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REORGANIZATION OF FOREST SERVICE REGIONAL OPERATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this morning, when I appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior, chaired by the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. Bogle), I asked the committee to give the most serious consideration to doing all within its power to overturn the order issued by Secretary of Agriculture Butz on April 24, which reduced the number of Forest Service regions from nine to six and transferred the headquarters of Forest Service Region No. 1 at Missoula, Mont., to Denver, Colo., approximately 1,000 miles away.

May I say that this, I think, is a most serious and costly misconception of the part of the Federal Government. In this connection I would point out that the Colorado State Senate, a few days ago, passed a resolution by a vote of 29 to 4 asking the Forest Service not to transfer the affected additional personnel to Denver.

Not only is Missoula, Mont., involved, but Ogden, Utah, is also involved, as is Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Mr. President, believe it or not, some of the functions of the regional headquarters at Albuquerque, N. Mex., have been moved as far away as Atlanta, Ga. How that will look in the scheme of regionalization being put into operation by this administration, I do not know. But all I want to say, Mr. President, is that this is not decentralization of government but rather a new and aggravated kind of centralization on a regional basis at the expense of the States.

If the Government really wants to decentralize, it should move many of its offices and bureaus out of Washington, D.C., and the metropolitan area, where they are an octopus and where they are running hog wild.
It is our understanding that representative Sen. Mike Mansfield will speak to the Committee in behalf of a request for appropriations. The District has $950,000 in current indebtedness of $25,900. We hope that the committee will find it possible to approve the request.

We would like to conclude this portion of our testimony with a strong appeal for the Congress’s assistance in the release of all of the appropriation provided in Fiscal 1973. 20,000 Rocky Boy’s Elementary School. The Congress approved $450,000 and the entire amount has been impounded. The Office of Management and Budget has said it will release $125,000 after 1 July. The School District, with a bonding capacity of $6,300, is wholly unable to provide for capital improvements, as the Congress has recognized. The $450,000 appropriation was the second increment of a total of $1,550,000 approved by Congress to permit planning and construction of an elementary school.

The Rocky Boy’s Elementary School has earned nationwide praise for its remarkable work in Bilingual Education. Under the leadership first of Senate Concord and now of Superintendent Gerald Gray, parents, teachers and pupils have written and illustrated, and printed and distributed, a series of story books in English and Cree used for instruction in the school. The existing facility is a b wish to the area, and will be closed when the school is opened and will be used for training and transportation.

As was true last year, there is an enormous backlog of applications from Federal agencies under Public Law 816. Of the unfunded total of $328 million, $413 million represents applications to construct schools for Indian children. The Administration has funded only $288 million for P.L. 816 in FY 1974, but has said it wishes to expend two-thirds of it for construction of schools for more than 168,000 Indian children. If this is done, the 7.8 million remaining would fund less than one-third of pending requests.

Busing School, a boarding school for Indian children now located at the Northern Cheyenne Reservation is serving 328 children. The present facilities consist of a school that is too small, supplemented by severa trailers, all of which are terribly crowded. Lame Deer De has a boarding school. We believe that their request for an addition to the existing school should have a high priority.

We should remind the committee that at some time in the future the school district's ability to sustain indebtedness or levies will have no doubt improve with the development of coal on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. At present, however, the Tribe is attempting to secure a review of coal leases that have been purchased in order to assure protection of the reservation from environmental damage. The review could take years. Until this is settled, the district is unable to help itself.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee will recall that the Senate approved $70,000 for assistance to Brockton High School on the Fort Peck Reservation, but that the sum was not available to the school district because of impoundment by the Administration. We urge the District to complete its plan for a new building. They ask $1,300,000 for construction of a new high school, furnishings and architectural-engineering costs and contingencies. We hope that the Committee will approve this request, and that the sum will be used to provide a building in which a student body. The new building will be located in a facility. The District has a bonding capacity of $65,000 which it intends to use for teacher housing.

