[continued from previous folder]

State _____ EIS Area _____
District _____ Date _____
Resource Area _____ Preparer _____

Worksheet #2

Page _____

ALLOTMENT RANKING AND RPS IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULING

1 Allotment Name/No.	2 Management Category	3 Total Cost ($000's)	4 Benefit/Cost Ratio	5 IROR (%)	6 Initial Rank	7 Critical Resource Values	8 Use Conflicts	9 Percent in Unsatisfactory Condition	10 Percentage Reduction (or Increase) Ranch Viability w/o I.W.	11 Public Controversy	12 State/Local Gov't Other Coordination	13 Cost per Added AUM	14 Changes in Management Category	15 Other Criteria Explanation, Rationale, Etc.	16 Area Manager Rank	17 Advisory Board Rank	18 Fina Rank (Dis Mgr.

List and Rank all I's

List M's* and continue ranking or rank separately

List C's* and continue ranking or rank separately

Worksheet #2

Criteria for Ranking and Scheduling Rangeland Investments

Worksheet Column	Criteria and/or Information
#1	Allotment name or number.
#2*	Selective management category (M,I,C) from Worksheet #2.
#3	Estimated total cost of improvements.
#4*	Estimated benefit/cost ratio of the improvement package for the allotment or group of allotments for which a "plan" will be prepared. Use SageRam model.
#5*	Internal Rate of Return (percent) as calculated by SageRam model.
#6*	Initial ranking (highest IROR first, etc.)
#7*	Extent to which a critical resource value(s) exists and requires protection (E,H,M,L).** (Presence of threatened or endangered species, deteriorating riparian areas, fragile soils and/or severe erosion, public safety, and health hazards are some examples.)
#8*	Existence of severe and/or controversial resource use conflicts (E,H,M,L).**
#9	Percent of allotment in unsatisfactory range condition. Application of this criterion requires that a determination be made as to whether the existing ecological site condition is suited to the uses for which the area is to be managed.
#10*	Actual percent reduction in livestock use proposed, based on the difference between most recent 3-year average of certified actual use and proposed initial stocking level. Licensed use may be used if actual use is not known.
#11*	Necessity of the proposed investments to maintain viability of this range livestock operation. From another viewpoint, what is the importance of the investment package in preventing the operator from going out of a business (H,M,L)?
#12*	Public controversy generated by the proposal to install improvements (E,H,M,L).
#13*	Importance of improvements in achieving State/local government or other agency coordination goals (H,M,L).
#14*	Undiscounted cost per additional AUM from SageRam printout. (Sum of costs for the 50 years divided by the sum of additional AUM's over the same period.)
#15	Other criteria developed for the specific local planning situation, other comments, etc. Also record any changes made in Management Category. Changes are not required.
#16	Area manager's ranking based on assessment of Bureauwide and local criteria.
#17	Ranking recommended by District Grazing Advisory Board.
#18	Final ranking assigned by District Manager.

*Required criteria; if the criteria does not apply, note with a zero (0).
**E = Extreme, H = High, M = Medium, L = Low

State _____ Resource Area _____

District _____ Preparer _____

Worksheet #3

Page _____

Rangeland Investment Ranking for FY 19__ AWP

1 Allotment Name or Number	2 Management Category	3 Total Cost	4 Cost in First Year	5 B/C Ratio	6 IROR	7 Preliminary AWP Rank	8 RPS Rank	9 FY Originally Scheduled	10 User Cooperation	11 Contributions Received/Pledged	12 Other Considerations	13 District Advisory Board Rank, etc.	14 District Manager AWP Rank	15 Sta Dir etc AWP Ran

APPENDIX 1

Glossary of Terms

Benefit: The payments and/or economic value generated as a result of pursuing a particular course of action. In the context of investment analysis, services and other outputs are usually translated into dollar amounts. The course of action is the proposal to incur the costs associated with a rangeland investment (improvement) package.

Benefit-Cost Ratio: The ratio of the present worth of benefits divided by the present worth of costs (both discounted to account for the time value of money). Used primarily in public investment evaluations, the technique helps to determine whether the economic benefits of an investment proposal equals or exceeds economic costs.

Cost(s): The dollar amount of expenditures and value of nonpriced inputs required to achieve a particular objective.

Costs, Total: All costs incured in the construction, operation, maintenance and repair of an investment package that accomplishes a specified objective.

Cost-Effectiveness: (Sometimes called cost-utility analysis.) A systematic examination and comparison of alternative courses of action (least-cost investment proposals) that might be undertaken to achieve differing but specified objectives. By identifying the costs associated with achieving each objective, a relationship can be defined to help decisionmakers select an "optimal" course of action. The technique is generally used in public expenditure/investment situations in which no objective way exists to evaluate a situation or when costs and benefits cannot be stated in commensurable terms.

Internal Rate of Return: The discount or interest rate on an investment that will make the present value of expected benefits equal to the present value of the costs of implementing and maintaining the investment package (improvements) over a period of time, generally 50 years.

Least-Cost: The least costly or expensive means of achieving a specific objective.

Maintenance: Timely repair of an improvement in usable condition to extend its useful life for the purpose intended. Such repair is performed as needed and is less than half the cost of new construction.

Operation: Routine use and function of an improvement, including those costs necessary to keep an improvement functioning. Operation usually refers to items such as energy costs, lubricants, and inspection costs commonly associated with pumps, wells, pipelines, etc.

Opportunity Cost: The value of an opportunity foregone or the value of an alternative action not taken.

Positive Economic Return: A return on an investment where the benefits received exceed the costs.

Range Improvement: Any activity or program on or relating to the public lands that is designed to improve production of forage, change vegetative composition, control patterns of use, provide water, stabilize soil and water conditions, and provide habitat for livestock and wildlife. Range improvements may be structural or nonstructural.

> Structural Range Improvement: An improvement requiring placement or construction in order to facilitate management or control distribution and movement of grazing animals. Such improvements may include, but are not limited to, fences, wells, troughs, reservoirs, pipelines, and cattleguards.
>
> Nonstructural Range Improvement: A practice or treatment which improves rangeland condition and/or resource production for multiple use. Such improvements may include, but are not limited to, seedings; plant control through chemical, mechanical, biological means, or prescribed burning; water spreaders; pitting, chiseling, or contour furrowing.

