Viewpoint of a Federal Agency

T. A. SCHLAPFER

The most current issue that resource managers, politicians, and public administrators are facing today in resource management is planning for the future. Resource managers and our federal and state legislators have spent much time wrestling with this subject. The goal is to put an end to destructive expansion and to allow for the orderly classification of land and the harvest of resources. Along with the need to identify land uses, we must also meet increasing demands for products. As an example, we need to step up red meat production on our public and private lands.

Demands for meat are increasing. Ranges are capable of producing more forage to raise animals, and this can be done competitively with other feed sources. In this day of energy shortages it is even more important that a well-managed rangeland can produce feed with much less fossil fuel. *Science* magazine in an article in November, 1973, reported that it

---

The author is regional forester, U. S. Forest Service, Portland, Oregon.

takes about 22 gallons of gasoline per acre to produce corn. Range livestock production has a much lower requirement, maybe about 1/20th for the same gross energy production.

The question then is: "How do we increase production substantially on our rangelands to meet the projected consumption of meat?" I propose cooperative resource planning as one of the most dramatic ways to accomplish this.

In June, 1965, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Soil Conservation Service (SCS) signed a Memorandum of Agreement outlining policy and procedure for working with Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD) and their Cooperators. In 1966, BLM and the Forest Service updated their original 1951 agreement, which was primarily aimed at range management, to include a broader spectrum of resource planning. The stated purpose of the agreement is to encourage cooperation between the agencies to improve management of resources for which each agency is responsible as well as the associate private and other public lands. The Memorandum also provides for the creation of regional, state, and local agreements. In 1969 the Forest Service in Oregon was invited to participate with BLM, SCS, and the Soil and Water Conservation Districts as a cooperative organization. The original emphasis in Oregon was to improve range management. Over the years, however, it became evident that no single resource could be planned without considering the other resources and services that must come from the same land area. This evolutionary process led into the cooperative range resource planning efforts now being developed in Oregon and other states by agencies, landowners, and permittees.

One of the biggest advantages of having a ranch plan prepared by and with the commitment of adjacent landowners is the greater flexibility it offers the rancher in overall management operations. For example, the coordination of "turn-on" dates. In the past there have been many times when the Forest Service has delayed opening dates for summer range past the closing date of BLM's lands. This, of course, left the permittee with a choice—to trespass on BLM or to move into trespass on the National Forest. A plan prepared in advance allows for these exigencies so that the rancher is not caught in the middle. During the northwest drought in the summer of 1973, permittees with good plans and grazing systems which improved range conditions and increased forage were allowed extensions for use of National Forest land.

More than Grass

Coordinated planning recognizes more than just grass. Soils, water quality, wildlife, forestry, and other resource needs are considered. Potential conflicts are resolved before they develop. And "many heads are better than one." A plan developed by several parties with commitment by everyone is more likely to result in a successful program. Furthermore, if one person transfers, the new man is fit into an existing team and he must get concurrence of the team to change things.

One benefit of interagency coordination that should not be overlooked is the breaking down of traditional barriers that inhibited interagency coordination. There was a time that the Forest Service would not accept range analysis techniques of other agencies, and other agencies felt the same about Forest Service methods and techniques. After several years of coordinated planning effort, these barriers have almost disappeared.

In some cases, however, there are still some startling philosophical differences in land management by local agency people. Operating independently, they often negate each other's programs. This is principally lack of understanding caused by poor communication. When agencies work together on the ground, particularly in cooperative ranch planning, these barriers are broken down by strengthened communications and working relationships. On the whole, technical guidelines are becoming more uniform between agencies every year.

Coordinated plans not only deal with the grazing aspects of the rancher's economic unit, but they also spell out management prescriptions for other resources within the area.

A Total Resource Plan

Murderer's Creek area in Grant County, Oregon, is an example of a total resource plan. The plan, completed in March of 1973, covers an area a little over 100,000 acres. The overall objective of the plan is to prepare one document from which the Oregon State Wildlife Commission, BLM, the Forest Service, and the livestock permittees can operate in harmony. The specific objectives are: (1) to improve the quantity and quality of forage and habitat for domestic and wild animals; (2) to offer for harvest the maximum amount of forest products compatible with the other resource values; (3) to offer recreational opportunities and development of a transportation system; (4) to maintain a high quality fisheries habitat; and (5) to provide sanctuary for a herd of 100 free-roaming horses.

The overriding prescription is to enhance the resources and land uses of the area while offering the maximum protection to land values.

The plan goes on to discuss in detail what will be done on the ground to meet the management objectives. There is a plan for big game and upland game birds, fisheries, water impoundments, irrigation, a grazing system, and so forth. By cooperation of all the agency personnel and the grazing permittee, there will be a gradual improvement in the quality of the biota and of the goods and services produced from this unit.

