28
Recommended Management of Forest Land	29
Present Ownership of Forest Land	30
Recommended Ownership of Forest Land	31
Area Covered by Forest Service Statistical Inquiry	44
Ratio of Forest Land to Area Reported Upon in Each County	45
Entire Forest Area	46
Present Available Commercial Forest Land	47
Farm Woodlands	48
Protection Forest Areas	49
Mature Timber Land	50
Second Growth Forest	51
Restocking Areas	52
Area Not Restocking	53
Mature Timber and Second Growth Areas	54
Productive Restocking or Non-restocking Area	55
Pastured Farm Woodland	56
Farm Woodland Not Pastured	57
Present Crop and Pasture Land Within and Adjacent to Forests	62
Recommended for Crops and Pasture Within and Adjacent to Forests	63
Crop and Open Pasture Land Recommended for Forests	65
Acreage Recommended for Forest Management	66
Recommended Intensive and Extensive Forest Management	67
Acreage Recommended for Intensive Forest Management	68
Acreage Recommended for Extensive Forest Management	69
Acreage Recommended for Protective Forest Management	70
Recommended for Production Cultivated Farm Crops Within and Adjacent to Forests	72
Recommended for Pasturage, Domestic Livestock	73
Present Population Dependent upon Forest Land	74
Predicted Population Dependent upon Forest Land	75
Private Forest Land Holdings	78
Forest Land in Public Ownership	79
Recommended for Private Forest Management	80
Recommended for Public Forest Management	81
Recommended Decreases in Private Ownership	82
Acreage of Forest Lands in State Ownership	92
Recommended for State Forest Management	93
Forest Land in Federal Ownership	96
Recommended for Federal Forest Management	97
Recommended Increases in Federal Ownership	99

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE

LAND-USE PLANNING MATERIAL

PREPARED FOR THE

NATIONAL RESOURCES BOARD

LANDS COMMITTEE REPORT

WORLD COMMITTEE REPORT
NATIONAL RESOURCES BOARD
WORLD COMMITTEE REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introductory statement, objectives, definitions, supporting data questions. . . 1-2

Summary of supporting data by States 14 pages. 3-16

U. S. Summary on form LUP #1. 17

U. S. Maps developed from State maps of present and recommended conditions of ownership and management. 18-23

Graphical U. S. maps classifying conditions of use and ownership by States. . . 24-43

INDEX

Area Covered by Forest Service Statistical Inquiry 44

Area Not Restocking 53

County

Classification of conditions of use, ownership and dependency by 45-103

Forest Land in, Ownership 88

Ratio of Forest Land to Area Reported upon in each 45

Recommended Decreases in, Ownership 90

- for, Forest Management 89

- Increases in, Ownership 91

Crop and Pasture Land

Present Forest Land Recommended for 64

- , Within and Adjacent to Forests 62

Recommended for Forests 65

- , Within and Adjacent to Forests 63

Decreases

Recommended, in County Ownership 90

- , - Federal Ownership 98

- , - Municipal Ownership 86

- , - Private Ownership 82

- , - State Ownership 94

Entire Forest Area 46

Erosion

Non-restocking Forest Land with Appreciable 59

- , - Critical 61

- , - Moderate 60

- , - Negligible 58

Farm Woodlands

Farm Woodlands 48

Not Pastured 57

Pastured 56

Federal

Forest Land in, Ownership 96

Present and Recommended, Forests 23

- Ownership of Recommended, Land 35

- Use of, Land 40

Recommended Decreases in, Ownership 98

- for, Forest Management 97

- Increases in, Ownership 95

- Use of Permanent, Land 41

Forest Land

Acres of, in State Ownership 92

In County Ownership 88

- Federal Ownership 96

- Municipal Ownership 84

- Public Ownership 79

Non-restocking, with Appreciable Erosion 59

- , - Critical Erosion 61

- , - Moderate Erosion 60

- , - Negligible Erosion 58

Predicted Population Dependent upon 75

Present Available Commercial 47

- Condition of 28

- Dominant Intensity of Management of 20

- Ownership of 18

- Ownership of 30

- Population Dependent upon 74

- Recommended for crops and pasture 64

- Use of Recommended Permanent 42

Private, Holdings 78

- , Holdings - Tax Delinquent 100

- , - Paid 101

Proportion of Predicted Rural Population Dependent upon 103

- Present 102

Ratio of, to Area Reported Upon in each County 45

Recommended Dominant Intensity of Management of 21

- Ownership 19

- Management of 29

- Ownership of 31

- Use of Present 43

INDEX (Cont.)

Increases

Recommended, in County Ownership 91

- , - Federal Ownership 99

- , - Municipal Ownership 87

- , - Private Ownership 83

- , - State Ownership 95

Management

Acres Recommended for Extensive Forest 69

- , - Forest 66

- , - Intensive Forest 68

- , - Protective Forest 70

Predicted Population Dependent upon Extensive Forest 76

- , - Intensive 77

Present Dominant Intensity of, of Forest Land 20

Recommended Changes in Forest Ownership and 22

- Dominant Intensity of, of Forest Land 21

- for County Forest 89

- Federal Forest 97

- Private 80

- Public Forest 81

- State Forest 93

- Intensive and Extensive Forest 67

- , of Forest Land 29

Mature Timber Land 50

Mature Timber and Second Growth Areas 54

Municipal

Forest Land in, Ownership 84

Recommended Decreases in, Ownership 86

- for, Forest Ownership 85

- Increases in, Ownership 87

Non-Restocking Forest Land

With Appreciable Erosion 59

- Critical Erosion 61

- Moderate 60

- Negligible Erosion 58

Ownership

Acres of Forest Lands in State 92

Forest Land in County 88

- in Federal 96

- Municipal 84

- Public 79

Present Dominant, of Forest Land 18

- Land 26

- , of Forest Land 30

- , of Recommended Federal Land 35

- , of State Land 39

Recommended Best Permanent 27

- Changes in Forest, and Management 22

- Decreases in County 90

- Federal 98

- Municipal 86

- State 94

- Dominant, of Forest Land 19

- for Municipal Forest 85

- Increases in County 91

- Federal 99

- Municipal 87

- State 95

- , of Forest Land 31

- Present Private Land 34

- State Land 38

Population

Predicted, Dependent upon Extensive Forest Management 76

- , - Forest Land 75

- , - Intensive Forest Management 77

Present, Dependent upon Forest Land 74

Proportion of Predicted Rural, Dependent upon Forest Land 103

- Present Rural, Dependent upon Forest Land 102

Predicted

Population Dependent upon Extensive Forest Management 76

- Forest Land 75

- Intensive Forest Management 77

Proportion of, Rural Population Dependent upon Forest Land 103

Present

Available Commercial Forest Land 47

Condition of Forest Land 28

Crop and Pasture Lands within and Adjacent to Forests 62

Dominant Intensity of Management of Forest Land 20

- Ownership of Forest Land 18

Forest Land Recommended for Crops and Pasture 64

Land Ownership 26

Land Use 24

Ownership of Forest Land 30

- Recommended Federal Land 35

- State Land 39

Population Dependent upon Forest Land 74

Recommended Federal Forests 23

- Ownership of, Private Land 24

- Use of, Forest Land 43

Use of Federal Land 40

- Private 32

INDEX (Cont.)

Present

Use of Recommended Permanent Forest Land 42

- State Lands 36

Private

Forest Land Holdings - Tax Paid 101

Land Holdings, Tax - Delinquent Acreage 100

Present Use of, Land 32

Recommended Decreases in, Ownership 82

- for, Forest Management 80

- Increases in, Ownership 83

- Ownership of Present, Land 34

- Use of Permanent, Land 33

Protection Forest Areas 49

Recommended

Acres, for Extensive Forest Management 69

- , - Forest Management 66

- , - Intensive Forest Management 68

- , - Protective Forest Management 70

Best Permanent Ownership 27

Changes in Forest Ownership and Management 22

Crop and Open Pasture Land, for Forests 65

Decreases in County Ownership 90

- Federal Ownership 98

- Municipal Ownership 86

- Private Ownership 82

- State Ownership 94

Dominant Intensity of Management of Forest Land 21

- Ownership - Forest Land 19

For County Forest Management 89

- Crops and Pasture Within and Adjacent to Forests 63

Forest Land, for Special Service Uses 71

For Federal Forest Management 97

- Municipal Forest Ownership 85

- Pasture, Domestic Livestock 73

- Private Forest Management 80

- Production Cultivated Farm Crops Within and Adjacent to Forests 72

- Public Forest Management 81

- State Forest Management 93

Increases in County Ownership 91

- Federal Ownership 99

- Municipal Ownership 87

- Private Ownership 83

- State Ownership 95

Intensive and Extensive Forest Management 67

Land Use 25

Management of Forest Land 29

Ownership of Forest Land 31

- Present Private Land 34

- State Land 38

Present and, Federal Forests 23

- Forest Land, for Crops and Pasture 64

- Ownership of, Federal Land 35

- , State Land 39

- Use of, Permanent Forest Land 42

Use of Permanent Federal Land 41

- Private 33

- State Land 37

- Present Forest Land 43

Productive Restocking or Non-restocking Areas 55

Restocking Areas 52

Second Growth Forest 51

Special

Forest Land Recommended for, Service Uses 71

State

Acres of Forest Lands in, Ownership 92

Classification of Use and Ownership by 24-43

Present Ownership of Recommended, Land 39

- Use of, Lands 36

Recommended Decreases in, Ownership 94

- for Forest Management 93

- Increases in, Ownership 95

- Ownership of, Land 38

- Use of Permanent, Land 37

Supporting Data 3-16

Supporting Data 3-16

United States

Present and Recommended Conditions of Ownership and Management 18-23

Summary Table 17

Use

Present Land 24

- , of Federal Land 40

- , - Private 32

- , - Recommended Permanent Forest Land 42

- , - State Lands 36

Recommended Land 25

- , of Permanent Federal Land 41

- , - Private 33

- , - State Land 37

- , - Present Forest Land 43

Land-Use Planning Material Prepared for the
NATIONAL RESOURCES BOARD
Land Committee Report

INTRODUCTION

By Executive order, on June 30, 1934, the President established the National Resources Board as successor to the National Planning Board and the Committee on National Land Problems. The new Board consists of Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of Interior, Chairman; Frederic A. Delano, Vice Chairman; George H. Dern, Secretary of War; Harry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture; Daniel C. Roper, Secretary of Commerce; Harry L. Hopkins, Federal Emergency Relief Administrator; Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; Charles E. Merriam; Wesley C. Mitchell. As its first task, the National Resources Board was directed to prepare a report on land and water resources to be presented to the President by December 1, 1934.

In the preparation of the land report the Board had the aid of a technical staff consisting of Dr. L. C. Gray, Director-Land Section; Dr. M. L. Wilson, Chairman Land Planning Committee; C. W. Eliot, Executive Secretary; John B. Bennett, Secretary; and Oscar L. Chapman; M. Ezekiel; W. C. Mendenhall; H. H. Bennett; and Jacob Baker, members.

ANALYSIS OF PROBLEM

On July 7, 1934 the Forester wrote the Regional Foresters that:

"In any such program, forestry must play a major part. Need therefore exists for early action by the Forest Service to focus and define the picture of the extent and distribution of the lands of the United States from which the highest permanent social and economic service will be derived through one form of forestry or another; the type of forestry required to realize the full potentialities of each land unit; and the agency, public or private, which permanently should be responsible for accomplishing the required forms of forest management. In the Copeland report we have stated that an additional 224 million acres of forest lands are destined for eventual public ownership and management, but we have not shown where these lands are located. It is not only desirable but necessary that we do so with a minimum of delay."

"As a first step in this process we must assemble all available information as to the forest conditions and forest policies of each State. We should know what parts and proportions of each State undoubtedly are actual or potential forest lands; what parts are in private ownership, especially the parts in large absentee ownerships. We must know the reasonable probabilities as to future forest-land ownership and management by the State, its counties, and its municipalities. In many instances the State itself now has no dependable answers to these questions. We must induce the State, if practicable, to think the problem through and shape its conclusions into some semblance of a long-time program. The efforts will develop many questions of constitutional or legal or political or financial character, which cannot be ignored but should not be allowed to becloud the issue or delay the best practicable expression of the basic facts."

"The more fully we develop the support and cooperation of all State and other agencies the greater will be the probability of recognition, acceptance, and endorsement of the final result of our efforts. Accordingly we should solicit and welcome maximum participation in this movement by all State conservation departments, State foresters, geological surveys, universities, and agricultural colleges, soil survey organizations, farm bureaus, economic organizations, etc. We also should secure the fullest cooperation of public agencies other than State, as for example the various Federal agencies which deal with any of the factors influencing or controlling future land use. What is desired is the collective or composite opinion of all informed groups and agencies."

PLANNING OF PROCEDURE

"Our need now is for a broad picture, true in fundamentals and perspective but without undue emphasis upon detail. Generally speaking, the facts most essential in relation to each forested State are the following:

1. The specific parts thereof from which the highest practicable forms of social and economic service will be derived through some form of forestry.
2. The type of forest management which can be justified for each natural unit of management, i.e. intensive, extensive, or simple protection only.
3. The appropriate agency of management for each unit or regions, i.e. private, municipal, county, State or Federal.

In explanation of No. 2: All forest areas which are primary sources of timber supply for the nation and its wood-using industries should be so managed as to realize the full productive power of the soils. Areas whose timber products have no immediate nor early prospective demand but ultimately will be needed for industrial uses should be subject to only extensive forms of management. Areas in which the function of the forest cover largely will be to protect watershed or the habitats of wild life or scenic elements will require protection and transportation facilities only."

"There should be statistical summaries of areas, ownerships, tax delinquency, acreages now under constructive forest management, costs of acquiring units for which public ownership and management is indicated, costs of developing and improving such units, appropriate divisions of such costs between the different participating agencies, and such other statistical data as may be obtainable and, in your judgment, are necessary to afford a correct understanding of the situation.

"For the guidance of a program of the character herein proposed, certain fundamental principles must be developed and established."