Reconstruction: Rebuilding an improvement after it has been damaged or has deteriorated to the point that repair constitutes more than half of the cost of new construction.

SageRam Program: A BLM-developed computer program that adjusts or discounts costs and benefits for the time value of money. It provides a consistent basis for rangeland benefit-cost analyses and generates reports that managers and potential contributors can use to determine the economic feasibility of proposed investments in rangeland improvements. The reports document assumptions made in investment analyses and provide several measures of economic feasibility in addition to the B/C ratio.

Willingness-to-Pay: The value of a good or service as determined through observation of market behavior between buyers and sellers or the economic value inputed for nonmarket goods as derived through a system consistent with the market mechanism.

"With or Without" Analysis: Analysis of the situation in the allotment with the proposed improvements as compared to the situation in the allotment without the improvements.

Appendix 2--Private Grazing Land Lease Rates

Grazing Fees--base data used in computing annual adjustment index. Monthly Rate (dollars) per head for pasturing cattle on nonirrigated private grazing land

Year[1]	11 West States	N. Dak.	S. Dak.	Neb.	Kansas	Okla.	Tex.	Idaho	Wyo.	Colo.	N. Mex.	Ore.	Mont.	Ariz.	Utah	Nev.	Wash.	Calif.
1964		$1.84	$3.13	$3.75	$3.52	$2.76	$2.38	$3.33	$3.40	$3.51	$3.09	$3.15	$3.03	$2.86	$3.42	$4.28	$3.17	$4.02
1965		1.94	3.16	3.89	3.54	2.84	2.35	3.25	3.68	3.70	3.42	3.16	3.14	2.87	3.51	4.00	2.98	4.02
1966		2.09	3.34	4.20	3.85	3.14	2.43	3.40	3.70	3.93	3.53	3.51	3.31	2.38	3.50	4.06	3.26	4.08
1967		2.10	3.72	4.35	3.99	3.05	3.38	3.47	3.73	4.05	3.37	3.74	3.59	2.84	3.66	N/A	3.32	3.93
1968		2.37	3.80	4.50	4.15	3.15	2.71	3.48	3.95	4.03	3.43	3.04	3.00	3.10	3.53	4.43	3.63	3.71
1969		2.38	3.76	4.76	4.28	3.52	2.76	3.50	4.04	4.03	3.47	3.67	3.71	2.91	3.64	4.43	3.62	3.95
1970		2.58	4.16	4.89	4.46	3.50	2.79	3.71	4.28	4.03	3.62	3.70	3.87	3.44	3.78	4.76	3.66	4.44
1971		2.61	4.22	4.90	4.35	3.67	3.04	3.79	4.28	4.23	3.40	3.61	4.03	2.78	4.05	4.32	3.63	4.44
1972		2.76	4.41	5.12	4.55	3.80	3.19	3.99	4.45	4.45	3.92	3.80	4.32	2.52	4.34	3.94	3.53	4.52
1973		3.00	4.69	5.78	4.97	4.23	4.12	4.41	4.98	5.11	4.10	4.20	4.82	2.79	4.81	4.36	3.91	4.72
1974		4.13	5.79	7.16	6.40	5.11	4.14	5.43	5.81	5.51	4.41	5.29	6.87	3.21	5.51	5.41	5.36	6.78
1975		4.17	6.22	8.04	6.56	4.38	3.72	6.55	6.27	5.71	4.94	5.11	7.03	4.60	5.76	5.62	6.04	5.54
1976		4.39	6.41	9.61	12.86	4.62	3.96	6.14	7.07	6.26	5.15	5.18	7.38	5.63	6.04	7.50	5.81	6.99
1977		4.49	8.91	9.77	11.97	5.43	4.58	6.20	7.06	6.11	5.83	5.26	7.28	4.90	6.88	8.21	5.83	5.81
Year[2]	3)																	
1978		5.56	9.21	10.23	9.11	5.67	4.27	6.43	8.09	7.26	5.94	6.64	7.79	3.42	5.73	4.10	6.67	8.07
1979		6.29	10.13	11.20	9.97	5.94	4.65	6.47	8.74	8.12	6.83	6.88	7.78	4.63	6.30	2.55	7.29	8.19
1980	$7,88	6.35	11.79	11.96	9.16	4.17	7.06	6.61	8.37	8.26	4.50	7.56	9.07	4.54	5.78	6.19	7.39	8.80
1981	8.83	8.69	11.97	13.81	9.06	5.88	6.78	8.20	7.93	8.20	6.98	7.54	9.40	5.60	7.24	6.29	8.18	10.48

[1]Data from General Farm Questionnaire
[2]Data from June Enumerative Survey

Source: ESS-Econ; work sheets; reflects data as originally published and not rounded. Will not agree with data published since 1975

3) Data is currently published in December issue of Agricultural Prices by USDA, Statistical Reporting Service, Crop Reporting Board, Washington, D.C. 20250. See: "Data Provided To Forest Service, USDA and Bureau of Land Management, USDI, For Computation of Grazing Fees."

APPENDIX 3

Recreation Day Values for Use in Benefit/Cost Analyses of Rangeland Investments*

Introduction

Responsible public administrators and successful business managers understand and use information gathering and analysis procedures that include:

(1) Identification of (rangeland) management or use objectives;

(2) Consideration of alternative practices or improvements (investments) that will achieve the desired result;

(3) Comparison or evaluation of the alternative means of achieving their objective; and

(4) A conscious decision to initiate or invest in those actions or improvements that will most efficiently accomplish their objective.

While some managers like to try new or interesting practices, nearly all understand that their credibility and survival is dependent upon a thoughtful analysis like that just described.

Since a substantial amount of outdoor recreation occurs on public lands or involves the use of public resources and markets for such recreation do not usually exist, it is difficult to establish accepted values or prices for much wildlife related and other outdoor recreation. That society values such recreational and environmental resources is seldom disputed.