One of the things both government and business have discovered in recent years is
that administrative fragmentation often is more efficient than monopolistic unity.

The idea is to delegate authority for management, and planning because it's been discovered people like to take responsibility for planning their work and seeing to it that it's done. The result is greater efficiency, higher output and more job satisfaction. It's a form of organized fragmentation and it works.

We call now to the federal government, which evidently believes in disorganized fragmentation.

A few years ago some thinkers in Washington thought it would be nice to get government out of the District of Columbia and back to the provinces. (The thinkers in Moscow, it might be noted, occasionally are smart thinkers.)

So 10 regional administrative units were set up in such outlying spots as Denver and Salt Lake City. This was to provide government back to the people, it would make it more efficient and responsive. It would be a grab at doing right, but now, under the guise of efficiency, the regional administrative bling is having exactly the opposite effect which the unit president—organized fragmentation—concealed.

First bureaucracy is dispersed to the 10 regions, and then—in direct violation of the principle of getting government back to the people—lands and headquarters and foremen are sent back to the outlying bureaucracy like 10 vacuum cleaners.

If the federal government was truly interested in getting government back to the people, it would further fragment administrative controls.

But now Missoula and other regional Forest Service headquarters are being closed so the Forest Service "...improve its efficiency and effectiveness in carrying out its resource management duties in the state and private forest programs," in the words of Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz.

It's hard to believe the administration's own theory of making government responsive. He has violated every management principle by his administration dictate. And he has sugar coated this monumental blunder with drive.

[From the Sunday Missoulian, Apr. 29, 1973]
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On the same day the announcement was made that the three Forest Service regional offices—Missoula, Portland, and Salt Lake City—would be closed, the chief of the Forest Service announced that 1.8 billion more board foot's would be cut on federal forests this year than last.

Each announcement lent plausibility to the other. If some of the demand for more wood hit Montana and New Mexico and wanted to miner mining in some areas, the dialogue about the need for more forest, and what to do about it, would be conducted between here and Denver rather than between here and there. Distance from the ground helps foil those who uproot things they consider protest concerning any action more difficult.

The key question facing Missoula forest program employees is not the loss of local payroll. It is this: What administrative tentacles will be left to link western Montana to Denver? What administrative conduits will be left so that communications regarding all aspects of forestry will be efficient and responsive?

Despite claims that this reorganization off to Denver is being done for more efficiency, and that this is a tremendous step forward, question remains unanswered. Until an answer is forthcoming, there will be uncertainty and heartache about all this will persist.


HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENSATOR MANSFIELD: I looked into the matter of Forest Service regional boundaries immediately following our conversation the other evening. It turns out that the decision to alter the boundaries and the regional office locations had already been made and was announced on April 24. I am assured that your views on the matter were on record and had been considered in the decision. I also understand that your office was notified prior to official announcement. You will shortly receive an explanatory reply to your letter to the President outlining the reasons for the decision and the expected benefits.

There appears to be little inclination either in the Department or in OMB to in the near future open this decision so recently announced. However, I am assured that the Department will do all it can to minimize the potential adverse consequences in your area, and, if you wish, I would be pleased to arrange for Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Long and Chief McGuire of the Forest Service to meet with you to provide a detailed explanation of the reasoning behind this decision and a briefing on their transition plans.

I'm sorry I cannot be of more assistance in this particular matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. SAWHILL,
Associate Director,

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,

HON. EARL L. BUTZ,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,

WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In connection with the proposed centralization of national forest supervision, made on April 1973, you are hereby requested to make available the following information:

1. Each study report and analysis with all of the supporting evidence, which shows the efficiencies (or inefficiencies) of the proposal to transfer regional offices and personnel, and consolidate or change national forests.

2. For Region 1, the fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973 through April 1973 separately by years:
   (a) travel by individuals and purpose from Regional office to one or more Forest offices including time, distance, mode of travel and cost from the Regional office to first stop. Please show comparable cost usage.
   (b) travel by individuals and purpose from each national forest to Regional office with data as above. Please provide similar information as above.
   (c) show estimated cost to transfer, including movement of household goods, sale of home, relocation expense and cost to move family, etc.