Another cooperative plan has been implemented by the Big Butte Cattle Association in southern Oregon on an area of nearly 145,000 acres. Besides the association consisting of four ranchers, the other participants include Medco and Boise Cascade—both timber companies, BLM, Oregon Wildlife Commission, Forest Service, and the SCS. The area supports a cow-yearling livestock operation, critical winter range for deer, timber production, recreation, and it also contains the water supply for the city of Medford. As in the other example previously mentioned, the objectives are to maximize the land capability in terms of resource production, to improve the quality of goods and services from the unit, and to identify and reduce potential conflicts between the resources and the public. The package includes a grazing system plan, a timber management plan, as well as plans for developing improvements, managing wildlife habitat, public recreation, and water production.

As of now there have been about 66 coordinated ranch plans written in Oregon. In 1973, more than 800,000 acres were covered in Oregon by coordinated plans. We really feel that this approach to ranch operations makes a lot of sense. If all of the adjacent landowners and interested agency personnel have the opportunity to mold the plan to meet their respective needs, the combined effort will be a more satisfactory basis from which to work. The payoff to the rancher will be a more

coordinated approach to scientific range management, which should yield more animal unit months, more production of red meat, and fewer problems in dealing with agencies.

While we are working on cooperative ranch planning, the Forest Service is also deeply involved with other agencies in an overall land planning effort.

The last two administrations have emphasized the need for partnership planning between local, state, and federal governments. There is only so much land and resource base in public and private ownership. The resource capability of this country has been estimated as adequate for a population of about 160 million. As you know, our most recent census puts the United States population at well over 200 million. In determining how our needs may be satisfied, there are many critical questions to answer. How much recreation, timber, grazing land, and wildlife habitat can federal lands provide? How much can come from state, local, and private lands? Why are the small woodlot owners not producing their share of the timber volume needed to meet national needs?

These are the questions to which a national planning effort must be directed. To get at these problems all planning agencies must work in concert with each other. The common denominator for this effort must be communication. During the entire planning process, the state and local governments and private land owners must be intimately involved. The process will be complex—recognition of both local and national needs, and coordination with state and local plans, as well as private industry plans.

Another cooperator in land planning is the public. As you know, agencies are making a real effort now to invite the public to participate in program preparation. Through open meetings, mailings, ad hoc committees, and an open door policy, people are being heard. I feel that this has resulted in better plans, because if compromises are reached now with interested parties, we should be able to reduce the number of incidents which end up in court. Land management should not be determined by judicial process. As long as people maintain the interest that has been shown in the last couple of years, and if we continue to have an open door policy, the overall operation will only improve.

Needs On-ground Application

No plan is worth more than the paper it's written on if the results are not applied to the ground. A policy statement and some new objectives for range management for the Pacific Northwest region of the Forest Service were recently signed into effect. We believe these objectives, developed by myself and the forest supervisors, will result in better management that is visible on the ground. I want to share this with you.

Grazing is, and will remain, an important use on all public lands that have a forage resource that can be used in perpetuity and in harmony with other equally valuable resources and uses. Three basic elements—planning, permittee cooperation, and administration—are essential in developing and maintaining the region's goal of a quality range program that contributes its due share of meat and fiber for an ever-expanding population.

To meet our goal, the range program must achieve a new vitality. It must have well-defined objectives, realistic targets, and a commitment by line officers to devote a fair share of their time and finances. Full integrity of range management appropriations must be maintained, and maximum accomplishment will have to be extracted from the present short supply of dollars. The establishment of program objectives relevant to our real needs will permit the region to make its case for adequate financing.

Will Note All Resources, Values

The land use planning process will not overlook or underrate the presence of a usable range resource, and land use plans will assess and define the role of grazing in relation to other resources and values. Where range problems are identified on otherwise suitable range, resolution of these—not elimination of grazing—will be our basic mission. The land use planning process and supporting land classification efforts will also identify those situations where present land ownership patterns might be adjusted to meet our objective of favorably influencing sound range management practices on associated private and other related lands. In addition, range planning (in cooperation with appropriate state and federal agencies) will give maximum attention to integrating lands of all ownerships under a single ranch unit management plan where this will enhance proper land use objectives, without regard to property boundaries. Finally, short-range and long-range planning efforts will identify unused and underused suitable range areas and develop strategies for optimum harvest of the usable resource.

Increased permittee involvement and full acceptance of management responsibilities will be essential to fulfillment of the range program. To get this involvement, permittees must be full partners in the planning and administration effort. Disinterest in full participation which has, and is, resulting in resource abuse and deterioration must not be tolerated; line officer action to reverse deterioration must be prompt, fair, and firm.

Just as the permittee has definite responsibilities in use of the range resource, so does the forest supervisor have the responsibility to provide all interdisciplinary technical expertise (including research findings) necessary to develop standards, analyze problems, prescribe solutions, devise satisfactory management systems, and conduct essential surveillance of grazing operations and results. He also has a responsibility to help organize range users to collectively make more effective use of available resources—grazing associations and allotment combinations will be promoted in lieu of isolation and division.