This paper provides recreation related benefit values, as estimated by individuals familiar with private market data and economic studies that simulate market behavior. These values should be used in rangeland investment analyses unless local data exists.

*The information presented here is summarized from a more comprehensive report titled "Recreation Day Values for Use in Benefit-Cost Analysis of Oregon's Allotment Management Plans," prepared by Hans Radke for the Oregon State Office, Bureau of Land Management, in April 1982.

Recommended Values

After reviewing existing studies and reports, a U.S. Forest Service (FS) task force recommended that the values shown in Table 1 be used in resource management planning on forests within each of their regions. The values shown in Table 1 are values per activity day, which is the unit of recreation use measurement commonly used by State and local wildlife and recreation agencies. An activity day consists of a visit by an individual to an area for hunting, fishing, camping, etc. during any portion or all of a 24-hour day.

The typical number of hours spent, by activity, for each activity day is shown in Table 2.

The FS and some other Federal agencies use a unit of recreation use measurement called the Recreation Visitor Day (RVD). An RVD consists of 12 hours of recreation activity. The values shown in Table 3 represent the estimated value of recreation per RVD, by activity, for each of the FS regions.

The values in Tables 1 and 2 were derived from the same basic information. To convert a value as shown in Table 1 to the value as shown in Table 3: (1) find the value for the activity and region in Table 1 and (2) multiply the value by the multiplier shown for the same activity and region (this multiplier is the result of dividing the average hours per activity into 12). The result is the value per RVD.

Updating the values: Since the FS values were developed in 1978 for use in their 1980 Resources Planning Act, they should be updated using the consumer price index (CPI) (see current Survey of Business for CPI values.)

State and District Office personnel will likely find it helpful to obtain a copy of the complete report prepared by Radke (contact WO 222) for examples of how State agency data can be used to calculate the average hunter days/animal harvested value per animal harvested, etc.

Appendix 3--Table 1. Average regional dollar values per activity day for wildlife and fish-dependent recreation on National Forest System lands.

Activity	Forest Service Region*									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Hunting:										
Big Game	$10.50	10.50	10.50	10.50	10.50	10.50	10.50	10.50	10.50	10.50
Waterfowl	$ 8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00
Small Game	$ 8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00
Upland Birds	$ 8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00
Nature Study, Wildlife (non-game use)	$ 7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25
Fishing:										
Cold Water	$ 5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25
Warm Water	$ 5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25
Ice Fishing	$ 5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25
Salt Water (Anadromous Sport Fishing)	$19.50	--	--	19.50	19.50	19.50	19.50	--	19.50	19.50

* Region 1
North Dakota
Montana
Idaho
Wyoming
South Dakota

Region 2
Colorado
Kansas
Nebraska

Region 3
Arizona
New Mexico

Region 4
Utah
Nevada
Idaho

Region 5
California

Region 6
Oregon
Washington

Source: U.S. Forest Service Memorandum 1920 and Management Planning "Unit Values to be Used in Forest Planning," February 24, 1981.

Appendix 3--Table 2. Average Regional Hours Per Activity Day (HAD) and Multipliers (HTP) to Transform Values Per Activity Day to Values per RVD

Activity	Entry[2]	Forest Service Region 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Hunting:											
	HAD	6.0	5.0	7.3	7.1	6.0	7.6		7.0	6.8	6.8
Big Game	MTP	2.0	2.4	1.6	1.7	2.0	1.6		1.7	1.7	1.8
	HAD	4.0	3.0	3.6	3	3.4	4.6		4.2	4.0	5.0
Waterfowl	MTP	3.0	4.0	3.3	4.0	3.5	2.6		2.9	3.0	2.4
	HAD	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.3	3.5	3.8		4.6	4.4	3
Small Game	MTP	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.8	3.4	3.1		2.6	3.0	4.0
	HAD	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.4	3.4	4.4		4.7	4.4	2.5
Upland Birds	MTP	3.0	3.0	3.1	2.7	3.5	2.7		2.6	2.7	3.0
Nature Study, Wildlife non-game use)	HAD	3.0	3.0	3	3	3	3		3	3	3
	MTP	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Fishing:											
	HAD	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.3	3.9	4.3		4.5	3.7	4.0
Cold Water	MTP	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.8		2.7	3.2	3.0
	HAD	4.0	3.0	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.5		4.4	3.8	-
Warm Water	MTP	3.0	4.0	3.2	4.0	3.3	3.4		2.7	3.1	-
	HAD	4.0	3.0	3	4.0	3.5	3		-	3.1	
Ice Fishing	MTP	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.4	4.0		-	3.8	3
											4.0
Salt Water (Aadromous	HAD	4.0	-	-	4.2	5.0	4.1		-	4.2	5.0
Sport Fishing)	MTP	3.0	-	-	2.9	2.4	2.9		-	2.6	2.1

[1]Derived from data included in 1530 (2800) letter to Directors of Recreation of various agencies from Director of Recreation Management, 6/24/76. Activity duration factors (HAD) were revised 11/80 by the Division of Recreation Management.

[2]HTP = (12) - (HAD)

[3]In order to meet requirements that values only be established for activities requiring all or a substantial portion of a 24-hour period, minimum average length of activity day must be 3.0 hours.

Source: "Defining Recreational Values Dependent on Wildlife and Fish to be used in Regional and Forest Lands and Resource Management Planning, July 18, 1980. Report of a Wildlife and Fish Values Task Force Established by Director RPA (USDA).