Following --- is a statement of nine basic principles by which the forest program of the Federal Government, in my opinion, largely should be governed":

Basic Principles to Govern Formulation of Comprehensive Forest Plan

1. All land capable of growing forests and for which no other higher social or economic use or need exists or can be foreseen should be maintained in or restored to a forest cover for the two-fold purpose of conserving its soils and of deriving from it products or services of social and economic importance most readily obtainable through the agency of trees.

2. In determining the desirability of forest use, or in gauging the ability of any agency effectively to redeem the obligations and responsibilities of forest-land ownership, there should be recognition of the fact that dedication of land to forest purposes does not invariably imply need nor justification for intensive and costly types of forest management. If the land is or will be a primary source of timber supply and thus the basis for highly developed wood-using industries and communities the optimum growing power of the soil must be fully realized through every applicable principle of silvicultural management. Where utilization of the forest products of a given area ultimately may be expected but cannot be foreseen during the reasonably near future, extensive types of forest management designed only to conserve and gradually improve the stand should suffice. If the function of the forest cover largely or exclusively will be one of protection to watersheds or wild life or scenic elements little more than protective activities and the improvement systems incident thereto should be necessary.

3. Public agencies should critically examine the field of private ownership and management. If it is evident in any case that, without undue or inequitable public assumption of costs of forest ownership, private initiative is able and disposed to handle forest lands in ways which reasonably safeguard the social and economic welfare of the nation it should be given encouragement to do so. On the other hand, there should be no hesitation in recommending public ownership and management where a breakdown in private management is obvious or inevitable, or where private ownership is not in the public interest.

4. If there is to be a comprehensive development of forestry in this country all political divisions of government must in some degree share in the obligations and responsibilities of forest ownership and management in proportion to their ability and economic, social and political interest. Definite effort should be made to encourage a municipality, a county or State, within its logical field of action, to secure and manage areas of forest land.

5. Federal forest-land ownership and management is justified only in the situations in which there is a reasonable rationality of interest and benefit. The safeguarding of future national security by definite guarantee of adequate timber supplies becomes a national function only to the extent that the programs of States, counties, municipalities and private owners, viewed realistically in the light of practical probability, fail to provide a satisfactory degree of assurance and certainty. The widely interstate influence and consequence of flood damage and sedimentation make watershed protection and erosion control a more obvious and exclusive Federal responsibility. As a general principle of action, the areas in which timber production is secondary to watershed protection and erosion control will be the logical field of Federal action; the areas in which watershed protection and erosion control are secondary to timber production will be the preferable fields of State, county, municipal or private action. Exceptions to this rule may, of course, be justified by special circumstances, such as objectives of social rehabilitation in which Federal forest-land ownership is integrally related to a broad Federal program of social readjustment, or where need exists for federally operated "Demonstration Forests" in which to work out and exemplify the best principles and practices of forest management for specific forest types or regions.

6. The prime objective of a sound program of public forestry should be the attainment of a maximum of effective result from the public funds, personnel and resources that can be made available for forest conservation. The forest activities of each agency of government should be so conducted as to supplement rather than compete or conflict with, or diminish, the programs of other agencies. Where wide opportunity for constructive action exists, as it does in practically every forested State, larger and better results will be obtained if the several public agencies work within their separate fields or zones of action, instead of duplicating each others functions and accomplishments within certain territories while at the same time other territories equally in need of similar services lack them entirely.

7. The programs and plans of many States may be predicated or contingent upon a large measure of financial cooperation from the Federal Government. Adequate Federal cooperation with the States is reasonable and necessary. It should not, however, extend to a point which requires the sacrifice or indefinite postponement of vital features of the Federal Government's own forest program, or which is in essence merely a transference to the States of the function of expending Federal funds for identically the same purpose as that for which the Federal Government would expend them. The governing principle should be that the State, county or municipality will through its own means and resources create the necessary public forests, but that the Federal Government in recognition of the broad public benefits which will accrue will contribute equitably to the subsequent costs of protecting, developing and administering such forests.

8. The owners of scores of millions of acres of forest lands are not now either protecting and managing such lands or paying taxes on them, nor do they offer any acceptable promise that they will henceforth either protect or pay taxes on such lands. Public repossession of such properties is dictated by all considerations of public interest and welfare. The legal power of repossession is vested in the States or their constituent units of government. In but few instances is that power now being exercised. Where lands so tax delinquent as to legally be subject to public repossession form, or by exchange can be combined into practicable units of public forest management, the Federal Government appropriately should contribute to the costs of the protection, development and management; but no reason is clearly evident as to why the Federal Government should provide funds with which to pay the owners of tax delinquent lands for properties which legally are subject to public repossession and management without further compensation.

9. Social as well as economic objectives dictate special governmental action to promote the establishment and permanent operation of community forests. Soundly conceived and administered, community forests should be important sources of community income and play a large part in the provision of local recreational opportunity and service; but their most important function will be to absorb the shocks of economic dislocation or maladjustment by the provision of emergency employment in creative work which permanently contributes to social progress and public security. Such broad social benefits will justify special Federal participation and cooperation, financial and otherwise, in the fruition of a comprehensive system of community forests and the general forest program should be shaped accordingly.

By July 23, 1934 the program had developed to a point where it was recognized that:

"So far as the Forest Service is concerned the first requirement will be to define its field of action, that is, the part of each State within which the data relating to forest uses will be collected by the Forest Service and its associated agencies. As an initial step in this procedure each State should be divided into definitely bounded and determined units. The smaller these can be made the greater will be the subsequent value of the information compiled. In States where the township form of government exists, the established townships might best serve as basic units. In States where there is no township division, but well defined magisterial districts, the use of such districts should be considered. Where the minimum political division is the county, that should be used; but in cases where the county is large or where only a part of it is forest in character, its subdivision deserves consideration."

"Consideration of the---(physical, economic, and social)---factors finally will result, in a preponderant opinion that within each state certain specifically indicated minor political units or subdivisions thereof should be regarded as preponderantly forest lands. This having been done the Forest Service will confine its subsequent studies to the areas thus classified. It is hoped and expected that the Regional Director of the AAA or his associates, particularly the State Planning Consultant, will have actively participated in all steps leading to this point. The main purpose of the specific definition is to make clear the part of each state in which the Forest Service studies will be conducted, so that other participating agencies can adjust their plans accordingly."

"In view of the magnitude of the job, and the brief time available for its accomplishment, the development and presentation of complete and detailed data in relation to each area covered by a report is, of course, impossible. Where the readily obtainable data are less than complete, approximations must be made. The most that can be expected is the best judgment of the reporting officers and their cooperative associates, based upon such information as is obtainable without undue delay or great expenditure of effort."

"It also is clearly apparent that long textual discussions are impractical and perhaps of doubtful value because of lack of opportunity and facilities for digesting or recapitulating them. To be of maximum immediate value all facts and all recommendations must be reduced to the absolute minimum consistent with understanding and application. The reporting officers must, of course, support their final presentations of factual data and conclusions by notes sufficiently detailed to permit of review and consideration by the other executives or agencies who successively handle the data as it progresses through the various stages." (Note questions at bottom of page 2 and concise supporting data on pages 3-16.)

COLLECTION, ORGANIZATION, AND PRESENTATION

It was recognized that "---in its final proportions the report largely should be cartographic and statistical." Maps were planned to express the present and recommended conditions of ownership and intensity of management resulting in the generalized maps on pages 18-23. "Supplementing the maps there must of course be certain quantitative expressions---" and the LUP Form #1 was devised for this purpose. (See page 17.) The data submitted on this form for 1,756 counties or appreciable portions (see maps pages 44 and 45) were edited and then presented in graphical form in the maps on pages 24-103. All maps with the exception of those on pages 46-49, 56, and 57 apply to the area covered by the statistical inquiry of the Forest Service shown on page 44.

REVISION, REFINEMENT, AND AMPLIFICATION

The graphical presentation available herewith should assist in the process of revising, refining, and amplifying the basic material utilized. The large personnel which participated in its assemblage resulted in some inaccuracies; definitions and instructions were misinterpreted; inadequate data at times necessitated approximations. It is realized that present foundation is insecure but with a great deal less effort we can now cover the entire country and by continual revision and refinement strengthen the foundation upon which sound land-use plans must be built.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is estimated that fully 500 persons contributed materially in the preparation of the reports and maps. Although the preparation of the reports was the responsibility of the Regional Foresters, the staffs of the Forest Experiment Stations collaborated and in the majority of States excellent cooperation was received from the State agencies and the representatives of other Federal Bureaus.

Since September 15, in the Washington office, a temporary force which grew to thirty members and has now dwindled to six was supplemented by experienced personnel in the statistical, drafting, and photographic fields. This Atlas is, therefore, the joint endeavor of a relatively large technical organization.

January 24, 1935.

DEFINITIONS

Definitions of terms and instructions used in preparing reports on Form LUP #1 (see page 17) are as follows:

Vertical Classifications - Column No. 1.

FOR EST LANDS:

"Mature Timber":--Timber of such size as to be currently merchantable for the major product to be taken from the area. Stands otherwise classifiable only as second growth but cut primarily for so-called minor products, such as chemical distillation, fuel wood, mine props, posts, etc. should not be included in this class.

"Second Growth":--Stands below mature timber classification as above defined, but above 2 inches average diameter d.b.h. and averaging more than 100 trees per acre.

"Restocking":--Lands supporting an average of more than 100 trees per acre, less than 2 inches diameter d.b.h.

"Not Restocking":--Lands not in three preceding classes, i. e., supporting less than an average of 100 trees per acre. Lands falling in this class should be broken down in accordance with the erosion problem thereon. The definitions under "Other Open Lands" will apply here, the definition under "Optimum Condition" applying to the "Negligible" caption and that under "Serious" applying to "Critical". Do not make any entries on the horizontal line following the "Non-restocking" caption, but report only after the three erosion captions.

"Protection Forest Land":--All land supporting or capable of supporting a forest cover valuable for protective purposes but without commercial value, and not falling in any other category. The decision as to whether a given area is to be reported as "Protection Forest" or "Other Open Land" will be based on whether or not the type of prevalent or natural cover will under normal conditions and protected from fire, reach a minimum average height of 6 feet and a density that will provide ground shade comparable to that in a timber forest. Wild lands that will only support lower cover than this should be reported as "Open Lands" or under other appropriate captions. The acreage reported as "Protection Forest" will be in addition to that reported after "Total Forest Land", which will be the total commercial forest land. The "Total Forest Area", reported in the lower left corner of the form should be the total protection forest plus the total commercial forest land (the sum of Column 14 entries opposite Column 1 captions "Total Forest Land" and "Protection Forest".)

SPECIAL SERVICE:

"Parks":--Includes all Private, Municipal, County, State or Federal lands formally dedicated to park uses and so administered or managed.

"Recreation":--Includes all lands not formally developed or administered as parks, but dedicated to outdoor recreational use under either private or public management.

"Wild Life Refuges":--All lands within which wild life is safeguarded from slaughter or undue disturbance and afforded adequate opportunity for propagation.

"Shooting Grounds":--All lands in either private or public ownership and/or management, of which the primary use is for hunting game animals and/or birds.

OTHER OPEN LANDS:

This classification is intended especially to meet situations common in the western States where treeless lands, while subject to certain incidental uses, are not logically classifiable into the other categories used herein. Not to be used for reporting deforested areas, which are properly reportable as "Forest Lands not Restocking". "Other Open Lands" will include unenclosed non-forest grazing land not parts of farms.

"Optimum Condition":--Lands upon which the soil cover is in a normal condition of repose, and the vegetative cover is of reasonably satisfactory density and species.

"Moderately Eroded":--Lands showing an appreciable degree of either sheet or gully erosion, or both; ordinarily accompanied by deficiencies in density and species of vegetative cover.

"Severely Eroded":--Lands containing numerous deep and/or wide gullies, or giving evidence of the loss through sheet erosion of the greater part or all of the productive top soil; usually characterized also by vegetative covers of low density and minimum soil binding or economic value.

PASTURE LANDS:--Enclosed areas, other than integral parts of farms, used primarily or exclusively for the pasturage of domestic livestock. Give total areas only.

FARM LANDS:--All lands comprising parts of farms (i. e., entities of management primarily for the production of agricultural commodities) including grazing lands and farm woodlots which form integral parts of farms, but not including pastures separate from farms. Give total areas only. Farm woodlots recommended to be continued as such are to be reported under the appropriate Forest Management heading, (Columns 17, 18 and 19).

DEFINITIONS (Cont.)

Horizontal Classifications: "Current Conditions of Use and Ownership."

DEPENDENT POPULATIONS:

These columns are designed to give at least an approximation of the numbers of persons to whom the use of the lands, or of the resources thereof, or employment in the protection, improvement or management of the lands, or in the utilization of the resources thereof, is essential to their continued economic and social well-being. Persons to whom such use or employment represents more than one-half of their source of livelihood should be classed under "Major Dependence"; those to whom it represents less than one-half their source of livelihood should be classed under "Minor Dependence." For the purposes of this report consideration should be given only to such dependent populations as are employed in stages of manufacture conducted within the unit of report or that make their residence therein. In reporting those dependent, for instance, upon a paper mill, allowance need not be made for the fact that a given mill may be wholly or partially dependent upon raw material from other units of report. Discrepancies due to reporting all the people dependent upon a paper mill in one unit of report will be compensated for by the reports for units which produce pulpwood but in which there is no mill. Although reporting in this way will not give a true picture of the population actually dependent upon the forest lands of individual units, the total figures for large groups of counties will be quite representative of the actual dependence of populations upon forest lands.

A given individual should not be reported more than once under "Dependent Populations." Decision should be reached as to which class of land contributes most to each individual's livelihood, and he should be reported as dependent on that class only. It is recognized that certain individuals are partially dependent upon farming, partly upon forestry, pasturage of livestock, etc., but for the sake of simplicity such an individual should be reported as having major or minor dependence upon only the class of land use which contributes most to his livelihood.

PRIVATE HOLDINGS:

"Tax Paid":--Lands for which taxes are delinquent less than three years should be included in this column as well as those on which all taxes are paid.

