6-26-1973

Congressional Record - The Administration's Proposal to Reorganize the U.S. Forest Service

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

FOR RELEASE
Tuesday, June 26, 1973
10 a.m. EST

Statement of Senator Mike Mansfield (D. Montana)

Senate Subcommittee on Environment, Conservation and Forestry

United States Senate

U. S. Forest Service Reorganization

Mr. Chairman, it is always a privilege to appear before the Senate Committee on Agriculture; this legislative Committee which has jurisdiction over some very important matters in my State of Montana. I am, however, deeply concerned that I should have to come before this Subcommittee to protest an unwise, ill-conceived and ridiculous Executive reorganization plan for the United States Forest Service.

The announced plan to make the Forest Service conform its Regional operations to the current 10 Standard Federal Regions will severely diminish the effectiveness of what has been an outstanding Federal agency. The Forest Service is charged with the management of one of the Nation's largest and most valuable renewable resources - the national forests and some of the grasslands. The proposed consolidation of Forest Service Regional Offices will not work and will only diminish the effectiveness of an already embattled agency. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am tired of having the management of our national resources dictated by the bookkeepers of the Executive Branch. These people are urban oriented in their thinking and unaware of complexities of this vast country. As I have said on other occasions, it will be a sad day when our Nation's policies are set by a computer. I have the distinct impression that the U. S. Forest Service implemented their reorganization plan rather hurriedly only after

considerable prodding from the Secretary of Agriculture and The Office of Management and Budget. I understand further that only in the past several weeks has there been any intensive studies developed to support the reorganization plan. The Department personnel are attempting to justify their position, after the fact.

I do not like the arrogance demonstrated by the Secretary of Agriculture in attempting to implement this plan. This was an obvious political move with no detailed studies or specifics to back it up. Earlier reorganization plans were rejected. This plan is contrary to the intent of the Rural Development Act which establishes a preference for rural areas. This proposal concentrates the administrative arm of the Forest Service in large metropolitan areas.

By design, the Executive Branch is curtailing the activities or abolishing established and worthwhile programs through impoundment of funds, reorganization and abolition - all without justification or consultation with the Congress. Among them are the Department of Agriculture conservation programs, the war against poverty, many Federal health, education and social rehabilitation programs and, in the instance of the Farmers Home Administration, the agency is being administered by an Acting Administrator, without FHA experience, who I fear is planning the dismantling of this agency.

The Department of Agriculture, Division of Administrative Management, in 1971 prepared a preliminary study of the "Feasibility of Conforming to Ten Standard Regional Boundaries." The obvious conclusion to such a study is that

it is feasible but it certainly is not practical. A person need only to look at a map of the United States. The present Forest Service Regional Structure is composed of 9 Regions. The boundaries of these Regions are set to accommodate the timber resources of the Nation, not the population centers as we find in the Federal Regional concept.

At the present time, Region I, which is located in Missoula, Montana, administers sixteen national forests in Montana, Idaho, and Washington, and 26,126,940 acres of timber. In addition, there are forestry research facilities in Missoula and Bozeman with associated programs at both State Universities. The agency administers grasslands in North and South Dakota. The vast majority of these forests are in Western Montana and adjoining Idaho. Missoula, Headquarters of Region I, is in the heart of these timber stands - a logical, central location.

Denver, Colorado, Headquarters of Region II, is approximately 1,000 miles away. Region II administers 20,000,000 acres of national forest. There are 186,000,000 acres in the entire national system of forest lands. The United States is a very large landholder and it does not seem unreasonable to ask that they continue to be administered from 9 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.

Region I and II are two very large areas, each distinct and separate. There is no direct public transportation between the two points. The other

Regional Headquarters under this plan is in Portland, equally inaccessable to Region I. There is no way in which I can be convinced that the affairs of Region I can be administered more efficiently from Denver. In fact, the people of Denver and State officials have indicated they do not favor the consolidation in Denver. The City of Denver has far too many urban problems now; they don't want more.

Looking at the map again, you will find the Department wants to place the State of New Mexico under the jurisdiction of the Regional Headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia. How this contributes to efficiency is extremely difficult to understand. The Secretary of Agriculture is determined to make the Forest Service conform to the Regional concept, yet his organizational chart exempts the State of Alaska. Our Alaskan neighbors are deserving of this attention but the need to conform to the Federal regional concept is obviously not binding for all.

This is not decentralization of government but rather a new and aggravated type of centralization on a regional basis at the expense of the States. If the government wants to really decentralize, it ought to move many of its offices and bureaus out of Washington, D. C., and the metropolitan area.

The proposed move of the Regional Headquarters from Missoula would admittedly be a severe economic blow but, in any other terms, it is also very impractical. The activities of the Forest Service are not the same as other Federal agencies. The agency is involved with the day-to-day management of a renewable resource and, if these personnel are to do a good job, they can't

do it from afar. That is just exactly what would happen if the administrative arm of the agency is moved to Denver. There are rumors that the Department wants to move more personnel into the forests for on-the-ground management. I think this is an excellent idea but that does not mean that regional administrative management should be from afar. Movement of some personnel now in the Regional offices into the individual national forests would be useful.

The U. S. Forest Service has been an active and innovative Federal agency for most of its lifetime and I am now concerned with an obvious effort to clip its wings. If given the proper budget and number of personnel, I am confident that they will provide the management of this great national resource that the citizens of this Nation deserve. In fact, I believe it is time for the Senate to review the question of personnel levels in the Forest Service. Are they adequate to do the job?

The Federal authorities apparently agree that, because of the large expanse of territory within Standard Region VIII and the large workload, it is desirable to establish zone offices at Missoula and Ogden to handle certain work better accomplished close to the on-the-ground job. If that is so, why bother to change the present setup.

The Research Unit and existing facilities at Ogden, Utah, should be maintained. Region I has always had a close affinity with the Inter-Mountain Station in Ogden. We must keep research priorities for the Northern Rocky Mountain and Inland Empire area. Fragmenting the research facilities at Ogden between Colorado and Oregon will only compound the problem. Fragmenting and

disrupting research activity now under way will cause greater delays in some very important areas of research.

There is a great deal of hunting and fishing use made of the national forests of Region I, and this is an excellent measure of a heavy people use. In fact, during 1971 the total recreation use on the national forests of Region I was almost eleven million visitor days. In that same year, eight states had in excess of five million recreation visits to their national forests. Montana was one of those states, with almost seven million visits, compared to forty-eight million in populous California and barely 1.5 million in Alaska. Even Georgia, which has only 837,000 acres of national forests compared to the twenty million in Alaska, had more recreation visits to her national forests.

Water is a very important resource in Montana. Region I national forests contributed over two trillion cubic feet of water to the Columbia and the Missouri-Mississippi watersheds and river systems. Not only is this water vital to farm, community, and industrial requirements but the management of these headwaters is important to every downstream area and town. By every test of use and resources, and by every test of the impact of people on the lands and resources of the National Forest, there is an absolute and clear need, in my judgment, for the continuation of a Region embracing the area that is now Region I and a Regional Headquarters at Missoula.

The Forest Service reorganization plan will, undoubtedly, entail the expenditure of considerable monies for moving of personnel, location, and rental of new facilities, abandonment of old offices and equipment. I have

seen no estimates as to any financial saving that would ensue from this ill-conceived plan. How much more money will be required for travel and per diem - distances would be substantially greater for Regional personnel.

The demands on our national forests are greater than at any time in history. The cost and demand for lumber is higher than any one anticipated. The lumber industry is pleading for more timber sales. Timber management of this nature requires sufficient personnel to protect the multiple use concept. The Administration proposes a solution to the timber crisis which is almost impossible to comprehend.

They announce a program of expanded timber sales in our national forests and then a reduction in personnel and removal of Regional offices which are important to on-the-ground management. In Region I, the organization plan calls for a personnel reduction of some 1,600 slots. The Department has asked for 450 additional personnel in timber sales but no additional funds. To say the least, I am somewhat confused - I suspect that may be the intent. Reduced funds, fewer personnel, and unnecessary reorganization will bring choas to the management of an extremely valuable natural resource. The multiple use concept will be cast aside and it will be full speed ahead for harvesting timber and nothing else - the consequences be damned.

The Department of Interior resource agencies, which is realigning their Regional operations, have found some difficulty because their activity is also resource based. The Regional structure there is less important. The major portion of their personnel are in the field. All in all, my colleagues

from New Mexico, Utah and Montana are bewildered by the intent of this reorganization plan.

Not only is the Administration talking about abolishing a Region that has been functioning effectively since 1908, but they are also talking about abolishing a Region that contains one-seventh of the lands in the National Forest System. The fifty states of our Nation reflect vast differences and that is one of the reasons our Country is great. The Forest Service Regions fit into this mold by providing an organization for management based on the location of the resource it administers.

My colleagues here in the Congress will be testifying on this issue at some length and we will be hearing from Governors and the people who will be directly effected by this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to make several recommendations to the Committee.