Appendix 3--Table 3. Average Regional Dollar Values Per RVD for Wildlife and Fish-Dependent Recreation to be Used in Comparing Forest Plan Alternatives

Activity	Forest Service Region*									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Hunting:										
Big Game	21.00	25.00	16.30	17.50	21.00	16.80		17.85	17.85	18.90
Waterfowl	24.00	32.00	26.40	32.00	28.00	20.80		23.20	24.00	19.20
Small Game	24.00	32.00	24.00	22.40	27.20	24.80		20.80	24.00	32.00
Upland Birds	24.00	32.00	24.80	21.60	28.00	21.00		20.80	21.60	24.00
Nature Study, Wildlife non-game use)	29.00	29.00	29.00	29.00	29.00	29.00		29.00	29.00	29.00
Fishing:										
Cold Water	15.75	15.75	15.20	14.70	15.75	14.70		14.20	16.80	15.75
Warm Water	15.75	21.00	16.80	21.00	17.30	17.85		14.20	16.30	-
Ice Fishing	15.75	21.00	21.00	15.75	17.85	21.00		-	19.95	21.00
Salt Water (Anadromous Sport Fishing)	58.50	-	-	56.55	46.80	56.55		-	50.70	40.95

* Region 1
North Dakota
Montana
Idaho
Wyoming
South Dakota

Region 2
Colorado
Kansas
Nebraska

Region 3
Arizona
New Mexico

Region 4
Utah
Nevada
Idaho

Region 5
California

Region 6
Oregon
Washington

Source: "Defining Recreational Values Dependent on Wildlife and Fish to be used in Regional and Forest Lands and Resource Management Planning," July 18, 1980. Report of a Wildlife and Fish Values Task Force Established by Director RPA. U.S. Forest Service

Pinyon-Juniper Chaining: Pinyon Juniper (P-J) chaining is still an accepted rangeland improvement technique and should be considered along with other vegetation manipulation techniques when resource conditions and planning considerations suggest that it is technically and environmentally feasible. Application of the Bureau's investment analysis procedures will help determine economic feasibility.

Proposed P-J chainings should be conducted in a timely manner, consistent with rangeland improvement implementation schedules, as identified in Range Program Summaries and AWP investment rankings.

Current policy emphasizes the sale and beneficial use of all woodland products. However, if local market conditions such as distance from local markets, availability of other free or less costly wood products (i.e., firewood, posts, poles, etc.) or a lack of interest in offered materials exists, the authorized officer can decide to initiate the proposed chaining. Proposed chainings should be scheduled with sufficient lead time to evaluate whether wood products can be marketed and to allow time for input from the other resource desciplines.

Prescribed Burning: Prescribed burning is an effective and accepted technique for vegetation management. It has been used quite successfully in some areas and appears to have the potential for wider use. It is particularly effective in situations where vegetation--fuel conditions meet certain criteria. Prescribed burning should follow similar planning and analysis considerations as those described above. Investment analysis procedures must be applied to proposed prescribed burns to ensure that the most cost-effective technique is selected. Measures should be taken to assure that the fire will be controlled and that property and life are protected. Bureau Manual Section 9211.3 provides guidance on prescribed burning.

Other Methods: Several other mechanical methods of vegetation management exist and are being utilized with success. Sale and physical removal of woodland products is desirable when market conditions permit. Questions concerning the acceptability and effectiveness of alternative techniques may be directed to the Division of Rangeland Resources (WO-222) at FTS 653-9210.

Occasionally, circumstances require that tests or trials of methods be conducted to determine which method is most cost effective. When this is the case, trial acreages should not exceed 1 percent of the total land area in need of treatment. Exceptions may be necessary if a larger area is needed to ensure valid test results. In all such trials, detailed cost records shall be kept, and the effectiveness of the treatments shall be monitored and recorded. Periodic monitoring of trial sites must continue so that long-term effectiveness and impacts can be studied. A report shall be submitted to the Director annually on the results and progress of the trials. That report must include cost and effectiveness data and the results of long-term monitoring of the site for impact assessment of impacts.

Bureau Manual Section 9222, Appendix 2, provides guidance for both pre- and post-treatment analyses of test sites. Reasonable modifications of report format and content may be made to fit the needs of specific programs.

TABLE 1
Allot. # ____
Date: _____

APPENDIX 5

RANGELAND INVESTMENT ANALYSIS
EXISTING PROGRAM DATA

LOCATION DATA

(01) ___ _____ _____ _____ ____ ___ ___
State District Resource Area Allotment Name Allot. No. Prog. Ident. Base Year

DATA PREPARED BY:

(02) _____ Range Conservationist (03) _____ _____
Last Name Last Name Title

(04) _____ Wildlife Biologist (05) _____ _____
Last Name Last Name Title

STRUCTURAL PROJECTS	NUMBER	TOTAL ANN. MAINT. COST	% BLM
(06) Springs (No.)			
(07) Reservoirs (No.)			
(08) Wells (No.)			
(09) Pipelines (Mi.)			
(10) Fences (Mi.)			
(11) Cattleguards (No.)			
Other Projects — Unit			
(12) _____ ( )			
(13) _____ ( )			
(14) _____ ( )			

NONSTRUCTURAL PROJECTS	LIFE SPAN	TOTAL REPLACEMENT COST	% BLM	NUMBER OF UNITS BY AGE CLASS 0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-25	+25
(15) Mech. Control (Ac.)									
(16) Chem. Control (Ac.)									
(17) Burning (Ac.)									
(18) Seeding (drill) (Ac.)									
Other Projects — Unit									
(19) _____ ( )									
(20) _____ ( )									
(21) _____ ( )									

TABLE 1
Allot. # ____

RANGELAND INVESTMENT ANALYSIS
PROGRAM BENEFITS

	BASE LEVEL	FIRST LEVEL		SECOND LEVEL		THIRD LEVEL		FOURTH LEVEL	
		Units	Yr	Units	Yr	Units	Yr	Units	Yr
LIVESTOCK FORAGE									
(22) Livestock AUMs									
RECREATION USE									
(23) Deer Hunting Days (HDs)									
(24) Elk HDs									
(25) Other Big Game HDs									
(26) Waterfowl HDs									
(27) Upland & Small Game HDs									
(28) Warm Water Angler Days (ADs)									
(29) Cold Water ADs									
(30) Inland Anadromous ADs									
(31) Devlpd. Site Rec. Days (RDs)									
(32) Dispersed Use RDs									
(33) Non-Game Wildlife RDs									
SOIL/WATER BENEFITS									
(34) Annual Maintenance Cost & Losses due to Sedimentation & Flooding from allotment									