"Tax Delinquent":--Should include only lands upon which three or more years taxes are due and unpaid.

LANDS IN MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP:--Should include all but only lands of kinds listed in classification column. Should not include areas acquired for municipal purposes, such as sewerage treatment plants, garbage dumps, etc.

LANDS IN COUNTY OWNERSHIP:--Should include all but only lands listed in classification column. In States where tax delinquent lands revert to county ownership all lands so reverted should be included.

LANDS IN STATE OWNERSHIP:--Should include all but only lands listed in classification column. In States where tax delinquent lands revert to State ownership all lands so reverted should be included.

LANDS IN FEDERAL OWNERSHIP:--Should include all Federally-owned lands regardless of present status or administration; the nature of which will be at least approximately indicated by distribution between the different classifications.

Horizontal Classifications. "Permanent Forms of Use Offering Greatest

Promise of Maximum Common Benefit."

PRODUCTION OF CULTIVATED CROPS:--Should include only those lands, which so far as can be foreseen, can be used indefinitely for the production of certain forms of cultivated farm crop without serious impairment of their social and economic values, provided the proper types of crops and tillage are employed.

PASTURAGE OF DOMESTIC LIVESTOCK:--Should include only those lands which in the light of present knowledge and under proper principles of range management can be used indefinitely for the pasturage of domestic livestock without serious impairment of their social and economic values. Should not include lands listed as suitable for production of cultivated crops, nor areas primarily suited for timber production on which grazing is a secondary use.

DEFINITIONS (Cont.)

FOREST MANAGEMENT:

Intensive:--Should include those lands for which timber production appears to be the highest economic and social service, and upon which highly developed wood-using industries and/or communities are or soon will be so vitally dependent for economic existence and progress that the employment of every applicable principle of silvicultural management clearly will be necessary.

Extensive:--Those lands for which timber production apparently will be the highest ultimate economic and social service as a basis for probable future wood-using industries and/or communities but where the present or immediately prospective demand for the timber products does not justify nor require other than extensive types of forest management which will conserve and gradually improve the forest cover without an immediate and complete realization of the optimum growing power of the soil.

Protective:--Those lands upon which the maintenance of a forest cover is essential for the adequate protection of the soil or to provide wild life with its necessary environment, or to stabilize streamflow or to conserve scenic beauty, but not as a primary source of timber supply; in view of which the only requirements of forest management shall be protection against fire, insects, and/or tree diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of such physical improvements as may be essential to those ends.

INSPIRATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, RECREATIONAL, ETC.:--Should include all lands which permanently should be managed and administered as parks, or as recreational areas other than parks, or as areas dedicated to scientific research, where such forms of use are of such dominant importance that all other forms of use must be wholly excluded or definitely subordinated.

WILD LIFE REFUGES OR PUBLIC SHOOTING GROUNDS:--Should include (a) all areas from which the highest social and/or economic service will be derived through their use for the propagation of wild life by protection against slaughter or serious disturbance or by creation of optimum conditions for breeding, and (b) all areas from which the highest social and/or economic service will be derived through their use as shooting or hunting grounds, and where other forms of use or management will be incompatible with that major service. The lands to be reported as Wild Life Refuges are those on which wild life protection is the primary use. Thus state game refuges and similar areas on which wild life protection is secondary to other uses such as timber production, grazing, farming, etc., will not be reported. Information on such wild life refuges will be obtained from other sources.

NUMBERS OF PERSONS LAND WILL SUPPORT:--In this column opposite each vertical classification there should be inserted the best attainable approximation of the number of persons that can be expected to derive a satisfactory standard of living from each classification of land, with due regard to the proposed permanent form of use and management. This will have to be based upon the probable number of workers who will find employment upon such lands, multiplied by the average number of persons per family, or per worker, which is or may be appropriate in the particular region. The objective is to show approximately the population which, under the proposed types of management and ownership, can be expected to maintain itself according to acceptable standards either through the use of the lands or their resources, or by employment in the management of the lands or in the utilization of their resources.

BEST PERMANENT OWNERSHIP:--Bottom lines:

The Grand Totals of each column should be divided between the five major classes of ownership so as to show (a) the apparently desirable changes from current to future ownership and management and (b) the apparently appropriate division of responsibility and obligation for the best permanent management of the lands in each future classification.

Under the proposed future plan of use, there would be an approximation of the division of responsibility between the five agencies concerned. Probably all the permanent farm and pasture land would be privately owned. The other categories would be variously divided.

The form also is intended to show statistically the proposed transitions from one form of use to another. If 2,560 acres now occupied by mature timber eventually should be devoted to farm-crop production, that fact will be indicated by inserting the 2,560 under the caption "Production Cultivated Crops," and opposite the classification "Mature Timber". Conversely, if 2,560 acres now in farms should be devoted to intensive forest management, that fact would be made evident by inserting the figure 2,560 under the caption "Forest Management-Intensive" and opposite the classification "Farm Lands."

Abandoned Farms. An idle farm, only temporarily vacant, should be reported as farm land. Farms definitely abandoned, with no attempt being made to maintain them and little likelihood of their again being used as farms should be reported as "Forest," "Other Open Land" or "Pastures" depending upon whether or not they are on areas naturally forested or treeless, and upon the use to which they are being put.

OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED

Separate explanatory statements and answers to questions have been submitted for each State. These include reference to conditions peculiar to specific counties. The statements are summarized on pages 3-16 in accordance with the following outline:

A. Explanations designed to afford a correct understanding of data and maps submitted.

- 1. What is the basis for the estimates of those areas tax delinquent over three yrs.?
2. How was the acreage figure representing the borderline between small and large holdings arrived at?
3. Give the basis for any large changes in use which are recommended, such as from forest to cultivation or from farm lands to forest.
4. Give the basis for recommendations for the establishment of special service areas and indicate whether such proposals are concurred in by the representatives of the agencies primarily concerned with such special services, or are believed to be inadequate by such representatives.
5. Explain any differences of opinion which arose in deciding upon the desirable intensity of management of forest areas.
6. How were the recommendations as to best permanent ownership arrived at?

7. Mention any important conflicting view points which developed in arriving at the best permanent ownership recommendations.

8. How were the figures as to the number of persons land will permanently support arrived at?

9. Cover any other points which are pertinent to a full understanding of the data or maps submitted.

B. Cost of recommended public program for forest lands.

10. What percentage of the additional acreage recommended for public forests do you estimate may be acquired through tax reversion to the State or counties?

11. What do you estimate will be the average cost per acre of acquiring the other land recommended for public forests?

12. What do you estimate will be the required average cost per acre for initial development and administrative improvements under each form of management?

Intensive
Extensive
Protective

13. What do you estimate will be the required annual cost per acre for protection and cultural improvements under each form of management?

Intensive
Extensive
Protective

14. To what extent should the Federal Government participate in the protection, development and improvement of forests under the administration of other public or of private agencies?

C. Organization and method of attack.

15. Report briefly the manner in which the work was organized, branches and individuals to which assigned, cooperating agencies, etc.

16. Describe the procedure followed in preparing the tabular portion of the report. (For example, what figures were used to start with? Was a horizontal or a vertical breakdown made first and in what order?)

D. Source Material and References (to be retained in Regional Forester's files.)

17. Specific citations to source material and reference to location of same; to be filed with individual county, state and regional reports to which they apply.

18. Maps, printed material, memoranda, statements, surveys, etc. to be preserved and filed so as to be accessible for future reference.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Alabama	Records of State Forestry Com. All tax delinquent lands automatically placed under its supervision.	Arbitrarily fixed at 5000 acres by Reg. Office.	Non-restocking areas in central and South Central section rec. for pasturage acct. of good grass and fairly prosperous cattle industry. Submarginal areas in general recommended for forest.	Embody rec. of agencies concerned.	State plan adopted for State forests. Our rec. for Federal and private lands approved by State For. Com.	State land intensive. Duty of State to show best form of management to private owners. Most productive lands left in private ownership, should be intensively managed. Least productive lands rec. for Fed. Ownership, and extensive management. No areas rec. for prot. man. due to low altitudes and inaccessibility.	None	R. O. Figures for Forest land. Int. Man. 1 to 200 acres. Ext. Man. 1 to 564A. 5 dependents for each worker. Census for Agr. Dept. (See next to last par. Page 3 explaining how woodlots were handled).	Detailed Inf. on State land policy, fire protection, man. of private land and summary of present and rec. use on Pages 6 to 10 of Report.
Arizona	Data obtained by LUP from County, and admittedly rough.	Average size homestead unit of 160 acres was natural dividing line.	No change rec. due to limiting conditions of moisture and altitude. See Report Pages 1 & 2. Multiple use on both timbered and open lands.	Except Yavapai Co. data in report is limited to exterior bdrys. of N F State agencies approved rec.	None	Federal lands control situation. Slow growth and low yields make private ownership unprofitable. Therefore, all forest land was rec. for Fed. ownership.	None and none likely to develop.	See Statement G. A. Pearson. Separate figures for saw-timber and woodland types for each class of management.	None
Arkansas	Very incomplete County Records. Emergency State Laws.	Fixed at 5000 acres by Reg. Office.	Farm woodlots transferred to forest lands and rec. for Intensive Private management.	Rec. of agencies concerned accepted and so reported.	State For. believes too large an acreage in Southern Ark. and Delta area was rec. for Int. Man. Criticize basic principles rather than inclusion of this area.	Forests in So. Ark. and Delta area rec. for private ownership on acct. of productivity and low elevations. North half, mountainous, important for watershed prot. and existing erosion problem rec. for Federal ownership.	Rec. under 6 is a revision of orig. rec. made by Reg. For. and not discussed with State Agent.	R. O. figures for forest land. Int. Man. 1 to 200 A. Ext. Man. 1 to 564 A. Prot. Man 1 to 10,000 A. This means gainful workers. Dependents per gainful worker not indicated.	Miso. Comments
California	Census figures for Agr. lands. Schofield report of 1932 for forest lands. Figures used not satisfactory.	Census figures for Agr. land. Working circle reports for timber lands. For other lands an estimate by Barrett & Show.	See Report. Discussed by Groups of Counties where similar types occur.	Discussed by Groups of Counties as in 3.	No important differences of opinion.	Basis of rec. for different types set forth on Pages 4 to 6 of report.	None of importance	For Agr. land present census figures for farm population were used for major dependency: all or part of non-farm rural population for minor dependency. For all other lands various methods for the different types. See Report.	Other maps showing problem areas, topography, population distribution of rainfall, watershed areas deer and quail and recreational use submitted to present a clearer picture of use and ownership problems.
Colorado (Reg. 2)	For 12 Counties, C W A proj. #F-6 For remaining 32 counties information obtained by For. Sups. presumably from County Records.	Arbitrarily fixed at 2560 acres by Regional Office	Largest change is from farm land to pasture on those dry farming areas not supporting occupants. Smaller acreage of same lands rec. for forest and recreation. To a lesser extent same transition rec. for irrigated areas lacking sufficient water.	Rec. based on demands for recreation use and winter range requirements for wild life. No mention made of concurrence of other agencies.	Some difference of opinion, presumably among Reg. personnel, due to uncertainty of industrial or community dependence on timber production.	Non-supporting, dry farming areas should go largely into pasturage and forests and overgrazed and eroding lands which round out bdrys. added to Nat. For. Also outover or mature timber lands essential for watershed protection should be in public ownership.	None in principle State Agencies emphasized necessity of gradual process in effecting changes due to upsetting of political units.	Based on data obtained from previous studies, especially that of Spring of 1934.	None
Colorado (Reg. 4)	No tax delinquent land included.	Only one 40 acre tract of private land involved.	None recommended	No special service areas recommended	None	By consultation in Reg. Off. Only area considered lies within LaSalle Nat. For.	None	Determined in Reg. Off. Farm-1 Maj. & 2 Minor for 30A. Pasture-1 Maj and 2 Min. for 20,000A Int. For. 1 Maj. & 10 Minor for 750 A. Ext. For. 1 Maj. & 5 Minor for 1200A. Prot. For. 1 Maj. & 2 Minor for 2000 A. Wildlife, etc. 1 Maj. & 10 Minor for 1200 A. Parks & recreations variable. 4 dependents to 1 gainful worker.	Map present use based on 1931 Revision of Copeland Report. Erosion data prepared in conference with Intermountain Exp. Sta.
Connecticut	Farm Real Estate Tax. Delinquency study made by C W A	500 acre figure arrived at by State Foresters of New England State.	Changes recommended in accordance with submarginal land survey conducted by Conn. State College	Proposals made and occurred in by all State Agencies	State For. suggested 90% Int. & 10% Ext. Forester for Conn. Agr. Exp. Station rec. 75% Int. & 25% Ext. Latter figure adopted.	Based on trends of population and experience and policies of State Agencies concerned.	None	Agr. land, same as at present. Forest land-procedure outlined in Reg. For. letter of August 8. Parks and Recreation, - 1 to 100 A. Wild life Refuges - same as at present. Minor dependency-same as at present.	None
Delaware	None reported	Selected by reason of knowledge holdings in areas reported on.	Based on fact that large areas of farm land are in process of abandonment.	Rec. approved by representative of agency concerned.	None	By reason of personal knowledge.		By conference with agricultural officials	

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.

Handwritten text, possibly a name or date, in the left margin.