The Department of Agriculture and The Office of Management and Budget should be instructed to stop reorganization of the U. S. Forest Service. Forget once and for all a change in the current Forest Service Regional operations. Place more personnel in the field but no further consideration should be given to consolidation of field operations.

I recommend that the U. S. Forest Service be exempted from Administrative personnel reductions. If the agency is expected to do a proper job of managing our national forests, they need personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I am sufficiently concerned about the issue at hand to

recommend that this Committee take no action on any pending legislation or proposal affecting the Department of Agriculture until this matter has been resolved once and for all.

I am confident that the Senate Subcommitte on Interior Appropriations will be willing to cooperate in every way.

What we are discussing today is the future efficient operation of an effective national resource agency which has been shackled by directives from above and I mean above. A resource of the magnitude of our national forests is something which cannot be taken lightly. The concern and attention of this Committee is most appreciated. Thank you.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL TO REORGANIZE THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), and I, along with the distinguished Governor of the State of Montana, Tom Judge, and the distinguished Congressman from the eastern district, JOHN MELCHER, appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, specifically the Subcommittee on Environment, Conservation, and Forestry. Our distinguished colleagues, Congressman SHOUP of Montana, Senators BENNETT and Moss of Utah and Senators DOMENICI and MONTOYA of New Mexico, also appeared before the Committee. The topic under consideration was the proposal by the administration to recognize the U.S. Forest Service which would have meant a shifting in part of some of the administrative duties of the headquarters region which is at Missoula, Mont., to Denver, Colo., approximately 1,000 miles away, with no direct lines of communication, which would have meant a dispersal of controls to Denver, and which would have meant a shifting of the headquarters from Albuquerque, N. Mex., to Atlanta, Ga., for the purpose of administering the forest region within the State of New Mexico.

Mr. President, I will later ask unanimous consent that this testimony plus additional correspondence relative to the desire on the part of the administration to bring about a reorganization of the Forest Service, a move which was made without any contact whatsoever with the Members of the House or Senate from the three States, involving a move which was made in the dead of the night, so to speak, during the time Congress was in recess at Easter, a move which has been thwarted, at least up to now, because of the attitude on the part of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and I believe the House as well, and on the part of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which, when the matter was brought to its attention agreed to conduct hearings, which are now underway.

Mr. President, I would hope that in the future before any action of this nature is undertaken that at least the members from the affected States would be given the courtesy of being allowed to express their views rather than to have to depend upon rumor and accomplished fact, which luckily did not this time, become an accomplished fact only because of the awareness in Congress of the nefarious undertaking which was underway.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of the material to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. FOREST SERVICE REORGANIZATION

(Statement of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, June 26, 1973)

Mr. Chairman, it is always a privilege to appear before the Senate Committee on Agriculture; this legislative Committee which has jurisdiction over some very important

matters in my State of Montana. I am, however, deeply concerned that I should have to come before this Subcommittee to protest an unwise, ill-conceived and ridiculous Executive reorganization plan for the United States Forest Service.

The announced plan to make the Forest Service conform its Regional operations to the current 10 Standard Federal Regions will severely diminish the effectiveness of what has been an outstanding Federal agency. The Forest Service is charged with the management of one of the Nation's largest and most valuable renewable resources—the national forests and some of the grasslands. The proposed consolidation of Forest Service Regional Offices will not work and will only diminish the effectiveness of an already embattled agency. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am tired of having the management of our national resources dictated by the bookkeepers of the Executive Branch. These people are urban oriented in their thinking and unaware of complexities of this vast country. As I have said on other occasions, it will be a sad day when our Nation's policies are set by a computer. I have the distinct impression that the U.S. Forest Service implemented their reorganization plan rather hurriedly only after considerable prodding from the Secretary of Agriculture and The Office of Management and Budget. I understand further that only in the past several weeks has there been any intensive studies developed to support the reorganization plan. The Department personnel are attempting to justify their position, *after the fact.*

I do not like the arrogance demonstrated by the Secretary of Agriculture in attempting to implement this plan. This was an obvious political move with no detailed studies or specifics to back it up. Earlier reorganization plans were rejected. This plan is contrary to the intent of the Rural Development Act which establishes a preference for rural areas. This proposal concentrates the administrative arm of the Forest Service in large metropolitan areas.

By design, the Executive Branch is curtailing the activities or abolishing established and worthwhile programs through impoundment of funds, reorganization and abolition—all without justification or consultation with the Congress. Among them are the Department of Agriculture conservation programs, the war against poverty, many Federal health, education and social rehabilitation programs and, in the instance of the Farmers Home Administration, the agency is being administered by an Acting Administrator, without FHA experience, who I fear is planning the dismantling of this agency.

The Department of Agriculture, Division of Administrative Management, in 1971 prepared a preliminary study of the "Feasibility of Conforming to Ten Standard Regional Boundaries." The obvious conclusion to such a study is that it is feasible but it certainly is not practical. A person need only to look at a map of the United States. The present Forest Service Regional Structure is composed of 9 Regions. The boundaries of these Regions are set to accommodate the timber resources of the Nation, not the population centers as we find in the Federal Regional concept.

At the present time, Region I, which is located in Missoula, Montana, administers sixteen national forests in Montana, Idaho, and Washington, and 26,126,940 acres of timber. In addition, there are forestry research facilities in Missoula and Bozeman with associated programs at both State Universities. The agency administers grasslands in North and South Dakota. The vast majority of these forests are in Western Montana and adjoining Idaho. Missoula, Headquarters of Region I, is in the heart of these timber lands—a logical, central location.

Denver, Colorado, Headquarters of Region II, is approximately 1,000 miles away. Region II administers 20,000,000 acres of national forest. There are 186,000,000 acres in the entire national system of forest lands. The United States is a very large landholder and it does not seem unreasonable to ask that they continue to be administered from 9 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.

Region I and II are two very large areas, each distinct and separate. There is no direct public transportation between the two points. The other Regional Headquarters under this plan is in Portland, equally inaccessible to Region I. There is no way in which I can be convinced that the affairs of Region I can be administered more efficiently from Denver. In fact, the people of Denver and State officials have indicated they do not favor the consolidation in Denver. The City of Denver has far too many urban problems now; they don't want more.

Looking at the map again, you will find the Department wants to place the State of New Mexico under the jurisdiction of the Regional Headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia. How this contributes to efficiency is extremely difficult ot understand. The Secretary of Agriculture is determined to make the Forest Service conform to the Regional concept, yet his organizational chart exempts the State of Alaska. Our Alaskan neighbors are deserving of this attention but the need to conform to the Federal regional concept is obviously not binding for all.

This is not decentralization of government but rather a new and aggravated type of centralization on a regional basis at the expense of the States. If the government wants to really decentralize, it ought to move many of its offices and bureaus out of Washington, D.C., and the metropolitan area.

The proposed move of the Regional Headquarters from Missoula would admittedly be a severe economic blow but, in any other terms, it is also very impractical. The activities of the Forest Service are not the same as other Federal agencies. The agency is involved with the day-to-day management of a renewable resource and, if these personnel are to do a good job, they can't do it from afar. That is just exactly what would happen if the administrative arm of the agency is moved to Denver. There are rumors that the Department wants to move more personnel into the forests for on-the-ground management. I think this is an excellent idea but that does not mean that regional administrative management should be from afar. Movement of some personnel now in the Regional offices into the individual national forests would be useful.

The U.S. Forest Services has been an active and innovative Federal agency for most of its lifetime and I am now concerned with an obvious effort to clip its wings. If given the proper budget and number of personnel, I am confident that they will provide the management of this great national resource that the citizens of this Nation deserve. In fact, I believe it is time for the Senate to review the question of personnel levels in the Forest Service. Are they adequate to do the job?

The Federal authorities apparently agree that, because of the large expanse of territory within Standard Region VIII and the large workload, it is desirable to establish zone office at Missoula and Ogden to handle certain work better accomplished close to the on-the-ground job. If that is so, why bother to change the present setup.

The Research Unit and existing facilities at Ogden, Utah, should be maintained. Region I has always had a close affinity with the Inter-Mountain Station in Ogden. We must keep research priorities for the Northern Rocky Mountain and Inland Empire area. Fragmeting the research facilities at Ogden between Colorado and Oregon will only compound the problem. Fragmenting and disrupting research activity now under way will cause greater delays in some very important areas of research.

There is a great deal of hunting and fishing use made of the national forests of Region I, and this is an excellent measure of a heavy people use. In fact, during 1971 the total recreation use on the national forests of Region I was almost eleven million visitor days. In that same year, eight states had in excess of five million recreation visits to their national forests. Montana was one of those states, with almost seven million visits, compared to forty-eight million in populous California and barely 1.5 million in Alaska. Even Georgia, which has only 837,000 acres of national forests compared to the twenty million in Alaska, had more recreation visits to her national forests.