OTHER OUTPUTS

	Output Type	Unit									
(35)											
(36)											
(37)											

(38) ____% of Livestock AUMs available between ____ & ____ at the Final Level.
Date

TABLE 2
Allot. # _____
Date: _____

RANGELAND INVESTMENT ANALYSIS
ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM DATA

LOCATION DATA

(01) _____ District _____ Resource Area _____ Allotment Name _____ Allot. No. _____ Prog. Ident. _____ Base Year

DATA PREPARED BY:

(02) _____ Last Name — Range Conservationist (03) _____ Last Name _____ Title

(04) _____ Last Name — Wildlife Biologist (05) _____ Last Name _____ Title

STRUCTURAL PROJECTS	FIRST MAINT	NEW UNITS	CONSTRUCTION COST BY YEAR 1	2	3	4	5	%BLM	ANN. MAINT. COST	%BLM
(06) Springs (No.)										
(07) Reservoirs (No.)										
(08) Wells (No.)										
(09) Pipeline (Mi.)										
(10) Fences (Mi.)										
(11) Cattleguards (No.)										
Other Projects — Unit										
(12) _____ ( )										
(13) _____ ( )										
(14) _____ ( )										

NONSTRUCTURAL PROJECTS	LIFE SPAN	NEW UNITS	CONSTRUCTION COST BY YEAR 1	2	3	4	5	%BLM	REPLACEMENT COST	%BLM
(15) Mech. Control (Ac.)										
(16) Chem. Control (Ac.)										
(17) Burning (Ac.)										
(18) Seeding (drill) (Ac.)										
Other Projects — Unit										
(19) _____ ( )										
(20) _____ ( )										
(21) _____ ( )										

(22) Permittee Costs: _____ Workdays (23) BLM Costs: _____ Workdays

TABLE 2
Allot. # ____

RANGELAND INVESTMENT ANALYSIS
PROGRAM BENEFITS

	BASE LEVEL	FIRST LEVEL Units	FIRST LEVEL Yr	SECOND LEVEL Units	SECOND LEVEL Yr	THIRD LEVEL Units	THIRD LEVEL Yr	FOURTH LEVEL Units	FOURTH LEVEL Yr
LIVESTOCK FORAGE									
(24) Livestock AUMs	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
RECREATION USE									
(25) Deer Hunting Days (HDs)	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(26) Elk HDs	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(27) Other Big Game HDs	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(28) Waterfowl HDs	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(29) Upland & Small Game HDs	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(30) Warm Water Angler Days (ADs)	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(31) Cold Water ADs	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(32) Inland Anadromous ADs	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(33) Devlpd. Site Rec. Days (RDs)	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(34) Dispersed Use RDs	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(35) Non-Game Wildlife RDs	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
SOIL/WATER BENEFITS									
(36) Annual Maintenance Cost & Losses due to Sedimentation & Flooding from allotment	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_

OTHER OUTPUTS

	Output Type	Unit									
(37)	_____	___	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(38)	_____	___	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_
(39)	_____	___	___	____	_	_____	_	____	_	_____	_

(40) ____% of Livestock AUMs available between ____ & _____ at the Final Level.
Date

AGE TWO ALLOTMENT NUMBER:XXXX ALLOTMENT NAME:XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

ATA PREPARED BY:XXXXXXXXXXX-RANGE CONS. XXXXXXXXXXX-XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXX-WILDLIFE BIOL. XXXXXXXXXXX-XXXXXXXXXXXXX

ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM COST DATA PROGRAM IDENT:XXXX
****

TRUCTURAL ROJECTS *********	FIRST MAINT (YRS)	NEW UNITS	CONSTRUCTION COST BY YEAR 1	2	3	4	5	%BLM	ANN.MAINT. COST	%BLM
PRINGS	XX	XXXXX NO	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXX	XXX
ESERVOIRS	XX	XXXXX NO	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXX	XXX
ELLS	XX	XXXXX NO	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXX	XXX
ENCES	XX	XXXXX MI	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXX	XXX
ATTLEGDS.	XX	XXXXX NO	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXX	XXX
XXXXXXXXX	XX	XXXXX YY	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXX	XXX
XXXXXXXXX	XX	XXXXX YY	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXX	XXX
XXXXXXXXX	XX	XXXXX YY	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXX	XXX

ONSTRUCTURAL LIFE ROJECTS *********	SPAN (YRS)	NEW UNITS	CONSTRUCTION COST BY YEAR 1	2	3	4	5	%BLM	REPLACEMENT COST	%BLM
ECH.CTRL.	XX	XXXXX AC	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXXX	XXX
HEM.CTRL.	XX	XXXXX AC	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXXX	XXX
URNING	XX	XXXXX AC	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXXX	XXX
EEDING	XX	XXXXX AC	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXXX	XXX
XXXXXXXXX	XX	XXXXX YY	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXXX	XXX
XXXXXXXXX	XX	XXXXX YY	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXXX	XXX
XXXXXXXXX	XX	XXXXX YY	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXX	$XXXXXX	XXX

ERMITTEE WORKDAYS: XXXDAYS $XXXXX BLM WORKDAYS: XXXDAYS $XXXXX

ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM BENEFIT DATA
****

NNUAL OUTPUTS **********	BASE LEVEL	FIRST LEVEL UNITS	YR	SECOND LEVEL UNITS	YR	THIRD LEVEL UNITS	YR	FOURTH LEVEL UNITS	YR
IVESTOCK AUMS	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
EER HUNTING DAYS	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
LK (HDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
TH.BIG GAME(HDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
ATERFOWL (HDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
PLAND&SMALL GAME	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
ARM WATER (ADs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
OLD WATER (ADs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
NLAND ANAD. (ADs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
ISPERSE USE (RDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
EVLPD SITE (RDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
ONGAME WLDF (RDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX
OIL&WATER LOSSES	$XXXXX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX
XXXXXXXXXXX-XXX	$XXXXX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX
XXXXXXXXXXX-XXX	$XXXXX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX
XXXXXXXXXXX-XXX	$XXXXX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX