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Florida	County Tax Assessors and report of State planning Board of Feb. 1933.	Fixed at 5000 acres by Reg. Off.	Agr. areas suitable for permanent Agr. as determined by State Geologist. Also existence of established forest ind. and dependent population.	Existing areas considered adequate. No changes rec.	Lands of higher productive capacity rec. for int. man. Those of lower productive capacity for ext. & prot. man. No difference of opinion.	Based on soil and cover type map, success of present use and population dependency.	See Pages 2 & 3 of Report for differences of opinion as to best permanent ownership in southern half. No difference on northern half.	R.O. figures for forest land. Int.-1 to 200A Ext.-1 to 564A Prot.-1 to 10,000A (This means 1 gainful worker)	Everglades area omitted from study.
Georgia	County Tax Collectors principally. Not exact only an indicator.	Fixed at 5000 acres by Reg. Off.	Submarginality of lands in Piedmont and mountainous sections, also erosive problem and financial breakdown of private owners.	Rec. of agencies concerned concurred in by representatives of same.	None between State & F. S. Officers. Some question as to intensity on private forests in N. half of state, finally decided upon extensive	Problem areas 1, 2 & 6 outlined on map and division as to both ownership and management discussed and decided upon in conference between State For. and F. S. officials.	None	Reg. Off. figures for forest land. Int. - 1 to 200A Ext. - 1 to 564A Prot. - 1 to 10,000A This means gainful workers. Dependents per gainful worker not indicated.	Misc. Comments

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Idaho (Region 4)	County Assessors and F S Taxation summary prepared in 1928	Dividing line set at 5000 acres in conference between Reg. Off. and Forestry officials of Utah and Idaho	Only large changes rec. are in Special Service areas.	All changes rec. were suggested and concurred in by all agencies concerned.	No appreciable differences.	In general, lands chiefly valuable for watershed protection were rec. for Fed. ownership; those chiefly valuable for timber production, for County and private ownership. For details see Pages 1 to 3 of report.	None	Determined in conference with State Officials. Farm-1 maj. & 2 minors for 80A. Pasture-1 maj. & 2 minors for 20,000A Int.For.-1 maj. & 10 minors for 750A Ext.For.-1 maj. & 5 minors for 1200A Prot.For.1 maj. & 2 " " 2000A Wild Lifel maj. & 10 " " 1200A Parks & Recreation Variable Four dependents to each gainful worker.	Misc. Notes
Idaho (Region 1)	Chiefly from data gathered by F S during winter of 19--?	Line of demarcation drawn between larger owners who could be considered more or less permanent and the smaller misc. scattered ownership.	Negligible acreage from forest to farm. Areas rec. from farms to forest based on unsuccessful efforts at profitable farming. Concurred in generally by AAA representatives. Areas so rec. are only indicative. Definite areas will need refinement.	Continuance of present Nat. & State Parks & existing & additional primitive areas. Also strips along lake shores and important highways. Figures not discussed with any "Special Service" agencies	Based on accessibility. Intensive for immediately accessible; extensive if accessible in future; protective if probably never accessible. Both physical and economic factors considered. No marked difference of opinion.	Based generally on findings at time Copeland Report was prepared. Areas for State Forests limited by policy of State Land Com. Chief consideration was there was any chance for other than ultimate public ownership due to opinions expressed by large owners as to financial impossibility to retain land to produce new crop of timber after present stand has been removed.	Conflict- ing views as to acre- age of State lands between State Land Com. and State Forester. Latter favors increas- ed acreage of State forests and former does not. See page 4 of report.	See Report Pages 4 and 4a.	Numerous pertinent comments-Pages 4 & 5 of report. (Report combined with that of other states in Region)
Illinois	County Records	Set at 160 acres after discussion with competent advisors and checking of available records.	Based entirely on Soil Survey and knowledge of soils men of the University.	State rec. deter- mined by State Agency. Federal Rec. based on opinion chiefly of L.O. Trigg. Special Service areas rec. thought to be too small by State of- ficials concerned.	Areas rec. for Fed. ownership not concurred in by Locks. Some confusion over special service areas. See sup- plemental report by S. S. Locks.	Question of financing influ- enced. Allocations suggested by State representatives, who desired maximum of Fed. owner- ship. In general those areas needed to safeguard public interests were rec. for public ownership.	None of im- portance.	Int. For.-1 Major Dep. for 80A Ratio between major & minor 8 to 1. Farms - 1 major to 25A Special Service-Same as at present.	Comments regarding Maps #3 and 4.
Indiana	Based on a C W A Tax Del. study supervised by Purdue University for counties not covered comparative figures were used.	Fixed at 175 acres at a conference of U S F S, State and A A A officials.	Entirely farm land to forest. Based on studies made by Purdue University, A A A directors & For. Div. of Con. Dept.	Addition to present areas believed would improve wild life conditions. All rec. concurred in by State Agencies.	Some debate re- garding rec. int. man. for private lands, but deci- sion reached to so rec. some a- reas.	By conference of State Agen- cies and U S F S and State AAA Director. 50% to remain in private ownership, 30% to State, 17% in Federal & 3% in County	None	For farm lands see Report Pages 2 & 3. Forest lands-1 maj. dep. for 80A or 1 family of 4 for each 320 A. 1 minor dep. for each 600A or 1 family of 4 for each 2400A.	Kankakee River area indicated as wild life refuge under extensive forest management.
Iowa	Records maintained by Iowa State College.	Arbitrarily deter- mined by experts of State College.	No large changes recommended. Areas rec. for forest had been classed as woods and wastelands; were mapped by C W A work- ers, winter of 1933, under supervision of State col.	None recommended	None	All areas believed suitable were rec. for Fed. ownership remainder for State & County ownership.	None	Base on man days of work annually required as determined by previous land use planning studies. All Int. Man. Int. Forest. - 1 maj. dep. for 80A. " " - 1 min. " " 600A.	Iowa strong for National Forests.
Kansas	(Not reported on Nov. 9, 1934)								
Kentucky	General knowledge of Forester & Asst. For. of State.	In 6 Counties 250 A. Balance of Counties, av- erage size of farm from Census.	Chiefly farm to forest based on submarginality and abandonment.	Changes suggest- ed by Agencies concerned were concurred in.	None	On basis of demonstration and watershed protection values	None	In consultation with State Con- sultant and U S F S One gainful worker to 12 acres of bottom- land up to 25 acres in some western sections of State. No figures for forest lands.	
Louisiana	Basis for estimate not given. None shown under private ownership since theoretically all such lands revert to state. Unlimited redemption peri- od.	Fixed at 5000 acres by Reg. Off.	Principal change from farm to forest in delta area reported as submarginal and being rapidly abandoned.	Rec. approved by State For. New areas rec. need approval of Army Eng. & Biological Survey.	None	Private ownership rec. on best producing areas; State demonstration forests repre- sentative of various forest conditions; Fed. ownership for less productive and sub- marginal lands.	Some objec- tion by State Forester to extension of Catahoula U- nit; also to establishment Ratio. of both State & N. F. in another sec- tion of State.	Reg. Off. figures for forest land. Int. - 1 to 200 acres Ext. - 1 to 564 acres. Prot.- 1 to 10,000 acres. Multiplied by family ratio for total dependents. Used Census establishment Ratio.	
Maine	State Board of As- sessors, Boards of Selectmen and As- sessors.	Set at 1,000 A, based on belief that acreage & over were inter- ested in forest lands as a per- manent invest- ment.	Scattered farm lands economically desir- able for conversion to forest.	None made	None	Result of conversations with men acquainted with forest and farm conditions and with town officers.	No report	Census figures, instructions in outline and best judgment of writers.	(Report states: "Mentioned on sepa- rate sheet". Sepa- rate sheet not lo- cated.

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Maryland	Study made by Extension Service in 1932. Sample election districts selected, delinquency in these obtained from tax books and figures obtained used as factor for rest of county.	Best judgment of State Forest Officers, consideration being given to average sized farm listed in census.	All changes based on soil types as determined by soil survey by Bureau of Chemistry and Soils.	Where State plans existed they were recognized. Other rec. represent best judgment of State For. Off.	None. All forested areas rec. for Int. Management except lands classified by Bur. of Soils & Chem. as rough, stony land, which were rec. for Ext. management.	Based on existing policies and best judgment of State Forest Officers.	Little difficulty experienced. Present control of land use and changing ownership too uncertain for setting up positive plan.	Farms-1 gainful worker to 30 to 60 acres. Int. For.- 1 gain. worker to 300 acres. Ext. For.- 1 gain. worker to 600 acres.	Military reservations listed as shooting grounds unless of distinctly park character.
Massachusetts	None reported. Am't. very small.	Based on average size of farms. Fixed at 100 acres.	No rec. for large changes in use because land use in state is fairly well stabilized.	Rec. in accordance with plan already adopted by State. Concurred in by State Advisory Committee.	Apparently none.	In continuation of plan now in process of accomplishment. Towns for this study selected by Com. of Conservation, Com. of Agr. and Chief of Land Economics Dept. of State College.	Apparently none	Based on population statistics and census data furnished by U. S.	
Michigan	Actual listing of tracts from books of Auditor General and County Records.	No division made due to great differences of opinion. Fed. Agencies used 1000 acres as dividing line.	Determined by experts from Mich. State College. Areas rec. for conversion farm land to forest due to submarginality & abandonment.	Determined by heads of Conservation Dept.	State group refused to make a division on ground that wild life and recreational areas in State are and should be as intensively managed as timber production areas.	Private holdings of large blocks of mature timber, recreation and mining lands to remain in private ownership. Federal units expanded so as not to conflict with State plans. Remaining areas designated for State ownership.	Expansion of Ottawa Purch. Unit to the West agreed upon by State representatives only in case private owners of mature timber lands will not agree to sustained yield management.	Int. Forest-1 maj. dep. to 150 acres & 1 minor dep. to 600 acres. Ext. & Prot. For 1 major dep. to 600 acres & 1 minor dep. to 2400 acres.	Misc. Comments
Minnesota	Data from Tax Commission for some counties; for remaining counties estimates of State Forester and comparison with other counties of known delinquency.	320 acres for forest land since this figure was used in a tax study made in 1926. 260 acres for farm lands since pertinent data in Census Report was based on this figure.	No large changes either way.	None rec.	No permanent differences.	Present Nat'l Forests and extensions as proposed under Fed. Ownership. State Own. as outlined by State Com. Remaining land under private ownership but State protection.	Some clash between State officials over some areas tentatively rec. for State forests. While area along International Bdry. has been reported for State ownership, Forest Service feels that Fed. ownership is more logical.	Same as for Michigan and Wisconsin.	
Mississippi	None reportable according to definition. In April, following first years delinquency, lands offered at public auction. Lands not bid in are conveyed to state subject to 3 yr. redemption period. If not redeemed in the 3 yr. period they revert incontestably to State.	(3) Chiefly farm land to forest due to submarginal and erosive character of lands in the "brown loan belt."	(4) Embodied rec. of State Agencies in charge of such areas.	(2) 5000 acre figure set up by Reg. Off.	Some difference of opinion as to whether private owners could or would apply degree of management recommended.	Recommendations are result of conferences between F S, State Forester and State AAA Consultant. Areas assuring quickest financial returns rec. for private ownership, also those where some form of management now exists. Balance to State and Fed. Gov't as decided in conference.	None	Reg. Off. figures for forest land. Int. - 1 to 200A; Ext. 1 to 564A; Prot.-1 to 10,000A. + dependents to each gainful worker. Parks,-1 worker or 4 dependents per park unless large enough to warrant more. Farm dependencies supplied by State AAA Consultant, based on 1930 Census.	Information regarding control of so-called school lands Section 16 most of which are under lease to individuals.
Missouri	For 36 counties based on CWA study of 2 yrs. delinquency. Adjusted for 3 yr. del. and average applied to remaining counties.	Report describes methods of obtaining total acreage of "large" & "small" holdings but mentions no specific division line.	Chiefly from pasture land to forest, also crop land to pasture. Such rec. forest areas to be managed primarily for timber production but also for grazing as an important but minor use.	Rec. for State controlled areas made by state agencies concerned. Federal areas rec. specifically for migratory bird refuges. All rec. concurred in by all agencies concerned.	Some difference of opinion as to intensive man. of areas rec. for conversion from pasture to forest, which areas are also to be grazed. Decision reached that all best forest land should be intensively managed.	Federal ownership for areas in estab. Purch. Units. State ownership for as large areas as State Agency would accept. Private ownership where farm or private special service predominates. Municipal where cities could finance them and social problems made them desirable.	Dean of State Agr. Col. felt that divisions between State & Federal ownership was an arbitrary one, details of which would have to be worked out later. Getting lands out of private ownership is important consideration.	Farms - 10 acres crop land & 20 acres pasture for one maj. dep. Allotted 2 acres crop land to each maj. dep. on forest land, thus making them minor dep. on farm land. Forest- one major dep. and one minor for each 120 acres under int. management. For protective man. double the acreage for intensive.	Social problems in mining areas. Discussion of misuse of lands.
Montana	For 17 Counties, tax del. maps obtained from AAA. For remaining counties by applying ratios of comparable counties.	Line drawn between larger owners who could be considered more or less permanent and the smaller misc. scattered ownerships.	See Remarks for Idaho, Reg. 1.	See remarks for Idaho, Reg. 1.	See Remarks for Idaho, Reg. 1.	Conforms generally to opinions of State For., Com. of State Land Board and by representative of one of largest timber land owners in State. Also see remarks for Idaho, Reg. 1, in regard to probabilities of ultimate public ownership. Alienated acreage rec. for Fed. ownership for administrative reasons.	None mentioned for Montana	See Report Pages 4 and 4a.	Basis of figures and other data in detail.