Water is a very important resource in Montana. Region I national forests contributed over two trillion cubic feet of water to the Columbia and the Missouri-Mississippi watersheds and river systems. Not only is this water vital to farm, community, and industrial requirements but the management of these headwaters is important to every downstream area and town. By every test of use and resources, and by every test of the impact of people on the lands and resources of the National Forest, there is an absolute and clear need, in my judgment, for the continuation of a Region embracing the area that is now Region I and a Regional Headquarters at Missoula.

The Forest Service reorganization plan will, undoubtedly, entail the expenditure of considerable monies for moving of personnel, location, and rental of new facilities, abandonment of old offices and equipment. I have seen no estimates as to any financial saving that would ensue from this ill-conceived plan. How much more money will be required for travel and per diem—distances would be substantially greater for Regional personnel.

The demands on our national forests are greater than at any time in history. The cost and demand for lumber is higher than any one anticipated. The lumber industry is pleading for more timber sales. Timber management of this nature requires sufficient personnel to protect the multiple use concept. The Administration proposes a solution to the timber crisis which is almost impossible to comprehend.

They announce a program of expanded timber sales in our national forests and then a reduction in personnel and removal of Regional offices which are important to on-the-ground management. In Region I, the ganization plans calls for a personnel reduction of some 1,600 slots. The Department has asked for 450 additional personnel in timber sales but no additional funds. To say the least, I am somewhat confused—I suspect that may be the intent. Reduced funds, fewer personnel, and unnecessary reorganization will bring choas to the management of an extremely valuable natural resource. The multiple use concept will be cast aside and it will be full speed ahead for harvesting timber and nothing else—the consequences be damned.

The Department of Interior resource agencies, which is realigning their Regional operations, have found some difficulty because their activity is also resource based. The Regional structure there is less important. The major portion of their personnel are in the field. All in all, my colleagues from New Mexico, Utah and Montana are bewildered by the intent of this reorganization plan.

Not only is the Administration talking about abolishing a Region that has been functioning effectively since 1908, but they are also talking about abolishing a Region that contains *one-seventh of the lands in the National Forest System.* The fifty states of our Nation reflect vast differences and that is one of the reasons our Country is great. The Forest Service Regions fit into this mold

by providing an organization for management based on the location of the resource it administers.

My colleagues here in the Congress will be testifying on this issue at some length and we will be hearing from Governors and the people who will be directly effected by this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to make several recommendations to the Committee.

The Department of Agriculture and The Office of Management and Budget should be instructed to stop reorganization of the U.S. Forest Service. Forget once and for all a change in the current Forest Service Regional operations. Place more personnel in the field but no further consideration should be given to consolidation of field operations.

I recommend that the U.S. Forest Service be exempted from Administrative personnel reductions. If the agency is expected to do a proper job of managing our national forests, they need personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I am sufficiently concerned about the issue at hand to recommend that this Committee take no action on any pending legislation or proposal affecting the Department of Agriculture until this matter has been resolved once and for all.

I am confident that the Senate Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations will be willing to cooperate in every way.

What we are discussing today is the future efficient operation of an effective national resource agency which has been shackled by directives from above and I mean above. A resource of the magnitude of our national forests is something which cannot be taken lightly. The concern and attention of this Committee is most appreciated. Thank you.

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR LEE METCALF

Mr. Chairman:

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before your subcommittee this morning. As my good friend and colleague, Senator Mansfield, has stated, it is unfortunate that we should have to appear on this matter. But serious actions have taken place with regard to the Forest Service which violate that agency's mandate and the common sense of the American people.

Before the day is over, you will have heard from the entire Montana Congressional delegation. I was born and raised in Stevensville, a small town thirty miles from Missoula, deep in the heart of Forest Service country. Senator Mansfield lived and taught in Missoula while at the University of Montana. Congressman Richard Shoup hails from Missoula. And Congressman John Melcher comes from Forsyth, just a few miles from the Custer National Forest.

Apart from our collective experiences as Members of Congress with regular dealings in Forest Service matters, we have personal knowledge of Montana's forests and mountains and timber, recreation and water and natural resources. All of these things were part of our lives before coming to Washington. We know what the words "renewable resources" mean. It therefore hits us hard when budget-balancing bureaucrats in Washington, most of whom wouldn't know a Montana pine from a Mississippi magnolia, treat this precious heritage as simplly another column of figures.

The successful farmer stays close to the soil. He sifts the soil through his fingers, surveys the sky for moisture and calculates the most opportune time to sow, weed, fertilize, and harvest. His relationship with his crop is close, personal, continuous.

The same relationship must exist between the forests and the public stewards of those lands. Proper maintenance requires on-the-spot decisions by competent Forest Service personnel. Those decisions simply cannot be made effectively by far-off bureaucrats.

It is ridiculous that we should be restating these obvious propositions today. There are only two questions which we should be asking: (1) what should be the goal of the Forest Service, and (2) what tools do they need to do the job properly?

The goal has already been laid out by Congress in numerous pieces of legislation, principal of which is the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Law. That Act obliged the Forest Service to give weight to the multiple uses of recreation, watershed, timber, wildlife and range management.

The tools should be those which meet increasing pressures on the national forests. More personnel should be provided to manage timber sales, conduct environmental surveys and cater to the millions of visitors. Research should be conducted on more efficient ways of removing timber from the forests, and more efficient ways of processing the logs once they are removed. Funds are needed to reforest large areas.

At some point, reasonable people have to ask themselves why this Administration, with commercial and recreational pressures of record levels on a vast domain of 186 million acres of Forest Service lands, are cutting experienced personnel and shipping many of those remaining to distant urban centers.

Mr. Chairman, I think you will find part of the answer in S. 1775, the "other half" of the reasons for these hearings. S. 1775 is nothing but a warmed-over version of the ill-fated Timber Supply Act which was rejected by Congress in February of 1970. Both measures share the distinction of replacing the multiple-use concept with timber as the dominant use of national forests.

This preoccupation with commercial interests has been the hallmark of the current Administration, so I suppose we shouldn't be surprised that it is extended to our national forests. The proposed Reorganization plan achieves two purposes for Mr. Nixon, the OMB and Mr. Butz. It gives the appearance of efficiency when viewed on the flow charts in government manuals, and it removes the watchdogs who guard the public's interests in the forest. Neither is accidental.

Although it is not properly an Administration bill, S. 1775 complements the Administration's efforts. It would condone, if not "legalize," the growing emphasis on the role of timber. The so-called "Wood Supply and National Forest Lands Investment Act of 1972" has as its rationale the claim that the nation's housing goals can't be met unless "available timber supplies in the National Forests are substantially expanded."

At first glance, the claim seems reasonable. But first glances seldom tell the whole story. The truth is that research, much of it by the Forest Service itself, demonstrates that up to a quarter of each tree is left in the forest when it is cut, and up to a quarter of the sawed log remains on the sawmill floor after processing. New techniques have been developed to get the most from each log, but much more needs to be done—in the laboratory and in pilot commercial operations. The President recently announced a ten per cent increase in the allowable cut; better he should have asked for additional research funds to increase the efficiency of each log by ten or twenty or even thirty per cent to achieve the same goal.

Also, the President's action could have little impact on the current lumber crisis. At the very earliest, timber contracted today could not appear on the market for at least a year. According to the Forest Service itself, there are already fifty billion board feet of saw timber contracted and in the pipeline today. This is nearly five times the annual allowable cut. The one point eight billion board feet increase announced by the President could hardly affect current prices. One must conclude, therefore, that the true motive, apart from giving to the American people the illusion of fast action, lies in its future application for the timber industry.

Mr. Chairman, if either or both the reorganization plan or the timber supply bill are allowed to stand, they will represent historic steps backward in our management of public lands. Timber interests will reap a temporary windfall; future generations will pay the price. And this Congress will be remembered for standing by and permitting it to happen.

The effects which will flow from the proposed Reorganization Plan will do incalcuable harm to our national forests. I attach such importance to reversing the proposed action that I urge the Senate Agriculture Committee to entertain no other legislation dealing with the Forest Service until this matter is resolved. That includes S. 1775.

I likewise urge the Committee to instruct Mr. Butz in no uncertain terms to cease his emasculation of the Forest Service and to conform to the legislative intent of this and previous Congresses. The President has called for a better working relationship with Congress. He can begin by reversing this ill-advised scheme which can only lead to systematic rape of the land.

I thank the Chairman and members of this Subcommittee for their kind attention.

FOREST SERVICE REORGANIZATION

(Statement of Congressman JOHN MELCHER)

Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and the members of your Subcommittee today to discuss proposed Forest Service regional reorganization.

I want to make it clear at the outset that I believe the plan to make the Forest Service conform to the Standard Federal Region concept is not in the best interests of the taxpayers, the people who use our National Forests or of the forest resources in my District, my state or the Nation. In fact, in the context of proposals to combine forests now before the Chief of the Forest Service, the reorganization plan becomes an even greater threat to the people and resources I have mentioned.