Grazing is a highly visible use of the National Forests and, by design on the part of forest supervisors, will become more visible both inside the service and to the public. Every allotment must become a demonstration allotment. Increased attention to the placement of structural improvements on the land which meet standards and exhibit craftsmanship, as well as complement the landscape visually and environmentally, is an essential accretion to the initiation of satisfactory management systems.

A dynamic, continuous system of allotment evaluation and comparison with standards and objectives must be maintained as an integral part of the range program.

To achieve this we plan to:

(1) Analyze all allotments to determine present management level and develop investment costs and specific targets to place all allotments under quality management by 1984. In the interim, implement a level of range management on all allotments which tolerates no unacceptable resource damage.

(2) Maximize permittee responsibility and accountability in both planning and executing the range program.

(3) Obtain range scientist input into all unit plans and utilize an interdisciplinary approach in developing all new and revised range management plans, to insure a balanced resource allocation.

(4) Provide the necessary range scientist input for land use planning and land adjustment activities to insure that land ownership patterns are considered in the light of their effectiveness in promoting sound conservation practices on associated private and public rangelands.

(5) Make maximum use of the interagency coordinating planning approach in developing all allotment plans to promote better management on associated public and private rangelands.

(6) Identify areas of unused or underused suitable range and place these in production, under proper management, for the benefit of the nation.

(7) Generate an effective cadre of range trained people (both line and staff) needed to accomplish the goal. Provide a continuing training program with development opportunities and an essential career ladder in order to attract and maintain a high level of range expertise.

This policy statement and objectives have specific targets for accomplishment. As a measure of progress, we will meet annually to see where we are. We believe this approach will provide better management visible on the ground. The key to good future land and resource management really lies in the willingness of everyone to cooperate and to accept any trade-offs that become more apparent as time goes on. If we plan the proper allocation of resources, with the best mix of uses, we will be able to optimize what we have. And if we do a more intensive job, we should be able to approach the 21st century confident that we will be able to provide an adequate supply of necessary products including red meat for the people of the nation through coordinated land planning.

Viewpoint of a Wildlife Manager

JOHN W. McKEAN

Aldo Leopold, the father of wildlife management in North America, defined wildlife management as "the art of making the land produce sustained annual crops of wildlife for recreational use."

The wildlife manager has the difficult task of practicing that art on lands that are owned by someone else and dedicated primarily to other uses. This is one reason coordination, cooperation, and compromise are essential tools of the trade. Another reason is that the wildlife he plans for is the common property of all the people of the State or, more often, all 200 million U. S. citizens, most of whom want a voice in any decision.

For these reasons coordination in wildlife management planning has historically been a *must,* but as recreational demands approach the limits of tolerance of either the wildlife resource or landowners, more sophisticated systems of coordination and planning become essential.

A diversity of multi-discipline planning systems have been developed, but in my experience they fall in two major categories: (1) Problem or area-oriented planning; and (2) comprehensive land use planning—county, state, and national.

The wildlife manager must be aggressive in both categories, so I will tell you briefly of some of our experiences in Oregon.

One of our first applications of a true multi-disciplinary approach to a resource problem occurred in the 1950's on a controversial deer winter range which had a long history of abuse by domestic livestock, wildlife, rodents, insects, drouth, etc. Several years of the pot calling the kettle black was achieving no constructive end until an interdisciplinary team composed of representatives of the Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Extension Service, Wildlife Department, and landowners objectively inventoried the problem area and developed a plan for constructive solution of problems. Not all of the remedies conceived by this task force have been implemented, but at least the landowners have a better understanding of the nature of the problem and potential solutions, and the public better understands the need for some regulation of wildlife densities on those lands.

Similar interdisciplinary planning programs have been conducted on selected problem areas or geographic subdivisions in much of our state and the federal land management agencies are now commonly using that approach in developing resource plans for federal lands.

A similar interdisciplinary approach has been used by the Oregon Wildlife Department in developing land use plans for over 100,000 acres of land within state wildlife management areas.

This kind of coordination in resource planning is:

Logical—because it is based upon inventories and knowledge of natural systems.

Simple—because it pools knowledge of many disciplines.

Flexible—because the resulting plans can easily be changed.

Practical—because it saves time and money.

The wildlife manager has a definite role in the broader mission of comprehensive land, water, and resource planning. Recognizing that man's manipulation of the environment is the dominant factor affecting the production of wildlife, wildlife agencies throughout the nation have necessarily become deeply involved in those decisions.

Using the "carrot and stick" approach, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife through the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts has offered some real incentives for the states to develop a meaningful data base for resource planning and to establish management goals. In addition to offering federal assistance in planning, they have provided that a state which has an approved state plan will not be required to write up detailed annual plans for approvable segments of the planned programs. Partially for that reason, but more importantly with the objective of developing a data base that could help land and water use planning bodies make better decisions, we launched an aggressive planning program in 1969.

Our first step was to assemble an inventory of all available fish and wildlife habitat in the State and the distribution and density of all major species of wildlife within those habitat types. With the assistance of other agencies we also made some guesses as to the changes that might occur during the next 20 years (1990).

The author is director, Oregon State Wildlife Commission, Portland, Oregon.