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nebraska	Report covers only gross area embraced in Nebraska Nat'l Forest. Only 1183 acres alienated land in the forest, none of which is tax delinquent.	No division applied on account of small acreage involved.	Acquisition of 1183 acres of adjusted land. No large changes involved.	Entire forest is State Game Refuge. Even camping is prohibited except on 5 acres recommended for public camp sites.	None	Alienated acreage rec. for Fed. ownership for administrative reasons.	None	Determined by past employment to which were added present permittees and probably future users.	Area of 103,445 acres to be planted recommended for intensive management. Remainder of forest classed as Open Lands.
Nevada (Reg. 4)	County Assessors. Data obtained supplemented and checked with F S, taxation summary prepared in 1928.	Set at 5000 acres by Reg. Office and Idaho and Utah Forest School heads.	None except that 443,080 acres of chiefly protection forest and open lands is rec. primarily for wild life to provide ample winter range.	Arrived at by conferences between supervisors and Regional Fish and Game Officer.	None	Consensus of opinion in Reg. Off. supplemented by opinions of State officials. All tax del. land, all tax paid for forest land and all seriously eroded County land rec. for Fed. ownership. All remaining State owned land to private ownership. Population of State too small to support State forests.	None	By conference with Reg. Off. and Forest and Agr. School heads of Utah and Idaho.	Basic data from which maps were prepared.
Nevada (Reg. 5)	(See California)								
New Hampshire	State Tax Commission	Used average as indicated on photostat reference data, page 10 of Reg. For. instructions of Aug. 8.	Changes from farm to forest embrace lands reverting to forest still listed as farms by census. Few towns in New Hampshire less than 75 to 95% forested.	Conservative estimate agreed upon by consultants.	None. Intensive man. rec. chiefly on public lands and woodlands attached to farms.	Best judgment of consultants.	Best judgment of consultants.	Obtained from a formula based on present dependent population.	Formula mentioned under 8 not attached as stated in report.
New Jersey	(No Report Nov. 9, 1934)								
New Mexico	County Records. Data is admittedly rough but best available in time allotted.	Set at 160 acres, approximate average size of home-stead units.	No change recommended from farm to forest nor forest to farm due to limiting conditions of moisture and altitude. See Report Pages 1 & 2. Multiple use on both timbered and open lands.	Areas rec. both inside and outside Nat. Forest Bdry. based on former study of demand for such areas on N F lands. Rec. confirmed by State Agencies.	None. Rec. based on knowledge gained in preparation of present management plans and last logging and appraisal reports.	Most of timbered area of State now in Fed. ownership or control. Due to slow growth, light yields and limited markets private owners are convinced that Forestry in the State is a public function. In general rec. Federal ownership of saw-timber type within and adjacent to Nat. For. together with areas of so-called woodland forests and open land needed to round out boundaries. State timber land holdings will eventually be exchanged for open grazing land.	None developed & none likely to develop in future.	Dependency based on data prepared by Director of S. W. For. and Range Exp. Sta. by types. See his supplementary report attached to Report for State	None
New York	None reported	Census data and experience in acquisition of more than 2,000,000 acres.	None recommended	State Park Council declined to furnish information. Game Refuge areas as rec. by Conservation Dept.	None	Based on established acquisition policies.	None	Not reported.	Reports cover Adirondack and Catskill Forest Preserve areas and remaining counties having potential forest land.
North Carolina	County Tax Collectors. Rough estimates only and probably low.	5000 acres fixed by Reg. Off.	Chiefly farm to forest and especially in Piedmont Section. Such large changes rec. on acct. erosion, submarginality and isolated location.	Rec. are those of State For. and Asst. Director of Conservation. Nat. Park Service and Biol. Survey not consulted.	None mentioned.	Larger areas with least prospect of financial returns rec. for Fed. ownership; smaller areas of better productive capacity for State Forests; most productive lands and woodlots to private ownership.	None	Int'l gainful worker per 200 A. Ext.1 " " " 564 A Prot.1 " " " 10,000A Future farm dependency, same as at present.	Basis of figures in Cols. 15 & 16 of Farms L U P # 1.
North Dakota	(No report Nov. 9, 1934)								
Ohio	Chiefly from data obtained in a CWA project, 1933-34 under supervision of State University.	First set at 160 by conference, then changed to 175 acres to coincide with census data.	No great changes necessary. In portions of a few counties agr. should be abandoned for forestry. Such areas should be in public ownership.	None rec. Areas rec. for forests will furnish such uses.	Only interpretation of terms.	Low quality land in S. E. Ohio unattractive to private enterprise, hence rec. for public ownership. Division between State and Federal arrived at in conference of F. S. and State For. officials.	None	On farm land: Present major dep. maintained and a 25% minor dep. added. Present dep. is 1 person to 8 acres or average family of 4 1/2 to 38 acres. Forest land: av. family of 4 1/2 to 360 acres, for maj. dep. av. family of 4 1/2 to 2700 acres for min. dep.	Forest acreage data for south. counties in forest area secured by survey of 1922. For remaining counties census data was used.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Oklahoma (Reg. 8)	County officials	5000 acres fixed by Reg. Off.	No large changes. Submarginal and eroded farm lands rec. for forest by County Agts.	Based on plans and rec. of agencies concerned.	Chiefly a question as to present management or lack of same on one area; rec. for private intensive.	Thru conference with State Forester.	State For. believed State could handle all rec. public forests but after laying out a logical State system, State Forester agreed to rec. balance to Fed. ownership.	Variations according to types. See Pages 2 & 3 of Report.	Refers to a summary of Land Use Conditions for State in files of Reg. For.
Oklahoma (Reg. 2) Comanche County	County Records	Arbitrarily set at 2560 acres by Reg. Off. Probably too large for Comanche Co. since no holdings of this size.	Only large change is 96,293 acres from farm land to pasture due its marginality for cultivation.	Based on recreational development plans of Wichita Forest. Only Federal owned lands are involved, hence not discussed with other agencies.	None. Multiple use problem of timber production and food for wild life.	Recommended 8500 acre addition to Wichita forest on basis of its low Agr. value.	None	1 worker with 3 dependents to 80 acres of farm land or to 1500 acres of pasture land.	Only forest land listed in report lies within Wichita National Forest. Some open timberland outside but its highest use is undoubtedly grazing domestic livestock.
Oregon	Various sources of information. See details Pages 1 & 2 of Report.	Set at 1280 acres. This figure about represents line between holdings for timber investment and incidental ownership.	No large changes recommended.	Special service areas on maps in Nat. For. are already so dedicated. Other state & county areas not located on map but embrace recreational acreage for various use to take care of heavy demand. See P. 2 to 4 of Report.	Chief differences of opinion were among members of Forest Service. See Pages 4 & 5 of Report for plan decided upon.	Possibility of continued private ownership from the standpoint of profitable investment, based on present and predictable future conditions. Details for types and sites on Pages 5 & 6 of Report.	No important conflicting viewpoints. Land Planning Consultants feel too large an area was rec. for State ownership.	Mature timber area dependency basis differs for west and east sides of Cascades. Based on productive capacity. Protection forest estimates vary by Counties. See Pages 7 & 8 of Report.	Description of data from which maps were prepared.
Pennsylvania	Lands 2 yrs. delinquent reported. For 52 Counties based on County Records in a study made 1932-33 by Dept. For. & Waters. 15 Counties estimated.	1000 acres, figure previously used by Dept. Census report shows more than 100 farms exceeding 1000 acres.	No large changes from occupied farms to forest. Cleared land not actually farmed or grazed rec. for forest and hunting uses.	Increase of one million acres for game refuges, etc. is rec. by Game Com. Park areas as rec. by Greater Pa. Council and Pa. Parks Assn. Other areas are estimates.	None. Intensive only is rec. including State owned game lands where timber production is at least secondary.	For state forests the plan and goal of State Dept. of For. & Waters. For state game lands, policy and plan of State Game Commission. County forests from County tax del. lands where State subsidy will be required.	None except that the game and recreation interests are prone to underestimate the possibility of combining timber production with the other uses.	Farm land:- Slight increase over present dep. plus 20% to cover primary farm mfg. minor dep. 1/6 of major. For basis for determining dependency on Forest land, see formula developed, page 2 of Report.	On map state game lands colored as state-owned forest since they are not withdrawn from timber production, although listed under Special Service.
Rhode Island	Town Clerks of two typical Counties which figure was adjusted for other Counties.	Fixed at 500 acres based on previous experience.	No large change recommended.	Based on rec. of organization, associations, State agencies, etc.	None	By conference with all agencies concerned.	None	Forest land- 1 gainful worker per 300 acres. For other lands, estimates based on 1930 census data.	Report refers to explanatory notes attached to L U P forms. Subdivisions determined by planimeter. 2% deduction made for highways, etc.
South Carolina	Figures obtained from study made by Dr. J. H. Aull of Clemson College, Delinquency increasing 5% annually since 1926.	5000 acres fixed by Reg. Off.	Problem area map used as basis. Poor soil types and serious erosion in Piedmont section and submarginality on Agr. lands in N. W. portion of State indicate conversion to forest as best use.	Rec. areas not adjacent to public forests. Concurred in by State For. Other agencies concerned made no reply to letter requesting their views.	None	Problem area map used as basis. Most productive and marketable areas rec. for private; large areas offering lowest financial returns to Federal; smaller more isolated areas to State.	State For. objected to broadening of Fed. Acquisition program although admitting State, Counties, etc. could not finance Acq. of large areas agreed upon for public ownership. Final rec. are those in Reg. Off.	Int. - 1 gainful worker per 200 acres. Ext.- 1 gainful worker per 564A. Prot.- 1 gainful worker per 10,000A. No mention made of no. of dependents per gainful worker. Farm dependency same as at present.	Cultivated and pasture acreages for best permanent use are estimates of County Agts. Large game holdings held by northern capital in 9 Counties. These areas are also timber producing and dependency on such areas is unknown.

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
South Dakota	County Records. In 5 counties reported by F S, 17% delinquent exists, consisting entirely of small holdings.	Arbitrarily fixed at 2560 acres by R. O.	Largest change involves 345,000 acres from farm land to forest and pasturage based on its submarginal character.	Rec. apply chiefly to Custer State Park. Not discussed with State Park Board since its views are well known to Regional and Forester's Offices.	No difference of opinion among forest officers. No other differences mentioned in report.	Rec. for public ownership based on misuse of forest lands, overgrazing of pasture lands and marginality of farm lands.	No conflicting viewpoints among Forest officers. Not discussed with State officials.	Basis for dependency figures are estimates which increase greatly number of dependents resulting from intensive management.
Tennessee	Estimates of County Trustees.	Set at 5000 by Regional Office.	One broad change recommended, conversion to forest of large areas of submarginal lands.	Based on suggestions as outlined by State Forester and State Fish and Game Commissioner.	None	Heavily forested areas rec. for Federal ownership in continuance of present acq. policy in locating purchase units. State forests for smaller and often detached forested areas. State cannot finance a larger program. Private ownership where established forest industries can reasonably be expected to apply proper forest management.	State Forester's views are in friendly conflict with rec. He does not oppose Fed. ownership but encourages it. He believes public ownership, whether Fed. or State, should be scattered over entire State rather than assembling huge acreages in only few areas. For details see his plan copy of which is in Lands Files and also in R. O.	No minor dependencies estimated. For farms, determined average size from data available, allowing five dependents. Checked against census and adjusted. For Forest lands, Reg. Off. figures were used allowing 4 dependents for each major dependent gainful worker. Int. - 4 dependents per 200 A. Ext. - 4 " " 564 A. Prot. - 4 " " 10,000 A.
Texas	Not reported on Nov. 9, 1934							
Utah	County Assessors data from F. S. Taxation Summary of 1928 and from Dept of Agr. Economics, Utah State Agr. College.	5000 acres decided upon by R. O. Staff and State Forestry and Agr. experts.	200,000 acre increase for crop production rec. by State Plan. Consultant. Only other large change is in acreage of special service areas.	Areas rec. by both State and Federal Agencies and all agencies concurred in recommendations.	No appreciable difference of opinion	Basis of rec. vary greatly to meet varied conditions in State. See Report Pages 2 to 4.	None	By conference between R. O. Staff and State Forestry and Agr. Staff of Utah and Idaho State Colleges Farm - 1 major & 2 minor dependents for 80 acres. Pasture - 1 major & 2 minor dependents for 20,000 acres. Int. For. - 1 major & 10 minor dependents for 750 acres. Ext. For. - 1 major & 5 minor dependents for 1200 acres. Prot. For. - 1 major & 2 minor dependents for 2000 acres. Wild Life) - 1 major & 10 minor Parks & Rec.) dependents for 1200 acres (note-4 dependents to each gainful worker)
Vermont	Questionnaires to 250 towns - 50% returned.	Based on general knowledge of conditions in Vermont.	No large changes	None Recommended		Conference with Agr. Econ. and Forest Service		As per instructions in Reg. For. letter of August 8.
Virginia	Not reported on Nov. 9, 1934							
Washington (Region 6) (For the part of Washington in Region 1 See "Idaho Region 1")	Sources of information and accuracy varies See Report Pages 1 to 4.	Set at 1280 acres by agencies concerned. An arbitrary figure but one which fairly well marks the line between holdings for timber investment and incidental ownership.	No large changes within area reported by F. S.	In addition to Fed.-owned areas recommended are State-owned areas together with roadside scenic strips, forested ocean beaches, etc. areas and locations not definitely established, but sufficient acreage was allotted in statistical reports to take care of rapidly increasing recreational use of region. See Report Pages 4 to 6.	In general best sites were rec. for intensive, balance of commercial timber zones for extensive and protective where no management plans are contemplated. Differences of opinion confined largely to members of Forest Service.	Private ownership rec. wherever in light of present and predictable future conditions it was reasonable to believe such ownership would be a profitable investment. Balance in public ownership, - best producing areas to State and remainder to Fed. Ownership. County ownership impossible due to financial condition thru loss in taxes. State Forester is broadly in agreement, some difference in details.	None except Reg. & state plan. Consultants feel that too large an area was rec. by State ownership, that State finances will not be able to handle it. If this is correct Fed. Government must ultimately acquire this surplus.	Same as for Oregon See Report, Pages 8 to 10.