Let me discuss several points individually.

First, the Forest Service has not justified the reorganization plan in dollars-and-cents terms. An analysis prepared by the Congressional Research Service points out that the criteria upon which the reorganization plan is based are not criteria at all. They are rather, a rationalization of management decisions already made—in this case quite clearly by the Office of Management and Budget. Those decisions appear to be a fuzzy attempt to cut much of the managerial muscle out of the Forest Service regionally in order to save money.

Yet, in answer to requests for itemized estimates of projected savings that would accompany reorganization, no figures were forthcoming until the very eve of this hearing, and then they were not complete and to the point. Until yesterday I had been told by the Forest Service that the General Accounting Office was now making a complete study of the matter and that I would receive a copy of the report. How could such a monumental reorganization plan have been devised and ordered into effect without cost/benefit figures having been prepared and carefully analyzed? What kind of management is this?

But the decision to go ahead with reorganization was made. And I still want to know how much more it's going to cost to have regional supervision of the forests in my District and in my State as a result of moving the bosses 800 miles to Denver. No one either can or will tell me.

The second point I want to touch on deals with the people who benefit from our National Forests—the people who want, and deserve, to use the forests for recreation under the multiple-use concept as well as those who depend upon our forests for a living as a result of the timber industry. Those who use our forests as a magnificent recreation

resource need road and campground maintenance. The timber people need adequate cut and environmental supervision and assistance. All need fire protection and adequate assurance of reforestation in cut areas.

Today the recreational use of our forests is increasing rapidly. The demand for timber cut allocations is not only increasing, it has been responded to with a promise that an additional 1.8 billion board feet can be harvested each year. The Secretary of Agriculture has promised an additional 450 "foresters, engineers and support personnel which are required under the expanded sales program." This commitment was made at a time when the Service was struggling to find ways to reduce its employment by 1590 people to meet its FY 1974 employment ceiling, and after previous reductions of more than one thousand people since 1971. Something has to give if the employment reductions, timber sales increases and reorganization goals are to be met.

We all should know what will suffer. It will be the very things our forests users need and Congress has intended they have—the maintenance fire protection, reforestation and environmental protection services. Already there are indications from Montana that Forest Service employees are being taken off important conservation and recreation jobs and assigned to help with the timber cutting, even outside their own forests.

Forest-level people are telling me that already the economic pressure for more timber is throwing the multiple-use concept out of whack. They are concerned about it and so am I, particularly when an important safeguard at the regional level is being proposed for removal to some distant city and employment of regional specialists, who serve a number of forests, is to be curtailed. Not only will forest-users suffer—more importantly our forests will suffer.

Some Forest Service spokesmen have argued against my position and in favor of Service reorganization by saying that, in fact, more people can be shifted to forest-level jobs once the regions have been standardized and headquarters at Missoula, Ogden and Albuquerque eliminated. One Forest Supervisor told my office that he might even accept a transfer back to a Ranger position in order to stay in the Service under reorganization. I've been told, too, that once these professionals are put back into the forests, more of the decisionmaking can be handled at that level.

If all this decentralization is really a goal of reorganization then I believe it should receive more attention. Then we could point out to the Service that it doesn't take the shifting of a regional headquarters 800 miles away to start cutting out deadwood in the office, if it is there in the first place.

I'm not convinced that increased forest-level staffing is a goal of reorganization, or that forest-level people have even been adequately consulted about the possibility of increasing such staffing.

My office recently released figures from within the Forest Service headquarters on projected personnel changes as a result of the elimination of the Missoula regional headquarters. Of the 370 Missoula headquarters employees, only 50 were projected to be assigned to forest positions within the Region, 170 were projected to stay in regional service centers, 70 were projected for transfer to Denver, Portland or to forests now administered in those regions, and 80 were expected to leave the Service. In Montana those figures were greeted with complete surprise. Regional and Forest people told me they must have been plucked from the air because no one in Washington had asked them for information as to what personnel shifts might be expected under reorganization.

If the Forest Service can place more professionals at the Forest Service level to provide closer supervision of timber cut, recreation, maintenance, and environmental work, fine. They can do so now without involving a move to Denver. More decisions might be handled at the forest level as a result. The regional paperwork might be reduced as more people were being sent into the field. But again, I doubt that moving regional supervision 800 miles away would help accomplish that if the Service found it necessary. On the other hand, I cannot stress strongly enough that when regional supervision or assistance is necessary it should be available quickly from people close enough to the forests to understand their problems and the resources available to solve their problems.

There is another situation related to reorganization that disturbs many Montanans today also. That is the plan, now before the Chief, to combine national forests and even ranger districts. I understand that these plans are only waiting in the wings for approval of regional reorganization. In Montana it is proposed, for example, that the six national forests that lie at least in part east of the Continental Divide be combined into three. One forest headquarters would be completely eliminated, with forest supervision transferred 100-to-200 miles away. At the same time there would be district consolidation, involving some ranger district elimination.

This is not speculation. The plans for consolidation are now before the Chief of the Forest Service and Forest Service people expect a decision affecting Montana as soon as regional reorganization is initiated.

It is clear to me that this represents an overall goal of reducting employment at all levels, not increasing it in the forests. This fits the overall planned employment reduction for fiscal year 1974 which cannot be justified. It raises the spectre of combined ranger districts with fewer people, being administered from combined forest headquarters perhaps hundreds of miles further away, at a time when regional decision-making and assistance is available only across half a continent.

As I have said, we have a threat to the proper management of our precious forest resources. That threat could evolve into disaster for our people and forests if it goes unchecked. Regional reorganization should be stopped now, and forest consolidation plans carefully considered under the present regional structure before any are approved.

Mr. Chairman, I again thank you and the distinguished members of the Subcommittee for the opportunity to be heard on this subject of such importance to Montana and the Nation.

TESTIMONY OF MONTANA GOV. THOMAS L. JUDGE

Mr. Chairman and Distinguished Members of the Subcommittee:

I believe the concept of Standard Federal Regions is potentially workable. There are, however, exceptions where local, state and national interests supersede organizational considerations. And the planned relocation of the U.S. Forest Service Region I Office exemplifies this type of thinking that ignores specific issues to achieve general objectives.

In Montana, we recently completed a program to reorganize the executive departments of state government. This program was intended to achieve general objectives. As we proceeded with the reorganization process, however, we realized that it was necessary to make exceptions to assure effective government operation. We realized that our concept of reorganization was not infallible.

We compromised some principles to achieve practical results. Eventually, we established a system that puts performance ahead of philosophy.

And I would hope that the same considerations of necessity would be applied to the proposed relocation of the Region I Office.

If our forests are not intelligently and effectively managed in the coming years, this nation will face another resource crisis similar to the current energy shortage. There are presently serious problems in the forest products industry as evidenced by the recent sharp increases in the price of timber. And if we do not begin immediately to do a better job of managing and appropriating our forest resources, these problems will become critical.

Effective forest management is a triangle of responsibility. There are three jurisdictions involved—federal and state government and private interests. Because of the scattered or checkerboard pattern of ownership of timber lands in the western states, cooperation among all those involved in forestry is essential to achieve good management. Maintaining and developing isolated tracts is not effective management. If the productivity and recreational value of our forests are to be maintained, federal and state government and private interests must work together to protect this priceless, renewable resource. And I believe Missoula, Montana is the nation's best example of this essential working relationship.

Missoula is the forestry capital of the Northwest. There are 13 federal and state agencies dealing with forestry located in the Missoula area. In addition, private forest product industries include saw mills, pulp paper, plywood, particle board, sash and other wood speciality products plants.

During the years the forest products industry was developing in the region, many close personal and professional relationships have been established. These people have worked together. They have fought fires, controlled diseases, cruised the woods, conducted inventories and timber sales, developed new technologies, and effectively managed the forests.

The triangle of responsibility works in Missoula and throughout the Northwest. And I do not believe that the practical advantages of the location of the Region I Office in Missoula should be cancelled by the vague concept of standard federal regions.

The organizational structure of the Forest Service dictates against the relocation of the regional office.

The Ranger Districts implement forest service policy. The supervisors of the national forest conduct planning. The regional offices provide support including coordination, training, quality control, disease, insect and fire control research.

Regional forest service offices implement policy only after receiving recommendations from the state and local levels. If the office is moved to Denver, it will lose the daily contact with state forestry and private industry personnel that is necessary to adequately manage our timber resources.

Quality control depends on the ability of the forest service to develop solutions to immediate problems. Confusion and delay can be disastrous in dealing with forest problems. An office in a metropolitan area 600 miles away will not be able to act as decisively as an agency located in the middle of the timber country.

Coordination of the myriad functions of the regional office is dependent on close contact with people in all areas of forestry. Because the forest service is concerned with so many activities that affect the region, including coal development, land use, recreation, insect and disease control and fire fighting, it is imperative that those people most affected be involved in determining policy.