XX% OF LIVESTOCK AUMS ARE AVAILABLE BETWEEN XX/XX & XX/XX AT THE FINAL LEVEL

nd of file - request executed 55 times

old bctable1

PAGE ONE

RANGELAND INVESTMENT ANALYSIS

DATE:XX/XX
TIME:XXXXX

STATE:XX
DISTRICT:XXXXXXXXXXXX ALLOT NO:XXXX PROGRAM IDENT:X
RESOURCE AREA:XXXXXXXXXXXX ALLOT NAME:XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX BASE YEAR:X

DATA PREPARED BY:XXXXXXXXXXXX-RANGE CONS. XXXXXXXXXXXX-XXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX-WILDLIFE BIOL. XXXXXXXXXXXX-XXXXXXXXXXX

EXISTING PROGRAM COST DATA

STRUCTURAL PROJECTS	UNITS	TOTAL ANNUAL MAINT. COST	
SPRINGS	XXXXX NO	$XXXXX	XXX%BLM
RESERVOIR	XXXXX NO	$XXXXX	XXX%BLM
WELLS	XXXXX NO	$XXXXX	XXX%BLM
FENCES	XXXXX MI	$XXXXX	XXX%BLM
CATTLEGDS.	XXXXX NO	$XXXXX	XXX%BLM
XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXX YY	$XXXXX	XXX%BLM
XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXX YY	$XXXXX	XXX%BLM
XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXX YY	$XXXXX	XXX%BLM

NONSTRUCTURAL PROJECTS	LIFE SPAN (YRS)	TOTAL REPLACEMENT COST	%BLM	NUMBER OF UNITS BY AGE GROUP 1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	
MECH.CTRL.AC	XX	$XXXXX	XXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX
CHEM.CTRL.AC	XX	$XXXXX	XXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX
BURNING AC	XX	$XXXXX	XXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX
SEEDING AC	XX	$XXXXX	XXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX
XXXXXXXXXXYY	XX	$XXXXX	XXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX
XXXXXXXXXXYY	XX	$XXXXX	XXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX
XXXXXXXXXXYY	XX	$XXXXX	XXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX

EXISTING PROGRAM BENEFIT DATA

ANNUAL OUTPUTS	BASE LEVEL	FIRST LEVEL UNITS	YR	SECOND LEVEL UNITS	YR	THIRD LEVEL UNITS	YR	FOURTH LE UNITS	Y
LIVESTOCK AUMS	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
DEER HUNTING DAYS	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
ELK (HDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
OTH.BIG GAME(HDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
WATERFOWL (HDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
UPLAND&SMALL GAME	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
WARM WATER (ADs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
COLD WATER (ADs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
INLAND ANAD. (ADs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
DISPERSE USE (RDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
DEVLPD SITE (RDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
NONGAME WLDF (RDs)	XXXXX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	XX	XXXXX	X
SOIL&WATER LOSSES	$XXXXX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	X
XXXXXXXXXXX-XXX	$XXXXX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	X
XXXXXXXXXXX-XXX	$XXXXX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	X
XXXXXXXXXXX-XXX	$XXXXX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	XX	$XXXXX	X

XXXX OF LIVESTOCK AUMS ARE AVAILABLE BETWEEN XX/XX & XX/XX AT THE FINAL LEVEL

end of file - request executed 57 times

The State of Texas
Office of State - Federal Relations

MEMO

October 26, 1982

Jim:

In a conversation with your secretary, I advised her that I would be sending you the enclosed information so that you would better understand the issue at hand.

I would appreciate your calling and allowing me to provide you with further details on the matter.

Ken

Ken

Ken Jordan
Agriculture Coordinator
(202) 488-3927

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
STATE CAPITOL
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711

WILLIAM P. CLEMENTS, JR.
GOVERNOR

October 21, 1982

The Honorable John R. Block
Secretary of Agriculture
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20205

Dear Jack:

Central and West Texas ranch leaders have brought to my attention what they perceive to be a major continuing problem revolving around efforts by the U.S. Forest Service to obtain jurisdiction over the management and use of privately owned range lands. These leaders working through the National Cattlemen's Association have developed two proposed papers designed to provide an understanding of the responsibilities of the Forest Service vis-a-vis the Soil Conservation Service with respect to a definition of range land and coordination of technical assistance programs and inventory activities. These were presented to representatives of both agencies at a meeting in Fort Worth last week. To me these appear to be very reasonable proposals, and I am quite concerned that there appear to be objections from the Forest Service and Assistant Secretary Crowell to acceptance of these as policy of the Department.

I want to explain why private land owners object to having their range land inventoried and classified by the Forest Service. By law, the Forest Service is the federal agency responsible for managing National Forest System lands. Because of that, the general public tends to confuse privately owned land classified as forest with federal forest land; therefore, they have demanded that greater restraints and controls be placed on uses of any land classified as forest. This concept is certainly embodied in federal laws and regulations, and future legislation and federal regulation could place even greater restraints on use of these lands.

Forest and range lands are separate kinds of lands and have different uses. Because the lands we are concerned about are range lands and not forests, they should be managed in different ways. Forest lands are subject to many restrictions on management improvement which do not apply to range land. As one example, herbicides that are valuable management tools on range

lands cannot be utilized on forest lands. The Forest Service and State Forestry Agencies are given several responsibilities with regard to forest land under the COOPERATIVE FORESTRY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1978. These conditions do not apply to private range lands.

The Forest Service is basically a regulatory agency mandated by Congress to manage National Forest Assistance lands. Private range land owners and users prefer to receive voluntary technical assistance provided by non-regulatory agencies at the land user's request as, for example, a cooperative agreement with locally governed Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

Principles of forest management and principles of range management are different. Likewise, the objectives of managing these two distinctive kinds of land are different. As recently as last week, I am told that Forest Service personnel from the Washington office stated at Fort Worth that "one of the reasons to classify range land as forest was to obtain more money for state forestry agencies".