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
West Virginia	Wyoming and Monroe Co. from County Records For remaining Counties used best judgment of State Dist. Foresters and other State Forest officers.	Varies by Counties Figure used was line between average small Company ownership and average large individual ownership.	Greatest change recommended is in intensity of management, thus increasing forest employment and securing highest ultimate economic use of land.	Rec. made and concurred in by State Agencies.	Difference of opinion in interpretation of definitions of <u>intensive</u> and <u>extensive</u> . Extensive management largely recommended.	By conference with heads of various State agencies.	None Federal vs. Private	Best judgment of State Forest Officers, based on instructions from Reg. Office.
Wisconsin	County Records where available. For other Counties, estimates from County Treasurer	Set a 160 acres as result of conference between State and F. S. officials	Tax delinquency was made the basis, Rec. of County Agents were accepted for lands suitable for agriculture.	Only those areas now in parks were rec. for that purpose. Logical areas along certain lakes and main streams rec. for recreation. All agencies concurred in rec.	Few differences of opinion and those only of minor importance.	Based on concensus of opinions of County Agts, Clerks and Treasurers. These were analyzed by State and F. S. officials and adjusted	Several differences- Reg. Off. believes too large an acreage was rec. for Co. Forests for some Counties. State Con. Dept. feels Fed. ownership should be limited to two million acres as set by legislature. For other differences See Report Page 2.	Fixed by R. O. for Mich. Wis. & Min. Int. Forest - 1 Major to 150 acres. Int. Forest - 1 minor to 600 acres. Ext. & Prot. 1 major to 600 acres. Ext. & Prot. 1 minor to 2400 acres.
Wyoming (Region 2)	Reports submitted by supervisors. Where they obtained their data is not mentioned.	Arbitrarily set at 2560 acres at conference of representatives of Central Rocky Mt. Reg.	One change rec. from farm lands to pasture and forest because lands not suitable for agr. Another large change is the rec. of large acreage for natural and primitive areas. Changes rec. will result in highest uses of lands.	Since there is already large acreage of Nat. Parks in State an additional 24,000 acres only is rec. Rec. concurred in by State agencies concerned.	Rec. of local Forest officers checked and agreed upon by R. O.	Federal ownership in certain areas where private ownership is not in public interest, and of State lands where interspersed with Federal in Nat. For. Scattered Fed. holdings close to ranches rec. for private ownership.	State Planning Com. approves of plan to transfer certain State and private holdings to Federal ownership but State administration has been and still is very much opposed.	Based on estimate of supporting capacity under more intensive management of both forest and farm lands. Details not given as to method of arriving at figures reported.
Wyoming (Region 4)	County Assessors supplemented and checked by Agr. Ec. Dept. of State University and State Land Planning Consultant.	Set at 5000 acres by Reg. Off and State Officials concerned.	No large changes except in special service areas for purpose of providing winter range and placing valuable game areas under proper administration.	Rec. made by R. O. and concurred in by State Agency concerned. No areas included for additions to National Parks.	None	R. O. and State L. P. Consultant prepared rec. State officials not consulted. See Report Page 2. Changes from present ownership mentioned but no basis given for such changes.	None although National Park extensions which will probably be desired, were not embodied in rec.	Same as for Utah

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.



© 1977 by the Board of Regents
of the University of California
All rights reserved. Printed in the U.S.A.

	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17-18
			Initial Cost annual average Maint.					
Alabama	None until State Laws are revised. Only 2% rec. State forests tax del. 3 yrs. or more.	Northern Area - \$5.00 per A. Southern " - \$4.00 " A.	Intensive \$1.85 .026 Extensive .54 .013 Protective .14 .05	Intensive .23 Extensive .10 Protective .035	See Reg. For. Statement	U S F S, State Agencies and County Agents.	Described Page 12 of Report	Listed Page 12 of Report.
Arizona	None Tax del. confined chiefly to small farms. Lands sold for taxes not permanently vested in public ownership under present laws.	\$2.00 per acre	Intensive .16 .08 Extensive .10 .04 Protective .07 .04	Intensive .03 Extensive .02 Protective .05	None necessary. Fed. ownership only is rec.	See individual county sheets.	Vertical breakdown by total areas, then horizontally into ownership.	Listed Page 5 of report.
Arkansas	50% if del. continues at present rate and suitable State laws are enacted.	\$3.50 per acre	Intensive \$2.40 .05 Extensive 1.00 .028 Protective .14 .04	Intensive .23 Extensive .13 Protective .03	See Reg. For. Statement	U S F S, State and other Fed. Agencies	Total forest area broken down horizontally, then vertically.	Listed Page 6 of report.
California	None without cost. By change in present law 10 to 15% would be ultimately available.	So. Pac. R. R. lands \$4.00 per acre. Coast Range Pine Lands west of S. P. R. R. \$8.00 per A. Mature redwood lands \$15 to \$45. Mature Sierra timber average \$15. Cutover lands \$2, merchantable 2nd growth \$7.00. Brush lands 25¢ to 50¢. Woodland hill pasture and open brush \$4.00. Desert Range 25¢ to 50¢. State school lands by law not less than \$1.25 per A.	Int. (New) \$5.045.13 Int. (Old) 3.955.13 Ext. 2.52 .06 Prot. (So. Cal) 3.589.13 " (Gen. Val) 2.35 .04 " (Desert) .49 .01 " (Alpine) .49 .01	Intensive .18 Extensive .18 Protective .18	Strongly recommend Cope-land report proposals for modification of Clark-McNary law. Wholly opposed to purchase of State forests with Federal funds.	U S F S State and other Fed. Agencies	See Report Pages 13 to 15.	Partially covered in report under Items 15 and 16.
Colorado (Region 2)	Probably 10% if suitable enabling laws are enacted.	Poorer cutover lands \$1.25 to \$2.00. Better timbered lands \$5.00. Black Forest area \$10.00. Average of all areas \$3.50.	Total cost not available due to lack of figures showing average cost of planting and cultural work. Int. 2¢ - Ext. 1.5¢ - Prot. 1¢.	Intensive .05 Extensive .03 Protective .02	Protection and other cooperation as embodied in Sec. 2, 4 & 5 of Clark-McNary Law.	U S F S and State Planning Commission	Gross area first broken down vertically in Col. 14 then horizontally to the left, then to the right, then adjusted.	No Comments
Colorado (Region 4)	None	\$2.00	Intensive 1.82 .07 Extensive 1.19 .04 Protective .40 .02	Intensive .03 Extensive .02 Protective .01	No problem. Only 40 A private land involved.	U S F S Personnel	Forest land acreage computed from 1931 revision of Cope-land Report. Balance of area classified as open land.	Listed Pages 3 & 4 of report.
Connecticut	None	\$3.00	Intensive 5.00 Extensive 3.00 Protective 2.00	Intensive .25 Extensive .10 Protective .05	25%	Thru State Forester & other State Agencies	Procedure as outlined in Reg. For. instructions of Aug. 8.	List on Supplemental Pages of report.
Delaware	None	\$10.00	Intensive 5.00	Intensive .05	Such as is now available under Clark-McNary law and revisions thereof rec. by Assn. of State Foresters.	Essentially work of State Forestry Dept.	As outlined in instructions furnished by F S.	See Page 3 of Report
Florida	None under existing law. Under suitable laws about 1/2 the poorer lands, roughly 2,500,000 acres.	\$2.00	Intensive 2.02 .048 Extensive .84 .017 Protective .14 .04	Intensive .23 Extensive .09 Protective .03	See Reg. For. Statement	Assembled all available information, compiled and correlated this data, field work obtaining additional information required, final compilation and analysis. F S State & other Fed. agencies.	Refers to attached memo., not located.	
Georgia	None	\$4.50	Intensive 2.06 .03 Extensive .57 .016 Protective .14 .05	Intensive .23 Extensive .11 Protective .035	See Reg. For. Statement.	U S F S, State and other Federal Agencies	See Page 6 of Report	See Page 7 of Report.

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.



	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17-18	
Idaho (Reg. 4)	None likely at present. if any cost will be about 50% of del. taxes.	50¢ to \$4.00 Average \$1.50	Initial cost Int. - \$2.07 Ext. - 1.40 Prot. - .46	Av. ann. main. .08 .05 .02	Int. .055 Ext. .05 Prot. .045	F. S. should be in charge of protection of all State and private forest land within 10 miles of N. F. Bdry. No Federal money should be spent in development or improvement of State or private forest lands.	For organization see Report Page 5. U S F S and State Agencies participated.	Gross areas from Census. Figures first broken down horizontally, then vertically. Acreage of forest land computed from 1931. Revision of Copeland Report.	Listed pages 6 & 7 of report.
Idaho (Reg. 1)	None can revert to State or Fed. agencies under existing laws. Possibly 5% may revert to counties but will probably have to be purchased at nominal prices by the ultimate owning agency.	If acquired before further cutting - \$7.00 per A. Cut-50¢ per A.	Int. - 3.00 Ext. - 2.40 Prot. - 1.80	?	Int. .44 plus 11¢ Ext. .25 " 11¢ Prot. .05 " 2¢	See Pages 7 and 8 or report.	See report for details. Chiefly F. S. personnel.	Maps of each county were prepared showing ownership, tax delinquency, cover, zone for management and proposed future use and ownership. Completion was then made by 40 acres units of areas falling into each separate category. Census figures of farm areas checked against this and adjustments made.	Listed Page 9 of report. note (Additional amounts needed for 6 yr. period for initial work on insect and disease control.)
Illinois	Probably 25% provided suitable law is enacted.	Mr. Locke estimates \$25.00, Reg. Off. \$10.00	Int. - 7.00 Ext. - 2.00 Prot. - 1.00	?	Int. .30 Ext. .10 Prot. .07	50%	Field work by F. S. Acquisition personnel and by State ECW employees who contacted County Agts and other County officials. U S F S and State Agencies participated in the planning and rec.	Gross areas broken down simultaneously both vertically and horizontally.	See Pages 4 & 5 report.
Indiana	None under existing law. New law anticipated whereby 10% additional public forest acreage would be acquired.	\$8.00 per acre	Int. - 7.00 Ext. - 2.00 Prot. None Rec.	?	Int. .30 Ext. .10 Prot. None Rec.	50%	Field Work by State Agencies	See Report Page 4.	Listed Page 5 of Report.
Iowa	None under existing law.	\$8.00 to \$10.00 per acre.	Int. - 7.00 Ext.) Report States Prot.) none rec.	?	Int. .30 Ext.) Report States Prot.) none rec.	25 to 50% Federal Gov't should not share cost of acquiring other public lands.	Tabular Reports and Maps compiled by State Agencies by breaking down or summarizing available data. State College especially active and cooperative.	Followed procedure outlined by Reg. Off in its instructions to field workers.	Listed Pages 4 and 5 of Report.
Kansas	(No report Nov. 9, 1934)								
Kentucky	None	\$5.00 per acre	Int. .25 Ext. .20 Prot. .15	?	Int. .07 Ext. .04 Prot. .03	State be required to purchase lands for State Forests, Fed. Gov't to bear 75% of maintenance and administrative costs.	State For., Asst. State For. and State Land Plan Consultant.	Outline submitted by U S F S was followed in preparing reports.	Listed Page 3 of Report.
Louisiana	None under present law. Probably 20% if suitable law is enacted.	\$3.00 average for delta hardwoods and cutover pine.	Int. 1.62 Ext. .82 Prot. .14	.025 .012 .05	Int. .22 Ext. .10 Prot. .035	See Reg. For. Statement	Excellent cooperation from State Forester whose 25 yrs of forestry work in State was a most valuable source of information.	Detailed procedure outlined Pages 5 and 6 of Report.	Listed Page 6 of Report.
Maine	None	\$2.00 to \$5.00 per acre.	(To be submitted later)	(To be submitted later)	Fire Prot. 3¢ per A.	Fed. Gov't. should carry on necessary research in silviculture taxation and utilization and continue cooperation in fire protection.	?	Vertical breakdown first.	Maine Dept. of Agr., Maine Planning Board, Local Boards of Assessors and Selectmen, Maine Forest Service. note (Report states: "mentioned on separate sheet" Separate sheet not located).

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.

	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17-18	Notes		
			Initial Cost	average annual Maint.							
			Intensive	Intensive		State lands	Municipal lands	Private lands			
			Extensive	Extensive		Fed. - 50%	Fed. - 25%	Fed. - 25%			
			Protective-None rep.	Protective-None rep.		State - 50%	State-25%	State - 25%			
						Mun. - 50%	Priv. - 50%				
Maryland	None	\$8.00 per acre	Intensive \$3.00 Extensive 1.00 Protective-None rep.	? Intensive .06 Extensive .04 Protective-None rep.		State lands Fed. - 50% State - 50%	Municipal lands Fed. - 25% State-25% Mun. - 50%	Private lands Fed. - 25% State - 25% Priv. - 50%	State Forestry Dept., Land Planning consultant and soil experts of University.	Procedure as outlined in Reg. For. letter of Aug. 8.	See Page 3 of Report.
Massachusetts	Very little	\$10.00 per acre	Intensive \$10.00 Extensive 5.00 Protective 1.00	? Intensive \$2.00 Extensive 1.00 Protective .50		Fire protection as embodied in Clark-McNary law.			Tabular sheets by Chief Forester of State; maps by office of Conservation Department.	From State forest survey, authoritative figures for Col. 14 and good data for Col. 12 were available. These figures were broken down horizontally.	See Report page 3.
Michigan	75% of area recorded for State ownership and 50% of area recorded for other public forests.	\$5.00 per acre	Intensive \$7.00 Extensive 2.00 Protective 1.00	? Intensive .30 Extensive .10 Protective .07		Up to 50%			Area assigned to State compiled by Dept. of Conservation and staff of Agr. Dept. of State College. Federal Agency data collected and compiled by staffs of Supervisors' offices.	In most instances horizontal breakdown first, then vertical.	See Report page 3. See Zon's letter of Sept. 26 attached to Report.
Minnesota	35%	\$3.50 per acre for tax paid lands.	Intensive \$7.00 Extensive 2.00 Protective 1.00	? Intensive .30 Extensive .10 Protective .07		Not over 50%			U.S.F.S. and State agencies.	Detailed procedure outlined Pages 3 to 5 of Report	See Report page 5. See supplementary Report on Forest Resources attached to Reg. For. Report.
Mississippi	10%	\$2.50 per acre	Intensive \$2.07 Extensive .73 Protective .14	2.7 1.3 0.5 Intensive .23 Extensive .10 Protective 3.5		See Reg. For. statement			U.S.F.S. State agencies and State A.A.A. consultant.	Horizontal breakdowns first, then vertical. For details see Report Pages 5 and 6.	See Report page 6.
Missouri	Practically none under present laws.	\$2.00 to \$2.25 per acre.	Intensive \$6.00 Extensive-None rec. Protective 1.00	? Intensive .50 Extensive-None planned Protective .10		Cost of advisory work at Federal expense. When acquired between State and Federal Government Fed. Coop. with private owners limited to advice and education. No coop. with State until lands have been acquired and funds appropriated for development.			U.S.F.S., State agencies and Land Plan. consultants. Data for tabular reports on 43 counties south of Missouri River obtained by Forest Service personnel. That for 15 counties north of River by State agencies.	Horizontal first. Detailed plan outlined pages 8 and 9 of Report.	See Report pages 9 and 10. Pencil changes made by someone under items 11, 12 and 13.
Montana	See remarks for Idaho, Region 1.	If acquired before further cutting - \$4.00 per acre. Cutoner-West. Montana, 75¢ per acre; East. Montana, \$1.00 per acre.	Intensive \$.75 Extensive .60 Protective .45	? Intensive-17¢ plus 2¢ Extensive-11¢ plus 1¢ Protective 3¢		See Report pages 7 and 8.			See Report for details. Chiefly Forest Service personnel.	See Remarks for Idaho, Region 1.	See Report page 9.
Nebraska	None	\$2.50 to \$4.00 per acre.	Intensive \$18.55 No extensive or protective areas.	2¢ Intensive \$.29 No extensive or protective areas.		No other public agencies involved.			Prepared by Supervisor and reviewed and corrected by Reg. Off.	Report embraces only the National Forest.	Material for report already available in Supervisor's office.
Nevada Reg. 4 Nevada (Reg. 5) see Calif.	None at present but probably some within 5 to 10 yrs. if suitable laws are enacted.	Range from \$1.00 to \$4.00 averaging \$2.00.	Intensive \$1.82 Extensive 1.19 Protective .40	7¢ 4¢ 2¢ Intensive \$.03 Extensive .02 Protective 1.5¢		Very little forest in State or private ownership. Federal Government not warranted in spending public funds on these areas.			Information obtained from data available from Federal and State agencies and compiled in Reg. Off. under supervision of Asst. Reg. Forester in charge of Lands.	See Report, page 4.	See Report pages 4 and 5.
New Hampshire	Difficult to foresee. None so acquired as yet.	\$1.00 to \$10.00 per acre. Average \$5.00.	Intensive \$1.00 Extensive .25 Protective .03	? Intensive \$2.00 Extensive .50 Protective .06		As far as possible.			General supervisors of State Planning Board, under supervision of State Forester assisted by members of other State agencies.	In accordance with Reg. Off. instructions of Aug. 8.	See Report page 3.
New Jersey											