Region I is comprised of 10 states, and although Denver is more centrally located, Missoula is in the heart of the Northwestern timber country.

Transferring the Regional Office to Denver will remove it from proximity with the resource it is charged to manage.

The relocation will break up the close working relationship that has developed through the years among the state and federal agencies and private industry in regard to forestry matters.

It will confuse and delay the implementation of forest service policy by restricting the informational process.

The cumulative effect of all of these conditions, in my opinion, will be a deterioration of the Forest Service's capability to effectively manage our priceless timber resources.

And I believe this is a prohibitive price to pay to achieve the still questionable objective of Standard Federal Regions.

We need men in the woods in the Northwest rather than bureaucrats behind desks in Denver.

We need people who can go to work to sustain our forests rather than an accumulation of new concepts.

We need day-to-day contact and cooperation among all forest interests rather than an aloof relationship with a remote government agency.

And finally we need to emphasize practical considerations rather than general ideas.

Effective management of our forests to achieve sustained productivity and preserve recreational values is a matter of vital national interest, that I believe has precedence over any other considerations of policy and organization. This committee has the opportunity to prevent the Forest Service from being crippled. I hope that you would agree that the forests of the Northwest can be more intelligently and effectively managed by maintaining the Regional Office in Missoula.

The effects of moving the Regional Office go beyond forest management. This proposed relocation will result in immediate adverse economic conditions in Montana and throughout the timber states of the Northwest. The forest products industry has just begun to recover from a period of extreme economic difficulty. And the recovery of the industry will never occur unless adequate forest service personnel are available to plan and control the development of our timber resources.

At a time when rising prices dictate the necessity of more timber sales, we must have forest service personnel in the woods to assure that allowable cuts are attained.

At a time of increasing conflict between environmental and economic interests, the forest service must become more actively involved to assure both conservation and development.

The relocation of the Regional Office will restrict the availability of personnel needed to conduct timber sales and plan for the sustained productivity of our forests. The effect in the Northwest will be a reduction of activity in the forest products industry, the loss of jobs and the return of the hard times that we have recently experienced. The effect in the nation will be higher timber prices, reductions in housing starts and other construction and a general weakening of the economy.

This is not the time to reduce, restrict and reorganize the forest service. Present problems indicate to me a necessity to strengthen the forest service by increasing management capabilities and involvement. And the proposed transfer of the Region I Office is in direct contradiction to the need—now more than ever—to effectively manage our forest resources.

I believe relocation is a very cold, impersonal and impractical policy. The Regional Office employs approximately 450 people in the Missoula area, and as Governor I can assure you that we need these jobs in Montana. And to me, relocation is just additional evidence of the disregard for rural America that seems to prevail in Washington.

The loss of the Region I Office will exaggerate already serious economic problems in Montana.

Transferring these people to Denver will only complicate serious population pressure and pollution problems in Colorado.

And I can think of no organizational structure that could justify these unreasonable dislocations.

I thank Senator Eastland, Chairman of this Subcommittee, and Senator Talmadge, Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, for providing me with this opportunity to testify on this matter of great importance to Montana and the Northwest.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

Mr. Chairman, before leaving this morning I would like to submit a series of correspondence for the record of this hearing. These documents include letters from my colleagues here in the Senate, Executive replies and reports.

To be very candid about the circumstances involved in this reorganization, I am not happy with the way that it has been handled. Inquiries early in the year about possible Forest Service reorganization brought replies—"the matter is under review"—and that we would be informed before any final action was taken. Then reorganization is announced during the Easter Recess when most of us were out of the city. After appealing to the able Chairman of this Committee, Senator Talmadge, he instructed the Department to withhold implementation until such time as these hearings could be held. The Department acquiesced, but only verbally, nothing was put in writing. Later the Department responded in writing that the reorganization was being postponed; however, tentative planning was proceeding according to a memorandum circulated in the Regional Offices.

Senators Metcalf, Moss, and I asked for some detailed statistical information which we assumed went into this decision, and we received a partial response yesterday. Much of the information was considered too voluminous to provide or deferral was made to the upcoming study of the entire matter by the General Accounting Office.

Finally, I wish to state that it is an exceedingly poor way for the Executive Branch of the Government to improve its relationship with the Legislative Branch. I hope that this Committee will take appropriate action.

MARCH 26, 1973.

Hon. EARL J. BUTZ,
Secretary,
Department of Agriculture.

Hon. JOHN MCGUIRE,
Chief,
U.S. Forest Service:

Rumors have come to my attention that U.S. Forest Service region one headquarters now at Missoula, Montana will be transferred to Denver. I object strongly to any such plan. Missoula is strategically located in the heart of timber resources region. Regional concept as now established does not necessarily apply to several of our natural resources. Denver is remote on the fringe of the most active forest regions. I would like your reassurance that nothing will be done to dissipate Forest Service activity at Missoula. Any plan to move the Missoula headquarters will be met with strong opposition here in the Senate.

Regards,

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.

FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1973.

Hon. LEE METCALF
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Your telegram of March 26 asking us to check on a rumor that the Forest Service is considering moving its Missoula Regional headquarters. Although we are reviewing the possibility, we have made no firm decision on this matter.

About two years ago, we initiated Standard Region studies as part of the government-wide Federal Assistance Review (FAR) program. This directed agencies to simplify and improve the ability of the Federal Government to provide services through conformance to the Standard Regional concept. Our Studies show that we can conform and still carry out Forest Service programs effectively.

At the same time, as you are aware, Federal budgets and manpower constraints have been tightened. Rising costs of doing business have added to the need to accelerate studies to find ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of National Forest management while reducing costs. Therefore, in order to maintain our present level of management on National Forests, it is essential that we take a positive approach to insure that the maximum amount of available dollars and people are released to on-the-ground resource management.

So far our evaluations are preliminary, but they do indicate that substantial savings can be made by reducing the number of Forest Service headquarters offices, including our Regional Office in Missoula. If this were to occur, the Forest Service would continue to maintain a work force in Missoula of about 370 people to support Forest Service programs.

We appreciate your concern in these matters, and would be glad to meet with you at your convenience for more detailed discussions. Copies of this letter are being sent to the other members of the Montana Congressional delegation as they have also inquired into this situation.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. MCGUIRE,
Chief.

APRIL 28, 1973.

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 announced 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. As I recently indicated to you, I am very much opposed, not only because it would mean the closing of the Region I headquarters at Missoula, Montana, but it will create similar problems elsewhere in the west. Moving the headquarters from Missoula to Denver will create some very difficult problems of communication and transportation. Region I, which administers one of the largest National Forest areas, would be some eight hundred miles away from Denver, which now administers Region II.

The Forest Service can be logically exempted from the Federal regional structure because of the nature of its business. Our National Forests are a renewable resource and require continual on the ground management. At a time when there are greater demands on our National Forests it is necessary that the administrative and operational personnel be located in close proximity. Also National Forests are scattered throughout 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 whatsoever. Candidly, I feel that whoever developed this plan is not aware of the resources or the land area involved. You may remember that on your trip to Libby Dam

in Montana you flew over a part—a very small part—of Region I's area.

I cannot let this matter rest, and I will be discussing the situation with my colleagues. In your capacity as Chief Executive you can perform a much needed service, in full accord with your policies, by rescinding the Secretary's order.

Respectfully.

MIKE MANSFIELD.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We were extremely disappointed to learn that the Department of Agriculture has decided to adjust its regional organization to fit within the standard federal region structure and thus phase out the regional offices at Ogden, Utah, Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Missoula, Montana, and the experiment station headquarters at Ogden and Asheville, North Carolina.

We respectfully request that this proposal be reconsidered. Although the new regional concept is sold as an economy move to increase efficiency and effectiveness in managing the national forests, we see it as a negative action which will result in less staff responsibility for more area, increased bureaucracy, and the creation of more distance between the forest managers and the users.

We can understand the logic of concentration in the standard regional offices of those organizations which exist to administer programs emanating 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 convenience simply to satisfy the theoretical desire to get all regional offices in one place.

Because of the serious effect these proposed changes will have on our states' economies, 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.

As you know, from the very beginning of the Forest Service, these regional offices have been located in Ogden, Albuquerque and Missoula. Region I headquarters at Missoula, Montana is one of the most active regions where there are mounting demands for increased timber sales requiring additional on-the-ground management of the forests. Moving the headquarters from Missoula to Denver as proposed would create very difficult problems of communication and transportation. This would place this large Region some eight hundred miles away from Denver. In addition, Region I operates the smokejumper school and the Forest Fire Research Laboratory and associated research facilities at both Montana Universities at Bozeman and Missoula. This proposed move would be an economic blow to this western 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 forest areas.

Of all the announced changes in the regional reorganization of the Forest Service, the relocation of the Albuquerque office to Atlanta is the most nonsensical. The abolition of a regional office that has successfully administered over 20 million acres of forest land since 1908 is completely unwarranted. It would be impossible for Atlanta to successfully administer New Mexico's forest, which contain half of the region's total acreage, from over 1,500 miles away. It is equally unlikely that New Mexico will receive the proper representation from the Atlanta region since the areas have completely different topographic, climatic and forestry problems.