(b) for each position to be "abolished" show results of various inspections over past four years that indicates success and summarize whether they recommended strengthening or abolishing position.

(c) show estimated cost to transfer, including movement of household goods, sale of home, relocation expense and cost to move family, etc.

(b) for each position to be "abolished" show results of various inspections over past four years that indicates success and summarize whether they recommended strengthening or abolishing position.

5. Based on the proposal, show analysis of how cost of doing business and effectiveness of the Department or Bureau will be changed by making the changes advocated.

6. One part of your proposal suggests that New Mexico, which has five national forests, be attached to the proposed Atlantic Region. However, Alaska, which has three national forests, is proposed to remain as a Region. Please list the most direct mileage by the most expeditious modes of transportation from:
   (a) Atlanta to each New Mexico forest headquarters.
   (b) Albuquerque to each New Mexico forest headquarters.
   (c) Denver to each New Mexico forest headquarters.
   (d) Distance from Missoula to each forest headquarters in Region 1 as now existing.
   (e) Distance from Missoula to each forest headquarters in proposed revision.
   (f) Show the distances in time and cost for each.

7. Show the key elements of business for each national forest in Alaska, Region 1, and New Mexico, and using time to travel, distance and cost explain the logic of retaining the Alaska "Region" rather than attaching to Portland, the logic of attaching New Mexico to Atlanta rather than leaving as is or attaching to Denver, and the logic of attaching Region 1 forests to Denver and Portland, rather than leaving "as is.

In summary, we want a full and complete explanation of all pertinent facts that demonstrate the efficiency of your proposal. If such studies were not made prior to the date when this proposal was ordered into effect and these data would have to be developed specially to answer our request, any such questions can be answered by Executive Office of the President "Do not know." However, you are advised that the absence of such studies and hard cost and direct analysis, or a study that does not contain as extremely significant factors in weighing whether the proposed reorganization of the Forest Service structure will significantly retard efficient operation of these public assets in the national interest.
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tana, and the experiment station headquar-
ters at Ogden and Asheville, North Caro-
olina. We feel that this is important to
be reconsidered. Although the new regional
case is sold as an economy move to in-
crease efficiency and effective in-
the national forests, we see it as a nega-
tive option which will result in less staff re-
sponding to the increased fire danger.
And, the creation of more distance be-
the forest managers and the 
who will be "in charge" of the logic of concentration in the standard regional offices of those organizations which exist to administer program-
groups stemming from Washington. But the essential program of the Forest Service is to
manage national forest land areas, and the
present locations were chosen because they
were most convenient to those areas. It does
not seem wise to us to destroy this conven-
ience simply to satisfy the theoretical desire
to get all regional offices in one place.
Because of the serious effect these pro-
posed changes will have on our states' econ-
omies, we have met with Department of
Agriculture officials to try to resolve this
problem. Now we must turn again to you to
urge that this order be rescinded.

Another one of the problems of the begin-
ing of the Forest Service, these regional of-
fices have been located in Ogden, Albuquerque and Mis-
soula. Now, it is true, as observed, Montana is one of the most active regions
where there are mounting demands for in-
creased administration, increased fire-ground management of the forests. Mov-
ing the headquarters from Missoula to Den-
ver and the others would create very effi-
cient problems of communication and transpor-
tation. This would place large Region one eight hundred and fifty miles away from Denver. In addition, Region 1 operates the smokejump-
er school and the Forest Fire Research Lab-
oratory and research facilities at both Montana Universities at Bozeman and Missoula. This proposed move would be an economic blow to these Montana city
and would not provide any great economic benefit to the government. It would, in fact, reduce the proper management of one of the
nation's busiest national forests areas.