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.

	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17-18	Notes
			Initial Cost Intensive Extensive Protective	average annual Maint. 1.2 0.52 0.52					
New Mexico	None under present laws.	\$4.00 per acre	\$.76 18.25 17.25	Intensive Extensive Protective	Intensive Extensive Protective	None warrants on account of small area involved.	This information appears on each county sheet.	Vertical breakdown first, then horizontal.	See Page 5 of Report.
New York	None	\$10.00 to \$15.00	\$10.00 (incl. cost rep. of Plant.) .10	Intensive Extensive-None Protective	Intensive Extensive-None Protective	50% for protection.	State agencies.	Started with total County Areas. Breakdown then both vertically and horizontally.	See Page 3 of Report.
North Carolina	Negligible amount under existing laws.	\$4.50 per acre	\$2.62 .75 .15	Intensive Extensive Protective	Intensive Extensive Protective	See Reg. For. statement	U.S.F.S. assisted by State Forester and other State and A.A.A. officers.	First largely vertical, then horizontal.	See Page 6 of Report.
North Dakota									
Ohio	None under present law. 10% if suitable law is enacted.	\$9.00 per acre	\$7.00 2.00	Intensive Extensive Protective-None Rec.	Intensive Extensive Protective-None Rec.	On a fifty-fifty basis and also provide a full-time extension forester.	Personnel from State Foresters office and State University.	Col. 14 first, then broken down horizontally and later vertically.	See Page 5 of Report.
Oklahoma (Reg. 8)	None under present law. 50% if suitable law is enacted.	Not over \$4.00 per acre.	\$1.64 Rec. .15	Intensive Extensive-None Protective	Intensive Extensive-None Protective	See Reg. For. statement.	U.S.F.S., State and other Federal agencies.	Horizontal first, then vertical.	See Page 4 of Report.
Oklahoma (Reg. 2) (Comanche Cou.)	None	\$5.00 per acre.	\$13.75 Rec. 13.75	Intensive Extensive-None Protective	Intensive Extensive-None Protective	To extent provided in Clarke-McNary law.	U.S.F.S., and County officials.	Starting with gross area, breakdowns were made from information available on forest types and Agr. uses.	?
Oregon	Within next 10 years, - 75% of cutover lands 100% of second growth areas and about 60% of mature timbered areas will have reverted to counties under existing laws, present economic conditions prevailing.	\$19.50 per acre.	\$1.007 .839 .671	Intensive Extensive Protective	Intensive Extensive Protective	Very interesting interpretations of responsibility. For details see pages 12 and 13 of Report.	U.S.F.S., State and other Federal agencies.	A combination of both vertical and horizontal breakdown. Details on Page 15 of Report.	? This is a very thorough report and should be read in order to obtain complete picture of situation there.
Pennsylvania	10%	Not over \$6.00 per acre.	\$4.00 Rec. "	Intensive Extensive-None Protective	Intensive Extensive-None Protective	Continuance of cooperative features of Clarke-McNary Act. C.C.C. camps should be continued after 1935 although on a reduced basis. State should handle balance of development and improvement.	All under supervision of State agencies concerned.	Vertical breakdown of Col. 14 first.	See Pages 4 and 5 of Report.
Rhode Island	10% or less.	Woodland - \$5.00 Submarginal farmland approx. \$10.00.	\$5.00 Rec. "	Intensive Extensive-None Protective	Intensive Extensive-None Protective	25% or more. For continuance of blister rust control work, 50% or more is needed.	Principally State Forest agencies.	Procedure outlined in Reg. For. letter of Aug. 8.	See Page 3 of Report.
South Carolina	Not over 5% unless suitable laws are enacted.	\$5.00 per acre	\$2.26 .85 .14	Intensive Extensive Protective	Intensive Extensive Protective	See Reg. For. statement.	U.S.F.S. and State agencies.	After entering totals from Census data, breakdown was made horizontally, then adjusted vertically.	See Pages 5 and 6 of Report.

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17-18	
South Dakota	None	Eventually, probably all tax delinquent land within 5 miles of N. F. boundaries will be disposed of to Fed. Gov't. by counties.	\$3.00 to \$4.00 per acre.	Initial Average Cost Annual Maint. Average cost not given Costs mentioned apply to specific age classes. Maint. Cost 3¢ All intensive management.	Int. 3.5¢ Ext. none rec. Prot. none rec.	Continuance of Fed. participation in protection of Custer State Park and in application of Clark-McNary Act. Additional aid from Fed. Gov't. in case of serious insect infestation.	All field work and reports by F. S. personnel.	Report not clear	?	
Tennessee	Problem area map of entire state was prepared based on classifications set up in A.A.A. outline of 6-5-34. So far as possible problem areas were located so that major problem prevailed on at least 50% of area. Percentages of area to which each problem applied were indicated on map.	8% if County Trustees are forced to act under existing law.	\$4.00 per acre if purchaser could begin at once. \$5.50 per acre by time purchases can have been completed. Mineral rights will be reserved on larger portions of area.	Int. \$1.68 Ext. .73 Prot. .14	2.5¢ 1.4¢ 0.5¢	Int. .23¢ Ext. .10 Prot. .035	See Reg. for. statement for entire Region.	U S F S, T V A National Park Service, State Forestry and Agr. Agencies, including both Fed. and State E. W. personnel	After entering total areas from Census data, the breakdown was generally horizontal first, then vertical.	See Report, Page 5
Texas										
Utah	Basis for preparation of maps	None at present without cost of approx. 50% of accrued taxes. Within next 5 to 10 years, cost will probably be materially reduced.	Average \$2.00, ranging from 50¢ to \$5.00.	Int. 1.82 Ext. 1.19 Prot. .40	7¢ 4¢ 2¢	Int. .045 Ext. .04 Prot. .035	F. S. assume protection of all forest land within at least 10 mi. of N. F. Bdry. owners to pay fixed charge per acre into cooperative fund. Fed. Gov't. should not spend public funds to improve or develop private or state forests.	U S F S, State Agencies, Agr. Colleges and other Federal Agencies. See Report Page 6.	In general, horizontal breakdown first, then vertical. See Report Pages 6 & 7.	See Report, Page 8
Vermont	Due to interspersion, impossible to locate types of future ownership graphically on map. Same applies to municipal holdings.	None	\$7.00	Int. 5.00 Ext. 2.00 Prot. .50	?	Int. 1.00 Ext. .25 Prot. .02	Protections:- Clark-McNary as at present. Nursery:- 50% cooperation to all instead of only to farmers under present Clark-McNary law. Development and improvement-C.C.C. or similar set-up on not less than one-half present scale.	Vermont Forest Service	Total net area broken down vertically, then horizontally.	See Report, Page 3
Virginia	(No report Nov. 9)									
Washington	1/Description of data from which maps were prepared	Within next 18 yrs. all 2nd growth lands will have reverted to counties and within 10 yrs. 50% of outover lands. under existing laws, present economic conditions prevailing.	\$22.78 per acre	Int. 1.007 Ext. .839 Prot. .671	?	Int. .097 Ext. .082 Prot. .067	None if this question applies to areas rec. for best permanent ownership. If in protection then only to extent of keeping lands in productive condition. Funds so spent should constitute lien against property and if allowed to accumulate up to value of property should result in Federal ownership. See Pages 14 & 15 of Report.	U S F S, State and other Federal agencies.	Combination of both vertical and horizontal breakdown. See report pages 17 & 18	
West Virginia	None	None until after 2 yr. moratorium expires in 1936. After that 10 to 25%.	Best estimate is \$3.00 to \$5.00.	Int. ? Ext. ? Prot. ?	?	Int. .02 Ext. .02 Prot. .02	Federal Government should make recommendations and make inspections. Desirable to greatly increase Clark-McNary allotments.	State Agencies and E C W Supervisory personnel.	As outlined in instructions from Reg. For.	See Report, Page 3
Wisconsin	Degree of detail on Map 1 variable according to agency responsible and difficulties encountered.	50%	\$3.00 per acre	Int. 7.00 Ext. 2.00 Prot. 1.00	?	Int. .30 Ext. .10 Prot. .07	Up to 50%	U S F S, State and County officials and E C W personnel.	As outlined in instructions prepared by Reg. Off.	See Report, Pages 4 and 5.

1/For that part of Washington in Region 1, See Idaho, Region 1 and combined Report covering all states in Region 1.

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.

RECEIVED



	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Wyoming (Region 2)	None	10% if enabling laws are enacted. None until then.	\$3.00 per acre	No average initial cost figure given Intensive Extensive Protective	Initial cost Av. Ann. Maint.	Int. 5¢ Ext. 4¢ Prot. 2¢	Aid in fire protection when State effects a fire organization. State and all private owners should also participate in Sec. 4 & 5 of Clark McNary law.	U S F S and State Agencies	Vertically, then horizontally, although description indicates combination of both	F. S. studies embraced only a small percentage of entire area of state. F. S. had no part in rec. for vast acreage of low grade grazing areas outside N. F. Communities.
Wyoming (Region 4)	Basis of data from which maps were prepared	None at present. Ultimate Cost will be 50% of accrued taxes. Should acquisition be delayed 5 to 10 yrs., cost will be materially reduced.	50¢ to \$4.00 Average 1.50	Intensive Extensive Protective	\$2.07 1.40 .46	8¢ 5¢ 2¢	Int. 5.5¢ Ext. 5¢ Prot. 4.5¢	Same as for Utah See Wyo. Report, Page 4 for details.	In general, horizontal breakdown first, then vertical. See Report Page 5.	See Report, Pages 5 & 6.

Refer to "OUTLINE FOR WRITTEN REPORTS IN SUPPORT OF DATA AND MAPS SUBMITTED", bottom of page 2.

L Land Use Planning Forest Service Form L. U. P. No. 1 - (7/27/34)

UNITED STATES SUMMARY LAND USE PLAN

STATE 46 COUNTIES 1,756 SUBDIVISION 1,756 Counties or parts of Counties (If report covers only part of County)

GROSS AREA OF UNIT (Acres) 935,762,104 PART THEREOF ACCOUNTED FOR IN REPORT 897,108,160

Table with columns for Classification on Basis of Past or Present Uses, CURRENT CONDITIONS OF USE AND OWNERSHIP (APPROXIMATIONS MADE WHERE DEPENDABLE DATA NOT READILY OBTAINABLE), and PERMANENT FORMS OF USE OFFERING GREATEST PROMISE OF MAXIMUM COMMON BENEFIT. Rows include Forest Lands, Other Open Lands, Pasture Lands, Farm Lands, and Grand Totals.

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PERSONS LAND WILL PERMANENTLY SUPPORT IF RECOMMENDED FORM OF USE IS PERMANENTLY ESTABLISHED: Major Dependence and Minor Dependence.


Total Area Forest Land Present Time (acres) 530,550,693 (Includes 96,160,884 acres of Farm Woodland reported as Farm Lands.) Total Area Recommended for Permanent Forest Management 546,586,217

Summary table for County Lands and State Lands, categorized by Under organized and Under lease to private forest management.

Prepared by: Kathleen Gall (Name), Statistical Clerk (Title), 1/2/35 (Date). Reviewed by: J. D. ... Approved by: P. A. Foster, Sr. Administrative Assistant, 1/2/35.