Another case in point is the Intermountain Region, which includes all of Utah, southern Idaho, western Wyoming, all of Nevada and a tiny segment of California. For the most part, this is Great Basin country with high temperatures in the summer, moderately cold ones in winter and precipitation amounts that are less than generous. These factors, plus a general similarity of soil have created plant groupings that lend themselves to the same general management techniques. To split the Intermountain Region would run the risk of taking a team of experts, skilled in managing one particular vegetative situation and scattering team members to where they would no longer be effective. This is hardly an efficient use of taxpayer monies. In addition, closing the Ogden Regional Headquarters will leave the Ogden 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 forests, its regional offices 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.
MIKE MANSFIELD.
PETE V. DOMENICI.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1973.

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

DEAR SENATOR 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 reopen this decision so recently announced. However, I am sure 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.

MAY 9, 1973.

Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Chairman, Agriculture and Forestry Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, I am very concerned about the Secretary of Agriculture's plans to implement the reorganization of the U.S. Forest Service regional setup. Region No. 1 at Missoula, Montana will be transferred to Denver.

I believe that this plan is impractical, inefficient, and would accomplish no savings to the Federal government.

I have discussed this matter with the Senate Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and I would also personally appreciate if the Committee on Agriculture would investigate this matter. I am enclosing my statement before the Subcommittee which will give you my views in greater detail. Anything that the Committee might do to stop this plan would be appreciated.

Insofar as I am aware, Congress was not consulted about the practicality of this move.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

———.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1973.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: I have just received your letter regarding the reorganization of the U.S. Forest Service and the consolidation of regional offices.

I agree that the Administration's plan to eliminate five regional offices is illogical and unsound. For example, the plan places Georgia in the same region as New Mexico.

I am placing this matter on the agenda of the Committee for our next regular meeting which is tomorrow. I will be in further touch with you when I ascertain the will of the Committee.

With best wishes and warm personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1973.

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

DEAR MIKE: The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry discussed the unfortunate reorganization and consolidation of regional Forest Service offices. We felt that this consolidation would create a number of problems.

I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture to ask that he suspend the reorganization until the Committee has an opportunity to hold hearings. Enclosed is a copy of my letter to the Secretary.

With best wishes and warmest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1973.

Hon. EARL L. BUTZ,
The Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: While the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry generally applaud any efforts toward economy, efficiency, and cost-effective operation practiced administratively by the Executive Branch, the members of the committee have some questions and reservations as to whether the proposed reorganization of the U.S. Forest Service will accomplish these ends.

As you are no doubt aware, there are several pieces of legislation in varying stages of readiness that will affect the operation of the Forest Service. All of them are predicated on a structuring of the Forest Service along lines similar to those that prevailed before the announcement of the reorganization, and at staffing levels which existed at that time.

It is the intention of this committee to hold hearings on several of these measures in the not too distant future, and we would appreciate it if the Department would see fit to suspend the proposed reorganization

until such time as our hearings can indicate what the results of the reorganization will have on pending legislation and existing law.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely,

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Chairman.

JUNE 11, 1973.

Mr. ROBERT W. LONG,
Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LONG: I have received a letter from a constituent expressing concern that the Department is proceeding with the Forest Service reorganization, contrary to the assurance I received from you. The letter indicated that a meeting was held in Missoula and that the word from the Secretary of Agriculture was that "they were proceeding with the reorganization and not going to let the Senators stop them."

I would appreciate confirmation of the fact that the reorganization will *not* proceed.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1973.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Bob Long is out of town this week so I have looked into the question raised by your letter of June 11. I have also discussed it with John McGuire.

The Forest Service has been doing some further analysis and planning in preparation for the Agriculture and Forestry Committee hearing on June 26. No personnel transfers or other irreversible moves toward regional reorganization have been taken.

This Department is fully aware of its commitment to defer reorganization actions until after the hearings. I assure you that we will honor that commitment.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL,
Under Secretary.

FOREST SERVICE,
June 15, 1973.

Reply to: 1360 Meetings (6130) (1200).
Subject: Reorganization Placement Meeting.
To: Regional Foresters.

REPLY DUE JULY 10

This is a follow-up of our letter of June 8 in which we tentatively scheduled a meeting of Personnel Officers in Washington the week of July 9 to prepare staffing proposals based on the possibility of reorganization.

We are committed taking no irreversible action on the implementation of the Standard Regions until the hearings are completed by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on June 26 and 27. However, we believe planning can continue, particularly placement planning to identify positions for employees in the proposed phased out Regional Offices who are willing to move. Therefore, we have rescheduled the Personnel Officers meeting for the week of July 16, subject to the outcome of the Senate Hearings. The objective of this meeting will be to make tentative placements of regional employees affected by the reorganization. Accordingly, the only Personnel Officers needed for the meeting are the Regional Personnel Officers and the Washington Personnel Officer.

We believe the following information needed for this meeting, can be assembled without the need to contact employees or in any way take action contrary to Mr. Long's commitment to Senator Mansfield. This information must reach the Washington Office by July 10 so that it can be consolidated in time for use at the meeting.

1. Vacant and New Position Information.

a. All Regional Offices not being phased out submit a list by title, series, grade, and location of vacant and new positions Region-wide.

b. Regions 1, 3 and 4 submit this same information for all vacant and new positions on your Forests. You should also submit this information on any new zone office you propose to establish in phased out Regional Office cities in line with the guidelines developed at the Denver meeting.

2. Employee Information.

a. Regional Offices scheduled to be phased out submit your best estimate of names of those R.O. employees who are willing to move at their present grade and their preference for assignment.

b. Regional Offices scheduled to be phased out submit their best estimate of names of R.O. employees who are unwilling to move.

Enclosed is an outline of the process to be used at the meeting to tentatively place employees and instructions and format to be used in submitting the advance information.

In addition to placements necessitated by the reorganization, some units may still have surplus employees who are not funded. However, these should be considerably reduced since the Denver meeting in view of the increased staffing provided to meet the new timber targets. Bring a list of your unfunded positions and affected employees with you to the meeting. After completing the recommendations on the reorganization placements, we will consider the placement of unfunded positions.

The meeting will be continued as long as necessary to accomplish all of the placements. Hopefully, it can be completed within a week. You will be contacted as early as possible after the Senate Hearings regarding the status of the meeting and lodging arrangements.

J. W. DEINEMA,
(for John R. McGuire, *Chief.*)

PROPOSED PLACEMENT PROCESS TO BE USED AT MEETING BY PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Responsibility for the programs and functions of the phased out Regions will be the responsibility of the new Regions. Therefore, it will be the primary responsibility of the new Regions to absorb the employees of the phased out Regional Offices. Representatives of R-2, 5, 6, and 8 should come prepared to place R.O. employees from Regions 1, 3, and 4. Placement will be based on employee preference, retention register standing, and management needs. The Personnel Officer should come with inputs from line officers and program people on staffing needs, and with the authority to make tentative selections. The W.O. Personnel Officer will be prepared to provide information on both Washington Office vacancies and general information on placement desires of the various Deputy Chiefs where Regional placements are concerned. Personnel Officers should come equipped with organizational configurations approved by the Operation people to be used in the placement of employees. We realize this will be difficult in cases where organizational changes have not yet been decided.

We will provide SIS profiles on all employees GS-13 and above in the closing offices. However, Regions 1, 3, and 4 should bring with them available PRI's on employees to be placed. Other Regions should bring with them the Regional Office portion of their Position Organization Listing, including new positions where known.

In very general terms, we plan to follow the following process in considering possible placement assignments for all personnel in the Regional Offices proposed for closing.

1. Consider Regional Office organizations in Atlanta, San Francisco, Portland and Denver as new organizations.

2. Consider the "transfer of function" principle which means for example the new Denver Region must take their proportionate share of personnel from R-1 and R-4.

3. Divide the Personnel Officers up into teams to make proposed placements. Team composition will be as follows:

R-1, R-2, R-4 and R-6. Make placements into the new Portland and Denver Regions.

R-3, R-5 and R-8, Make placements into the new Atlanta and San Francisco Regions.

*R-4 and R-5, Make placements into new San Francisco Region.

4. Personnel Officers from the Washington Office, R-9 and R-10 will work with these groups to consider additional placements.

---

*These units to meet as a team following the other team meetings.

Title [1]	Specialty [2]	Series, grade [1]	Organizational unit
Vacant and new positions:			
Forester	Administration	GS 460-15	Big River Forest.
Do	Recreation	GS 460-13	R.O., Division of Recreation.
Do	do	GS 460-13 (Interd. W/GS-807-13)	Do.
Do	Timber Management	GS 460-13	R.O., Division of Timber Management.
Do	do	GS 460-12	Big River Forest.
Do	Recreation	GS 460-12	R.O., Division of Recreation.
Soil Scientist		GS 470-13	R.O., Division of Soils and Watershed.
Accountant		GS 510-12	R.O., fiscal control.
Do		GS 510-12	Do.
Civil engineer	Design	GS 810-14	R.O., Division of Engineering.
Do	Construction	GS 810-12	Big River Forest.