Of all the announced changes in the re-
gional reorganization of the Forest Service, the relocation of the Albuquerque office to
Atlanta is the most nonsensical. The aboli-
tion of the office that has successfully
administered over 20 million acres of forest land since 1908 is completely unwarranted. It would be very difficult, indeed, to
fully administer New Mexico's forest which contain half of the region's total acreage, from the same city office. It is equally likely that New Mexico will receive the prop-
er representation from the Atlanta region since New Mexico's forests are scattered in
the sparsely populated areas, and possess topographic, climatic and forestry problems.

Another case in point is the Intermoun-
tain Region, which includes all of Utah,
southern Idaho, western Wyoming, all of Ne-
vada and a tiny segment of California. For
the most part, this is Great Basin country
with high temperatures in the summer, mod-
erately cold ones in winter and precipitation amounts that are less than generous. These
factors, plus a general similarity of soil have created at least groupings that lend themselves to the same land administration techniques. To split the Intermountain Region would run counter to forming a team of experts, skil-
led in managing one particular vegetative
situation and scattering team members to
areas with no local leadership. This is quite a
hardy and efficient use of taxpayer monies. In
addition, closing the Ogden Region Office
will leave the State of Utah and the entire Federal Building almost empty, leaving a very
bitter taste in the mouths not only of the
Forest Service employees, but also of the local voters.

We cannot accept the explanation that the
regional Forest Service offices must conform
to the standard Federal regional structural
concept. Since the Forest Service's objective
is to administer regional offices, each must be located where the majority of the
forests are.

Again, we strongly urge that this proposal
be reconsidered and that practical values be
put above theoretical conformity.

Sincerely,

WALLACE F. BENNETT, 
Mansfield Libary, University of Montana

Pete V. DOMENICI.


THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, 
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On my return to the
city from an official visit to Mexico, I was
very disturbed and disheartened to learn
that the Secretary of Agriculture had an-
nounced the U.S. Forest Service Regional
reorganization during the Easter recess. You
may recall that I discussed this matter with
you at our last breakfast meeting.

In my estimation this effort to adjust this
agency's regional organization to fit with the
standard Federal regional structure is unwise
and unnecessary. Indicated to you, I am very much
opposed, not only be-

cause it would mean the closing of the
Region I headquarters in Missoula to Denver,
but it will create similar problems elsewhere
in the west. Moving the headquarters from
Missoula to Denver will not solve the

problems of communication and transporta-
tion. Region I, which administers one
third of our National Forest areas, will
be some eight hundred miles away from Denver, which now administers Region II.

The Forest Service can be logically
exempted from the regional structure be-
cause of the nature of its business. Our Na-
tional Forests are a renewable resource and
require continual on the ground manage-
ment. At a time when there are greater de-

mands on our National Forests it is neces-
sary that the administrative and operation-

al personnel be located in close proximity.

Also National Forests are scattered through-
out the nation, and they are not uniformly
located so as to conform to the United States
regional structure.

This proposed reorganization is inefficient,
and I cannot envision any financial savings
that would justify whatever has been
developed this plan is not aware of the
resources or the land area involved. You may
remember that my State of Montana is
ubiquitously scattered. In Montana you flew over a part—a very small
part—of Region I's area.

I cannot, therefore, support, and I will be

This move would not be in the public interest, and I will be discussing the situation with my col-

leagues. In your capacity as Chief Executive you can perhaps take a different view
full accord with your policies, by rescinding
the Secretary's order.

Respectfully,

MIKE MANSFIELD.


Senators Mansfield and Metcalf said the announcement by the Nixon Administration
that the Policy Office in Missoula will be transferred to Denver "is another example of this Administration's

(continued)

on the Appropriations Committees in both the House and the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to appear before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations because this is one of the appropriations bills which has significant impact
for the State of Montana. It is a large rural state with an abundance of natural resources. The management of these
resources by the federal government is of vital concern. There are two Items I wish to address myself to this morning. Senator Lea Metcalf joins me in expressing our concern and will appear before the Subcommittee tomorrow, May 10th.