PRESENT DOMINANT OWNERSHIP OF FOREST LAND




RECOMMENDED DOMINANT OWNERSHIP OF FOREST LAND




PRESENT DOMINANT INTENSITY OF MANAGEMENT OF FOREST LAND



RECOMMENDED DOMINANT INTENSITY OF MANAGEMENT OF FOREST LAND




RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN FOREST OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT



PRESENT AND RECOMMENDED FEDERAL FORESTS
(PARKS AND INDIAN LANDS NOT INCLUDED)

PRESENT LAND USE




LEGEND






- Farm Lands (including woodlands)
- ▤ Fenced Pasture Lands (not integral parts of farms)
- ▨ Open Lands (not in other classifications)
- ▩ Wild Life Refuges and Shooting Grounds
- ▧ Parks and Recreation
- ▦ Commercial and Protection Forest

□ This Block Represents
5,000,000 Acres


RECOMMENDED LAND USE




LEGEND


-  Production Cultivated Farm Crops
-  Pasturage Domestic Livestock
-  Wild Life Refuges and Shooting Grounds
-  Parks and Recreation
-  Forest Management

 This Block Represents
5,000,000 Acres





PRESENT LAND OWNERSHIP






PRESENT CONDITION OF FOREST LAND (Other than Indian Reservations and Parks)











PRESENT OWNERSHIP OF FOREST LAND (Other than Indian Reservations and Parks)




LEGEND

-  Private
-  Municipal
-  County
-  State
-  Federal


 This Block Represents
1,500,000 Acres




PRESENT USE OF PRIVATE LAND




RECOMMENDED USE OF PERMANENT PRIVATE LAND




RECOMMENDED OWNERSHIP OF PRESENT PRIVATE LAND



PRESENT OWNERSHIP OF RECOMMENDED FEDERAL LAND




PRESENT USE OF STATE LANDS



LEGEND


- 6 Farm Lands (including woodlands)
- 5 Fenced Pasture Lands (not integral parts of farms)
- 4 Open Lands (not in other classifications)
- 3 Wild Life Refuges and Shooting Grounds
- 2 Parks and Recreation
- 1 Commercial and Protection Forest







Handwritten text, possibly a signature or date, located at the bottom center of the page.


RECOMMENDED OWNERSHIP OF STATE LANDS







PRESENT USE OF FEDERAL LAND






PRESENT USE OF RECOMMENDED PERMANENT FOREST LAND





AREA OF FOREST SERVICE STATISTICAL INQUIRY AND NATURAL FOREST AREA



WESTERN LEGEND


AREA OF REPORT	AREA OUTSIDE REPORT
DOMINANT COVER OR USE	
Natural Forest Area	
Protection Forest Species	
Commercial Forest Species	
Farm Land	
Desert	
Open Land	

EASTERN LEGEND

AREA OF REPORT	AREA OUTSIDE REPORT
DOMINANT COVER	
Natural Forest Area	
Protection Forest Species	
Commercial Forest Species	
Open Land	

MILES
0 100 200 300


RATIO OF FOREST LAND TO AREA REPORTED UPON



LEGEND
PERCENTAGE FOREST LAND


- 0-17
- 17-33
- 33-50
- 50-67
- 67-83
- 83-100

MILES
0 100 200 300




Distribution of all lands supporting or available for and capable of supporting a forest cover. Including forested portions of Indian Reservations and parks. This map is a composite of the following three, 'Present Available Commercial Forest Land' and 'Protection Forest' were compiled with the assistance of Zon and Shantz, 'Forest Vegetation of the U.S.' (1923) and the Extensive Revision of the Capper Report (1932).

PRESENT AVAILABLE COMMERCIAL FOREST LAND




Distribution of land supporting or available for and capable of producing forest products other than farm woodlands and areas withdrawn from commercial use as in parks.



Distribution of "Farm Woodlots" as compiled from the 1930 Census of Agriculture. Includes timber tracts, natural or planted and cut-over land with young growth; but excludes chaparral and woody shrubs.

PROTECTION FOREST AREAS




*Each dot represents
10,000 acres*

MILES
0 100 200 300

Distribution of all lands supporting or capable of supporting a forest cover essential for protective purposes, but without commercial value and not falling in any other classification. The natural cover will under normal condition and when protected from fire reach a minimum average height of six feet and a density that will provide ground shade comparable to that in a timber forest.




MATURE TIMBER LAND



*Each dot represents
10,000 acres*


MILES
0 100 200 300

Distribution of land supporting timber of such size as to be currently marketable for the major product to be taken from the area. Does not include stands otherwise classifiable only as second growth, but cut primarily for so-called minor products, such as chemical distillation, fuel wood, mine props, posts, etc.




Distribution of productive forest lands supporting stands below mature timber classification, but above two inches average diameter at breast height and averaging more than one hundred trees per acre.

RESTOCKING AREAS




Distribution of productive forest land supporting an average of more than one hundred trees per acre less than two inches in diameter at breast height.




Distribution of potentially productive forest land supporting less than an average of one hundred trees per acre two inches in diameter at breast height. A large part of this area will require planting to restore it to forest cover. See figures through for its present condition.* (The maps on these two pages and those on the following 40 pages, with the exception of numbers (11) and (12), apply only to the 1,756 counties or appreciable portions thereof reported upon by the Forest Service in its study for the National Resources Board. This area is approximately shown in figure no. (Present Dominant Ownership of Forest Land) and includes approximately 87% of the total forest land of the country.) *The figures show the extent of erosion in these areas.


MATURE TIMBER AND SECOND GROWTH AREAS



Distribution of land supporting stands above two inches average diameter at breast height and averaging more than one hundred trees per acre. Timber supplies of the present and relatively near future will come from these acres. Existing wood-using industries and communities are dependent upon these areas.




Distribution of productive forest land supporting trees less than two inches in diameter at breast height. These areas should in the future become a primary source of timber supply and thus the basis for highly developed wood-using industries and communities. Their present condition requires planting on a large part of the non-restocking areas and management to conserve and gradually improve the forest cover.




Compiled from the 1930 Census of Agriculture. For total Farm Woodland see Figure


FARM WOODLAND NOT PASTURED




Compiled from the 1930 Census of Agriculture.



NON-RESTOCKING FOREST LAND WITH NEGLIGIBLE EROSION




Distribution of potentially productive non-restocking forest land upon which the soil cover is in a normal condition of repose, and the vegetative cover is of reasonably satisfactory density and species.




Distribution of potentially productive non-restocking forest land which requires correction of deficiencies in density and species of vegetative cover or reduction of erosion through mechanical means. Includes areas with moderate and critical erosion.


NON-RESTOCKING FOREST LAND WITH MODERATE EROSION




Distribution of potentially productive non-restocking forest land showing an appreciable degree of sheet or gully erosion, or both, ordinarily accompanied by deficiency in density and species of vegetative cover.



Distribution of potentially productive non-restocking forest land containing numerous deep and/or wide gullies or giving evidence of the loss through sheet erosion of the greater part or all of the productive timber soil; usually characterized also by vegetative covers of low density and minimum soil binding or economic value.



PRESENT CROP AND PASTURE LAND WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO FORESTS




Each dot represents
10,000 acres

MILES
0 100 200 300


Distribution of agricultural land used for the production of crops or for the pasturage of domestic livestock within and adjacent to appreciable areas of forest.

RECOMMENDED FOR CROPS AND PASTURE WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO FORESTS



Distribution of those lands which so far as can be foreseen can be used indefinitely for the production of cultivated farm crops or the pasturage of domestic livestock without serious impairment of their social and economic values, provided the proper types of tillage and management are employed.

PRESENT FOREST LAND RECOMMENDED FOR CROPS AND PASTURE




*Each dot represents
10,000 acres*



MILES
0 100 200 300


Distribution of present productive forest land which is considered well adapted to use for the production of cultivated farm crops or the pasturage of domestic livestock without serious impairment of its social and economic value.

CROP AND OPEN PASTURE LAND RECOMMENDED FOR FORESTS




Distribution of land at present devoted to the production of cultivated crops or the open pasturage of domestic livestock from which the highest permanent social and economic service will be derived through forest management.






ACREAGE RECOMMENDED FOR FOREST MANAGEMENT




Distribution of lands from which it appears that the highest permanent social and economic service will be derived through one form of forestry or another.

RECOMMENDED INTENSIVE AND EXTENSIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT




Distribution of those productive forest lands upon which highly developed wood-using industries and/or communities are or soon will be so vitally dependent that the application of silvicultural principles of forest management clearly will be necessary to assure adequate timber supplies.






ACREAGE RECOMMENDED FOR INTENSIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT



Each dot represents
10 000 acres

MILES
0 100 200 300

Distribution of those lands upon which highly developed wood-using industries and/or communities are or soon will be so vitally dependent for economic existence and progress that the employment of every applicable principle of silvicultural management clearly will be necessary.




Distribution of those lands which will serve as a basis for probable future wood-using industries and/or communities but where the present or immediately prospective demand for the timber products does not justify nor require other than extensive types of forest management which will conserve and gradually improve the forest cover.





ACREAGE RECOMMENDED FOR PROTECTIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT





Distribution of lands upon which the maintenance of a forest cover is essential, but not as a primary source of timber supply, in view of which the only requirements of forest management are protection against fire, insects, and/or tree diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of physical improvements essential to those ends.

FOREST LAND RECOMMENDED FOR SPECIAL SERVICE USES




Distribution of present forest land other than farm woodlands from which the highest permanent social service will be derived through dedication to use as parks, wild life refuges, etc.





Distribution of those lands which, so far as can be foreseen, can be used indefinitely for the production of certain forms of cultivated farm crops without serious impairment of their social and economic values, provided the proper types of crops and tillage are employed.

RECOMMENDED FOR PASTURAGE, DOMESTIC LIVESTOCK




Each dot represents
10,000 acres


MILES
0 100 200 300

Distribution of those lands which in the light of present knowledge and under proper principles of range management can be used indefinitely for the pasturage of domestic livestock without serious impairment of their social and economic values. Does not include lands shown as suitable for the production of cultivated crops.

PRESENT POPULATION DEPENDENT UPON FOREST LAND




Distribution of persons to whom the use of forest lands, or of the resources thereof, or employment in the protection, improvement or management of which furnishes more than one-half of their source of livelihood and is essential to their continued economic and social well-being and those to whom it furnishes less than one-half but an appreciable part of their income and who have major dependence upon occupations other than agriculture.




Distribution of those persons whom it is estimated can be expected to derive a satisfactory standard of living from the area recommended for permanent forest management after timber growing stocks have been built up to normal or those who will receive some support from the forest resources though obtaining the major proportion of their income from occupations other than agriculture.





Distribution of those persons to whom it is estimated the realization of the recommended plans of extensive forest management will mean a satisfactory standard of living or those who will receive an appreciable part of their livelihood from such management though obtaining the major proportion of their incomes from occupations other than agriculture.

PREDICTED POPULATION DEPENDENT UPON INTENSIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT




Distribution of those persons to whom it is estimated the realization of the recommended plans of intensive forest management will mean a satisfactory standard of living or those who will receive an appreciable part of their livelihood from such management though obtaining the major proportion of their incomes from occupations other than agriculture.






PRIVATE FOREST LAND HOLDINGS



Distribution of forest land in private ownership, including commercial forest, protection forest and farm woodlands. Does not include forested Indian Reservations.




Distribution of commercial forest and protection forest land in municipal, county, state or federal ownership. Does not include forest land in Indian Reservations, nor land used primarily for parks, wild life refuges, etc.






RECOMMENDED FOR PRIVATE FOREST MANAGEMENT



Distribution of forest land which private initiative should be able and disposed to handle under systems of management which will reasonably safeguard the general social and economic welfare.

RECOMMENDED FOR PUBLIC FOREST MANAGEMENT



Each dot represents
10,000 acres


MILES
0 100 200 300

Distribution of those forest lands on which it appears that public forest management is essential to adequately safeguard and develop inherent values, and to restore depleted resources. Includes land where the failure of private management is obvious or inevitable, or where private ownership is not in the public interests.






RECOMMENDED DECREASE IN PRIVATE OWNERSHIP



Distribution of private land which is recommended for public ownership.



Distribution of public land which is recommended for private ownership.





FOREST LAND IN MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP



*Each dot represents
1,000 acres*

MILES
0 100 200 300


Distribution of forest land in municipal ownership. Does not include land used primarily for parks, wild life refuges, etc.



Distribution of those forest lands which are considered the logical fields of activity of municipalities in constructive forest management.








Distribution of Municipal land which is recommended for other ownership in the future.







Distribution of forest land in county ownership. Does not include land used primarily for parks, wild life refuges, etc.


RECOMMENDED FOR COUNTY FOREST MANAGEMENT




Distribution of those forest lands which the counties should be encouraged to secure and manage to realize the full potentialities of each land unit.








Distribution of County land which is recommended for other ownership in the future.




Distribution of land recommended for County ownership which is now otherwise owned.








Distribution of forest land in state ownership Does not include land used primarily for parks, wild life refuges, etc




Distribution of forest lands which are considered the logical fields for state forest management designed to realize the full potentialities of each land unit; in general, areas in which timber production is of primary importance and watershed protection and erosion control are secondary.








Distribution of State land which is recommended for other ownership in the future.




Distribution of land recommended for State ownership which is now otherwise owned.








Distribution of forest land in federal ownership. Does not include land used primarily for parks, wild life refuges, etc.




Distribution of forest lands which will serve the public interest best under federal management; those areas required to safeguard future national security by definite guarantee of adequate timber supplies where other ownership fails to provide a satisfactory degree of assurance and certainty; areas with interstate influence and consequent flood damage and sedimentation; areas where federal ownership is justified by objectives of social rehabilitation or as "demonstration forests."








Distribution of Federal land which is recommended for other ownership in the future.




Distribution of land recommended for federal ownership which is now otherwise owned





Distribution of productive and protection forest land in private ownership upon which three or more years taxes are due and unpaid. Does not include farm woodlands.

PRIVATE FOREST LAND HOLDINGS - TAX PAID




Each dot represents
10,000 acres

MILES
0 100 200 300

Distribution of productive and protection forest land in private ownership upon which taxes have been paid or are delinquent for less than three years. Does not include farm woodlands.




PROPORTION OF PRESENT RURAL POPULATION DEPENDENT UPON FOREST LAND



The proportion of the present rural population which is dependent upon forest land, or of the resources thereof, or employment in the protection, improvement or management of the lands. Does not include those receiving over half of their support from agriculture.

PROPORTION OF PREDICTED RURAL POPULATION DEPENDENT UPON FOREST LAND



The proportion of the predicted rural population which will be dependent upon forest land if the recommended forms of management are permanently established and after the timber resources are built up to normal. Does not include those who will receive over half of their support from agriculture.