[1] Group positions by identical series, grade and specialty. List in descending order within each series, as illustrated. Enter interdisciplinary positions only once but indicate alternative series.

[2] Forester and engineer positions only require a specialty. Use promotion roster specialties listed in FSH 6109.14, p. 31.72. When a position encompasses more than 1 specialization, enter the predominant or more technical one. Also show specialty for 301, General Administration, positions.

Title [1]	Specialty [2]	Series/grade [1]	Name	Regional preference [3]	Retention group	SCD
Regional office employees willing to accept reassignment:						
Employee Dev Specist		GS 235-13	William Smith	Portland, Denver	1A	Jan. 3, 1952
Administrative Offcr		GS 341-11	James Boyd	Denver, Portland	1B	July 28, 1959
Forester	Timber Mgmt	GS 460-15	Phillip Brown	Portland, Denver, San Francisco	1A	Sept. 2, 1940
Do	Recreation	GS 460-14	Robert Wilson	Portland, San Francisco	1A	Dec. 3, 1943
Do	Timber Mgmt	GS 460-12	James Green	Atlanta, Portland	1A	July 12, 1964
Do	do	GS 460-12	Joe Brown	Portland, Denver	1B	Nov. 3, 1939
Do	do	GS 460-12	Jack White	W.O., Milwaukee	1B	Oct. 15, 1962
Fiscal clerk		GS 501-06	Mary Jones	W.O., San Francisco	1B	May 13, 1953

Title [1]	Specialty [2]	Series—grade [1]	Name	Retention group	SCD	Proposed action
Regional office employees not willing to accept reassignment—None.						

[1] Group employees by identical series, grade (and specialty for foresters and engineers). List in ascending series order, and in descending grade order within each series, as illustrated.

[2] For foresters and engineers show specialty. Use promotion roster specialties in FSH 6109.11, p. 31.72. When an employee is currently working in 2 or more specialties list the 1 where his expertise is greatest. Also show specialty for employees in the 301, General Administration series.

[3] Preference for regions is to be identified using new regional boundaries. Do not show cities, States or other specific locations. List in order of preference.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1973.

Hon. EARL L. BUTZ,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In connection with the proposed centralization of national forest supervision announced on 24 April 1973, you are hereby requested to make available the following information.

1. Each and every 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 for the fiscal years 1971, 1972, 1973 through 1 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 for the portion from the Regional office to first stop. Please show comparable cost under proposed change.

(b) travel by individuals and purpose from each national forest to Regional office with data as above. Please make similar comparison as above.

3. Describe facilities to be vacated or abandoned by move, cost, value, etc., and the cost of new facilities in Denver and Portland and the net financial impact. Show cost to move equipment, etc.

4. By job title list personnel affected by proposed transfer.

(a) 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 discuss the position and summarize whether they recommended strengthening or abolishing position.

(c) for each position to be transferred show results of various inspections over past four years that discuss position and summarize whether they recommended transfer and the reasons therefor and whether they recommended transfer as now planned.

5. Based on the proposal, show analysis of how cost of doing business and effectiveness 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 Atlanta 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.

Show the differences in time and cost for each and time as above.

(d) Distance from Missoula to each forest headquarters in Region 1 as now existing.

(e) Same information from Denver or Portland to each forest in proposed revision.

Show the differences in time and cost for each.

(f) Show distance and time from Juneau to each Alaska national forest.

(g) Show same data from each Alaska national forest to Portland.

Show distance in time and cost for each.

(h) 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 question can be answered by the statement "Do not know." However, you are advised that the absence of such studies and hard cost and benefit analyses will be considered as extremely significant factors in weighing whether the proposed revamping of the Forest Service structure advances or significantly retards efficient operation of these public assets in the national interest.

We will appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience. Please send a copy of your response to Senator Alan Bible, Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Very truly yours,

LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1973.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This responds to your June 8 letter asking for information you and Senator Mansfield had requested on May 8. You recall we had suggested awaiting outcome of the GAO survey in order to avoid possible duplications.

Since the GAO survey will not be completed before June 26–27 we have attached responses to the questions raised in your May 8 letter.

We are also sending copies of this information to the Congressional Delegations of Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, and Montana.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. LONG,
Assistant Secretary.

METCALF, MANSFIELD, AND MOSS QUESTIONS IN LETTERS DATED MAY 8 AND MAY 30, RESPECTIVELY

Responses to the numbered questions in Senators Metcalf's and Mansfield's May 8 letter follow:

1. Each and every 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.

Answer: Our files on these subjects are extensive. They have been made available for inspection by GAO and anyone else having such need. Key reports such as the November 1971 analysis have been sent to interested individuals on request. An additional copy is enclosed.

2. For Regions I and IV for the fiscal years 1971, 1972, 1973 through 1 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 for the portion from the Regional Office to first stop. Please show comparable cost under propsed change.

b. travel by individuals and purpose from each National Forest to Regional Office with data as above. Please make similar comparison as above.

Answer: We do not have this information. In our studies of the travel question, we estimated increased travel cost that would accrue by reason of having larger but fewer regions through the use of modified regres-

sion analysis techniques. The Travel Index thus derived was a simple number, which took into account several variable factors such as point to point distances, costs, frequency of travel, time and workload, etc. Using this technique allows for much easier assimilation of a great deal of information such as you requested. The resultant Travel Indices for a number of alternative regional boundary configurations could then be compared easily by inspection—the larger the index the more costly the alternative. See pages 8, and 14 through 20 of the November 1971 study.

After the number of alternatives were narrowed down to a few "best" the indices were converted to dollars of cost and this cost then subtracted from the savings that would result from economies of scale and other factors. See pages 22 and 23 of the November 1971 study.

3. Describe facilities to be vacated or abandoned by move, cost, value, etc., and the cost of new facilities in Denver and Portland and the net financial impact. Show cost to move equipment, etc.

Answer: In Missoula, Ogden, and Albuquerque, we now occupy federally owned space operated by GSA under its regulations. We will vacate approximately 60,000 sq. ft. in Missoula, 70,000 sq. ft. in Ogden, and 40,000 sq. ft. in Albuquerque. We pay no rent in these, but the estimated fair market value on an annual sq. ft. rental basis is: Missoula $4.75, Ogden, $5.00, and Albuquerque $5.00. Details on our needs in Atlanta, Portland, San Francisco, and Denver to implement the new Regional alignment are as follows:

ESTIMATED ONE TIME COSTS OF IMPLEMENTATION

City	Number people	Square feet	Rate	Annual cost
1. New office space needs:				
Atlanta	15	1,500	$10.50	$15,750
Portland	62	6,000	9.23	55,380
San Francisco	26	2,500	9.96	24,900
Denver	73	7,000	7.65	53,550
Total	176			149,580

Trip	Load	Rate per hundredweight	Cost
2. Moving things (furniture, files, equipment, etc.):			
Albuquerque and Ogden to San Francisco.	(26x600#) 15,600	$10	$1,560
Missoula and Ogden to Portland.	(62x600#) 37,200	8	12,976
Missoula and Ogden to Denver.	(73x600#) 43,800	9	3,894
Albuquerque to Atlanta.	(15x600#) 9,000	11	990
Total			9,420