Mr. Chairman, I also bring with me a prep-
ared statement on behalf of Senator Metcalf and myself on a number of Items in the Interior Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1974. I ask that these recommendations be made a part of the record of this hearing at the end of my remarks.

Now, I turn to a matter of extreme concern
and overriding importance to the Montana Congress delegation. During my Easter recess, the Secretary of Agriculture an-
nounced the reorganization of the U.S. Forest Service Regional structure, reducing nine re-
gional offices to six to conform with the existing Federal regional complex. At the outset, such measures appeared to be sound, and were made aware of the activities of this Federal agency immediately recognizes that such a reorganiza-
tion is neither effective nor efficient, and I save the Federal Government one cent. I am

sure that my sentiments are shared by my colleagues from the States of Utah, New

LEGEND,
U.S. Senate.
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Mexico, and North Carolina, all of whom are being hard hit by such action.

Region I which is located at Missoula, Montana since the Forest Service established its regional system. Region I administers one of the most active national forest systems. There is a heavy demands for increased timber sales, improved management. Several important research facilities are found in the area. The Forest Service now proposes to move the Region I area to Denver. There are indications that the residents of Denver are not too happy about absorbing this new influx in a city experiencing some serious growth problems.

The problems and day to day business of Region II will obviously receive more attention in the Senate because of the administrative organization. Region II is going to suffer and become a stepchild. Incidentally, the Colorado State Senate passed a bill to try and keep the Forest Service not to transfer the affected administrative functions.

Region I is made up of the State of Montana, northern Idaho, eastern Washington, and the grasslands in North Dakota and northern South Dakota. Region I headquarters in Missoula administers 26,129,940 acres of national forest. There are ten national forests within its jurisdiction. Ten in my State, five in Idaho, and one in Washington. The regional headquarters in Montana are in western Montana and if we look at a map we can see that Missoula is a very large landholder and it does not seem unreasonable to ask that they continue to be administered from nine regional headquarters. Building up an even larger administrative monster in Denver, in addition to the one in Washington, D.C. is not going to simplify matters. Such action takes away more responsibility and action from local authority.

This is not decentralization of gov’t but rather an exaggerated systematization on a regional basis at the expense of the states. If the gov’t wants to really decentralize, it ought to move many of its offices and bureaus out of Washington, D.C. and the metropolitan area where they are now and take them back to where they run and walk.

I do not know what the lumber industry thinks about this move but, if the national forests in Western Montana and Idaho, and nearby areas are to be properly administered, with necessary management, timber sales, surveillance and research, it is going to have to be from the Regional Headquarters in Missoula.

The proposed move of the Regional Headquarters from Missoula would admittedly be a useful move in any other terms, it is also very impractical. The activities of the Forest Service are not the same as those of the states. This agency is involved with the day-to-day management of a resource and, if these personnel are to do a good job, they can not be detached from the scene. That is exactly what would happen if the administrative arm of the agency is moved to Denver, Tassie. There are again the Department wants to move more personnel, make management decisions for on-the-ground management. I think this is an obvious error.

Near movement of some personnel now in the regional office into the individual national forests would be useful.

MHD and the Energy Crisis

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to turn to another subject which is important to Montana. The "Energy Crisis" is demanding a considerable amount of attention in recent weeks. Any number of solutions are being offered.

One of the most often discussed new sources of energy is the west deposits of low sulphur coal in Eastern Montana and our neighboring states of North and South Dakota and parts of the Big Sky Country are alarmed at the potential of unreclaimed and poorly planned extractions of these resources. The need for preplanning, evaluation, reclamation, and other controls are not matters of concern to this Committee other than to impress upon you the need to provide the appropriate Federal agencies with sufficient financial resources to study and monitor developments in this area.

My purpose this morning is to restate the sentiment of the many others—their coal deposits are not the only and most immediate answer to the energy crisis. Montana and corresponding available to me indicates that the real answers to the crisis are a combination of improved practices of communication research and new areas of energy production.

If the coal resources of Eastern Montana