Jack, I hope you will look into this situation personally and provide for programs and assignment of responsibilities in line with the basic philosophy of the Reagan administration. The 1980 RPA Program Report, in my opinion, is a direct contradiction of the administration's philosophy of reducing the role of government and restricting the intrusion of federal agencies into the management of privately owned land. As I stated earlier, I believe that the National Cattlemen's Association recommendations are appropriate and are workable.

I enclose copies of these recommendations, in case you have not yet been given copies by your staff. I want to stress that while I am speaking for Texas, this is clearly a national issue. Any of your officials who consider this merely a Texas issue is in error, as the position of the National Cattlemen's Association represents the consensus of the national organization.

Sincerely,

W. P. Clements, Jr.

William P. Clements, Jr.
Governor of Texas

ffm
Enclosures

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
STATE CAPITOL
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711

WILLIAM P. CLEMENTS, JR.
GOVERNOR

October 21, 1982

The Honorable John Crowell
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture
U. S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20205

Dear Mr. Crowell:

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss our concerns about the continuing problem of definition of forest and range lands and coordination of responsibilities between the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service. As you know, Texas has large areas of both forest and range land, almost all of which is privately owned and managed. Our Central and West Texas ranchers have been very concerned for a number of years over what they perceive to be systematic efforts by the Forest Service to obtain control over the way in which they manage their land. The two draft statements proposed by the National Cattlemen's Association at the meeting with USDA officials in Fort Worth on October 14, 1982 represent, I believe, a constructive effort to address and resolve the continuing concerns of our ranch industry leadership. You indicated that you thought that they were being unduly alarmist in their concerns and requested that I provide you with background information to document our concern.

As far as I can determine, the Forest Service has persistently sought, at least since 1973, to expand its authority to cover privately owned ranch lands. The 1975 Draft RPA Program Report is our first documented evidence of this effort. This was followed in 1976 by an interagency agreement between the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service on coordination of range programs on non-federal forest lands and inventory activities on forest and range lands.

Subsequently, in January 1977, the two agencies reached agreement on definition of forest and range lands. The Forest Service has interpreted this to legitimize their efforts to assume responsibility for inventory and classification of private range lands as forest lands.

In 1978, the State and Private Forestry Division Regional Office in Atlanta prepared, published and widely distributed maps of western range lands classifying large areas as forest lands.

The 1980 RPA Program Report contained numerous references to Forest Service assistance to private land owners and direct involvement on privately owned land.

In 1981 the State and Private Forestry Division published a document containing an explicit strategy for expanding Forest Service assistance to private land owners. Finally, the 1985 RPA alternative goal draft document issued in early 1982 openly discusses proposed Forest Service activities on private forest lands.

These actions taken together appear to represent a classic case of expansion of authority and control by a federal regulatory agency. I hope that this chronology will be helpful to you as you attempt to understand our concerns.

While this is clearly a national issue, Governor Clements is seriously concerned about the problem and would like a resolution of this issue as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Jarvis E. Miller

Jarvis E. Miller, Director
Governor's Office of Budget and Planning
ffm

DRAFT SECRETARY'S MEMORANDUM ON RANGE

1. PURPOSE

The Nation's range 1/ resource includes about half the land area in the contiguous 48 States and large areas in Alaska and Hawaii. The USDA manages more than 102 million acres of federal range, and USDA programs influence the use and management of other federal and 414 million acres of nonfederal rangeland. 2/

Ranges provide the principal source of forage for the cattle, sheep and goat operations on thousands of American farms and ranches.

In addition to supplying livestock forage, ranges provide a vast national treasure of vegetation, minerals, water, recreation, and wildlife and fish, as well as archeological, historical, and cultural amenities. As human populations increase and demand for food and energy expand, the need for forage and the other range resources will increase.

In recent years, the condition and productivity of the Nation's ranges have improved through grazing management, seeding, weed and brush control, water management, and erosion control. However, much work remains to be done to achieve acceptable ecological conditions and levels of productivity as a basis to respond to current and future demands on the range resource.

This Memorandum sets forth Departmental policy relating to range resources and coordination of range activities among agencies of the USDA and other executive agencies, organizations, and individuals. It is furtherance of USDA responsibilities mandated by the legislation identified in paragraph 5. Agencies of the Department of Agriculture affected by this Memorandum include APHIS, ARS, ASCS, CSRS, ERS, ES, FmHA, FS, OICD, SCS, AND SRS.

2. CANCELLATIONS

This Memorandum cancels and replaces Secretary's Memorandum No. 1999 dated October 23, 1979, "Statement of Range Policy."

3. POLICY

It is USDA policy to implement program to:

a. Improve and enhance range ecosystems.

1/ Range - Embraces rangelands and also many forest lands which support an understory or periodic cover of herbaceous or shrubby vegetation amendable to certain range management principles or practices.

2/ Rangeland - Land on which the native vegetation (climax or natural potential) is predominantly grasses, grass-like plants, forbs or shrubs suitable for grazing or browsing use. Rangelands include natural grassland, savannas, most deserts, tundra, alpine plant communities, coastal marshes, wet meadows and introduced plant communities managed like rangeland.

Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended (PL 93-378); the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (PL 95-192); the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978 (PL 95-306); Subtitle M - Rangeland Research of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981; the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978 (PL 95-514); and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (PL 94-579).

b. The NRE Committee will provide Departmentwide leadership and will establish a Range Issues Working Group to help implement its range responsibilities.

c. The NRE Committee will:

(1) Coordinate the range policies of affected USDA agencies.

(2) Provide a forum for formulating and assessing alternative range policies and procedures better to serve the missions of the various agencies within USDA and those of other executive agencies.

(3) Encourage and assist USDA agencies to develop liaison, as needed, with other executive agencies, public interest organizations, and professional societies.

(4) Coordinate with the Rangeland Research Board established by the Secretary pursuant to Subtitle M of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 and assist the Secretary in carrying out the purpose of this legislation.