	Cost
3. Refurbish old and new locations	$10,000
Total 1, 2, and 3	169,000

4. BY JOB TITLE LIST PERSONNEL AFFECTED BY PROPOSED TRANSFER

Series	Title	Albuquerque Now [1]	Albuquerque Available [2]	Missoula Now [1]	Missoula Available [2]	Ogden Now [1]	Ogden Available [2]
018	Safety	1	1	1	1		
110	Economist	1	1			2	2
193	Archeology					1	1
201	Personnel management	3	3	2		2	1
203	Personnel clerk	2		9	8	8	2
212	Personnel staffing			2	1	3	2
221	Classification	3	3	3	3	2	2
223	Salary and wage	1	1			1	1
230	Labor management and employee relations			3	2	1	1
235	Employee development	1	1	3	3	1	1
301	General clerk and administration	9	5	17	11	14	1
304						1	
305	Mail and file	2	2	8	3	6	2
312	Clerk-steno	19	8	9	4	20	
316	Clerk DMT	2	2	1		1	
318	Secretary	9	4	11	3	6	1
322	Clerk typist	12	5	18	5	22	3
330	Computer operator	3	3	5	5	4	6
334	Computer specialist	7	5	8	8	12	10
335	Computer aid	1	1	3	3	5	2
341	Administrative officer	2	1	3	3	4	1
342	Office service management	3	2	1	1		
343	Management analysis	4	3	1	1	4	3
344	Management assistant	2	2	2	1	2	
345	Program analysis			3	3		
350							
356	Card punch	5	2	11	4	8	1
359							
371							
401	General biology			2	1	1	1
404	Biology technician	2	1	3	2	1	
414	Entomologist	4	4	5	5	6	7
434	Plant pathologist	1	2	3	3	1	1
454	Range cops.	1		2	1	4	4
456		1					
460	Forester	51	44	51	42	55	42
462	Forester technician	5	1	9	1	5	4
470	Soil scientist	2	1	4	2	2	1
482	Fishery biologist	1	1	1		3	3
486	Wildlife biologist	1		1	2	1	2
501	General accountant	1		4	1	4	1
505							
510	Accountant	7	6	9	6	8	8
520	Account maintenance clerk	3	3	3	2	5	1
525	Accountant technician	1	1	5	3	1	
525	Accountant technician	1	1	5	3	1	
530				1			
540	Voucher examiner	3		6	2	6	1
560	Budget administrator	4	3	3	2	4	2
802	Engineering technician	1	1	14	11	18	14
806	Material engineer	2	1				
807	Landscape architect	2	2	4	4	3	2
808	Architect	1	1	3	3	2	2
810	Civil engineer	18	16	26	25	25	22
818	Engineering drafting	1	1	2	1		
819	Sanitary engineer			1	1		
830	Mechanical engineer	2	2	2	2	1	1
850	Electric engineer			1	1	1	1
855	Electron engineer	1	1			1	1
856	Electron technician	1	1	5	4	2	
880	Mining engineer	4	3	2	1	1	1
963	Legal inst. examiner	7		5	3	7	2
992		1	1	1		1	
998							
1001	General information officer			1	1	1	
1020	Illustrator			1	3		
1060	Photographer			3	3	4	4
1081	Information officer	2	2	1	1		1
1082		1	1	2	1	1	
1083							
1084	Visual information					2	1
1102	Contract and procurement	5	6	14	11	7	5
1105	Purchasing	1		1	1	2	2
1106	Procurement clerk			2			
1170	Realty	1	1				1
1311	Physical science technician			1			
1315	Hydrologist	2	2	3	3	1	1
1350	Biologist	3	3	4	4	1	
1370	Cartographer	3	4	1	1	1	
1371	Cart. technician	15	13	22	7	20	17
1373	Land survey	1	1	1	1	2	1
1380	For Prod. technician			1	1	1	1
1531	Statist assistant	1	1				
1601	Facility management			1	1	2	
1640	Facility maintenance			1			
1670	Equipment specialist	1	1	2	2	2	
1701	General education			1	1	1	1
1702	Education and training technician.	2	1				
1810							
1811	Criminal investigation	3	3	1	1	2	2
2001	General supply			2	1	1	1
2005	Supply clerk			3	1	1	1
2020				1			
2132	Travel clerk			1	1		
2150	Transportation—Operator					1	1
2181	Pilot	5	5	6		11	8
	WG	4	1	35	24	16	2
	Total	272	198	539	272	383	218

[1] Total with status (career or career conditional) RO's Apr. 28, 1973. Excludes Missoula smoke jumper.

[2] Same as 1 above available to move Apr. 1973.

4a. Show estimated cost to transfer, including movement of household goods, sale of home, relocation expense and cost to move family.

Answer: Approximately 400 people will be placed in vacant, financed jobs. These positions must be filled regardless of Standard Region realignment of boundaries. Thus no additional transfer of station costs will be required. 165–180 people will be transferred and placed in new positions. The estimated cost of transfer is $5,000. These additional, one-time, transfer of station costs amount to $825,000–$900,000.

4b. For each position to be "abolished" show results of various inspections over past four years that discuss the position and summarize whether they recommended strengthening or abolishing position.

4c. For each position to be transferred show results of various inspections over past four years that discuss position and summarize whether they recommended transfer and the reasons therefore and whether they recommended transfer as now planned.

Answer: Individual positions are neither being abolished or transferred. The entire function of providing Regional Office services and administration is being transferred. In essence a new Regional Office is being established. The positions created at that office are to serve the needs of that new Regional area.

Positions are of course audited on a regular basis. The objective of audits however, is not to recommend Regional reorganizations. The audits look at performance of the position, need of position in present organization, proper description of duties and proper classification of those duties.

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

Answer: This is covered in the November 1971 study.

6. One part of your proposal suggests that New Mexico, which has five National Forests, be attached to the proposed Atlanta 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.

Show the differences in time and cost for each and time as above.

d. Distance from Missoula to each forest headquarters in Region 1 as now existing.

e. Same information from Denver or Portland to each forest in proposed revision.

Show the differences in time and cost for each.

f. Show distance and time from Juneau to each Alaska National Forest.

g. Show same data from each Alaska National Forest to Portland.

Show distance in time and cost for each.

h. 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".

Answer: This information, as you must realize, is voluminous, involving some 94 National Forests and 500 Ranger Districts in the West and is not available in the format you request. However, our studies of the travel costs were developed through use of modified regression analysis techniques applied to the increased travel cost that would accrue by reason of having larger but fewer regions.

The workload analysis data is available for inspection and was furnished to GAO inspectors. It is also summarized on pages 8 and 14 through 20 of the November 1971 report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for yielding to me.

(The following colloquy, which occurred during the debate on the supplemental appropriation bill, is printed at this point in the RECORD by unanimous consent.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, Senator METCALF, and I appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Although I spoke on this subject earlier today I would repeat that the purpose of the appearance was to forestall an attempt by the administration to bring about a reorganization of the Forest Service by means of which the headquarters, at least in part, of region 1 at Missoula, Mont., would be moved approximately 1,000 miles away, to Denver, Colo., an area with which we in Montana have no direct communication facilities. The Ogden, Utah, offices would be dispersed primarily to Denver also but partly to Portland, as well, as would some of region 1 facilities.

The facilities at Albuquerque, N. Mex., would be transferred to Atlanta, Ga., a long, long way from New Mexico.

This was done without the knowledge of the six Senators concerned. We heard rumors about this proposal in the early part of this year. While the Senate was in recess over Easter, the reorganization announcements were made. When the Senate reconvened, the Senators from the three States tried to do everything possible to bring about a rectification of the situation which was inexcusable, unnecessary, and very expensive in our opinion.

At that time I appeared before the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations. At the request of Senators DOMENICI and MONTOYA of New Mexico, BENNETT and MOSS of Utah, and METCALF and MANSFIELD of Montana, the following language was inserted in the urgent supplemental appropriations bill:

Providing further that none of the funds currently available or made available under this Act shall be obligated or expended to change the boundaries of any region or establish or abolish any region of the national forest system of the Forest Service.

Mr. President, it was my purpose in asking the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to yield to ask if this proviso was accepted by the House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was accepted. The House receded and accepted the Senate provision. I do not even recall that it was even controversial. It was readily agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am very intimately acquainted with the problem that the majority leader has directed his attention to.

There was no problem whatever on the House side. They accepted it. In fact, they thought it was good language.

My memory is not clear as to whether they have added it or are going to add it in the regular appropriations bill. I am inclined to believe that they will. And if they have not, I am sure that our majority leader will put it in the regular appropriations bill as well as in the supplemental.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This would be binding only until the 30th of this month. It will be necessary to add it in the new appropriations bill and in the continuing resolution if we are to make certain that they are not permitted to do it after June 30.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nevada have any further comment?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the only thing I have to add is that I am of the impression—and I do not have the House report before me—but I am inclined to think that it is already in the House report for Interior appropriations. If it is not, we will attempt to add it in the Senate when we complete our action in the Senate on the Interior appropriations bill about the middle of July.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Nevada and to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN).

Just to make the record straight, the proviso quoted was put in by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior by a unanimous vote of that subcommittee.

Furthermore, when the urgent supplemental was brought before the full Appropriations Committee, it was agreed to unanimously. When the matter was referred to the conferees with the same proviso, it was agreed to unanimously on the part of the conferees representing the other body. In other words, for the information of the Office of Management and Budget and also for the information of the Department of Agriculture, I would suggest that before they make any moves whatsoever which would tend to bring about a reorganization in whole or in part through the transfer of

functions or otherwise, they read the RECORD and make absolutely certain that they know what the intent of the Congress was and is—no reorganization.

I am delighted that the distinguished Senator has given me the chance to make these observations for the RECORD, because they will stand the six Senators and the Congressmen from the three States involved in good stead at the appropriate time.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for what he has had to say about this matter.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I have checked with my staff man on the Interior Appropriations Committee, and I find that my memory has not faltered completely. The language is written into the supplemental appropriations bill and has been carried over in the regular Interior appropriations bill and has been so marked up on the House side and will be carried over on the Senate side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope we can accomplish this. This was a worthwhile project, that would never have been accomplished with full hearings.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right, and it was done in the stealth of the night.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is right, and we caught them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

(This marks the end of the colloquy which by unanimous consent was ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD.)