(5) Provide the Secretary an annual status report of range issues under consideration, opportunities for improvement, and progress toward resolution.

d. <u>Agency Compliance</u>

(1) Each agency of USDA will maintain its policies and program direction in compliance with this Memorandum. Agency heads will assure that current range program activities are delineated and that range programs of each agency are known to the NRE Committee.

(2) Rules, regulations, and other directives are to be written or revised as necessary to comply with this Memorandum.

b. Contribute to the social and economic well being of people and communities that depend on range for their livelihoods.

c. Provide continuing research and technology development to increase range conservation and range productivity.

d. Support local, State, national and international education and cooperation designed to improve range condition and range productivity.

e. Emphasize cooperation and coordination with Federal, State, local and private organizations and institutions and individuals in planning and executing range programs to benefit the Department's range constituency and to prevent duplication and overlap of duties in reaching interagency goals affecting range.

f. Provide periodic inventories of the Nation's range resources that are compatible among agencies, that are acceptable and beneficial to rangeland users, that are based upon technically sound economic and ecological principles, and are useful in improving range resources at the local, State, and National levels.

g. Provide technical, managerial, and other assistance programs for range owners, operators, and other users that will encourage application and use of range practices that improve and enhance production of red meat and fiber.

h. Administer the range resources of National Forest System lands in an economically and ecologically sound manner which will enhance and improve range productivity.

4. ABBREVIATIONS

USDA - U.S. Department of Agriculture
NRE - Natural Resources and Environment
FS - Forest Service
SCS - Soil Conservation Service
APHIS - Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
FmHA - Farmers Home Administration
ASCS - Agricultural Stablization and Conservation Service
ARS - Agricultural Research Service
CSRS - Cooperative State Research Service
ERS - Economic Research Service
ES - Extension Service
SRS - Statistical Reporting Service
OICD - Office of International Cooperation and Development

5. RESPONSIBILITIES

a. Plans of action to implement the policies of this Memorandum will be developed by affected agencies and will be subject to review by the NRE Committee of the Secretary's Policy and Coordination Council. These plans will be prepared in accordance with directions of the Forest and Rangeland

Agreement for Coordination of Technical
Assistance Programs and Inventory Activities

United States Department of Agriculture
Forest Service—Soil Conservation Service

I. INTRODUCTION

The Forest Service (FS) and Soil Conservation Service (SCS) each have long-standing statutory and delegated authorities for programs and activities on federal and nonfederal lands. It is essential that each agency's role and responsibilities in technical assistance programs and inventory activities on nonfederal lands be defined, understood, and followed to avoid duplication of effort and make maximum effective use of manpower and monetary resources.

II. PURPOSE

This agreement is intended to promote harmonious working relations between the two agencies at all levels and to clarify (1) technical assistance responsibilities for nonfederal land and (2) inventory responsibilities on nonfederal land.

III. POLICY

SCS and FS will cooperate fully within the scope of each agency's authorities in carrying out their respective programs on nonfederal land.

FS and SCS will coordinate resource inventories to avoid overlap or duplication of data collection activities. They will cooperate in identification of data needs and will use data developed by each other and by other agencies or groups as may be applicable to the programs they administer.

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Technical Assistance

1. SCS will provide direct technical assistance to landowners and users of nonfederal land. Such assistance will normally be provided through conservation districts as a part of SCS responsibility for conservation planning including assisting landowners and users with land use/land treatment decisions.

2. FS will work indirectly with landowners and users of nonfederal forest land through appropriate State and Federal agencies, consultants, and others in its cooperative forestry programs.

3. SCS will cooperate with State forestry organizations to assure that timber management is fully integrated into conservation plans developed with landowners and users.

4. FS and SCS will work with State forestry organizations to enhance their knowledge of livestock and wildlife forage potential and grazing opportunities so that they can reflect these values in their timber management recommendations.

5. FS will encourage appropriate State agencies to work closely with SCS and conservation districts to help landowners make full use of existing SCS technical assistance on nonfederal forest land.

6. FS and SCS will work together and with other agencies and organizations to identify research needs for nonfederal land and to interpret and disseminate research information to appropriate users.

B. Inventories

1. FS and SCS will work together on inventory programs for nonfederal land to identify data needs, avoid duplication of effort, and assure that data collected by each agency are mutually usable.

2. SCS will be responsible for all resource inventory on nonfederal rangeland. 1/

3. FS will be responsible for timber resource inventory on nonfederal forest land. SCS will be responsible for all other resource inventory on nonfederal forest land.

4. National Resource Inventory (SCS) and Forest Inventory and Analysis (FS) personnel will meet regularly to assure coverage, avoid duplication, develop common methodology and standards, and broaden opportunities for sharing of information.

V. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

A. Both savannas and natural grasslands on which mesquite or other low value trees have increased or invaded will be considered rangelands unless the landowner or user chooses to manage the land primarily for wood products.

B. This agreement recognizes the policies set forth in the following:

1. Memorandum of understanding of SCS, FS, and ERS pertaining to comprehensive river basin planning, April 15, 1968.

2. USDA Interagency Agreement on Forestry, February 1978.

1/ For purposes of this agreement, rangeland is considered to be land on which the native vegetation (climax or natural potential plant communities) is predominantly grasses, grass-like plants, forbs or shrubs suitable for grazing or browsing use. Rangeland includes natural grassland, savannas, most deserts, tundra, alpine plant communities, coastal marshes, wet meadows, and introduced plant communities managed like rangeland.

3. Joint memorandum of understanding of BLM, FS, and SCS pertaining to coordinated resource planning, January 1973.

C. Cooperation with other agencies and organizations having responsibilities or interests in activities covered by this agreement is important.

D. Existing memoranda of understanding between conservation districts and State forestry agencies are recognized and will be used to further the purposes of this agreement.

E. Procedures for implementing this agreement may be developed locally in consultation with officials of conservation districts and State organizations.

F. Interagency reimbursement will not be required but may be made under separate agreement as appropriate.

VI. MODIFICATION

This agreement shall remain in effect until canceled or modified by the parties in writing. It may be amended or supplemented to include agreement by other agencies or groups, as appropriate.

Chief Soil Conservation Service	Date	Chief Forest Service	Date