

Y4
.Ag 8/1
F 76/45

1010

92V4
-Ag 8/1
F 76/45

**COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT AND FIRE
PROTECTION, AND URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL
FORESTRY PROGRAM**

GOVERNMENT

DOCUMENTS

Storage

AUG 23 1971

THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

**H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084, H.R. 6086 and
similar bills**

MAY 17, 18, AND 19, 1971

Serial 92-G

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture

(11)



**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1971**

64-348

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION



1/8 PA.
F 50/45
DOCUMENTS
AUG 28 1941
THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina,
Vice Chairman
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky
GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas
THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington
ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, Texas
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
B. F. SISK, California
BILL ALEXANDER, Arkansas
BILL D. BURLISON, Missouri
JOHN R. RARICK, Louisiana
ED JONES, Tennessee
JOHN MELCHER, Montana
JOHN G. DOW, New York
DAWSON MATHIS, Georgia
BOB BERGLAND, Minnesota
ARTHUR A. LINK, North Dakota
FRANK E. DENHOLM, South Dakota
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii

PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma,
Ranking Minority Member
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California
WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia
GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
CLARENCE E. MILLER, Ohio
ROBERT B. MATHIAS, California
WILEY MAYNE, Iowa
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
ROBERT D. PRICE, Texas
KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Kansas
WILMER D. MIZELL, North Carolina
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
JOHN KYL, Iowa
J. KENNETH ROBINSON, Virginia

Mrs. CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Chief Clerk*
LACEY C. SHARP, *General Counsel*
HYDE H. MURRAY, *Associate Counsel*
L. T. EASLEY, *Staff Consultant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina, *Chairman*

THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington
BILL D. BURLISON, Missouri
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania
JOHN G. DOW, New York

CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California
JOHN KYL, Iowa
J. KENNETH ROBINSON, Virginia

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
H.R. 6082, a bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for cooperative forest management.....	1
H.R. 6084, a bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for cooperative forest fire protection.....	2
H.R. 6086, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and furnish financial and other assistance to States and other public bodies and organizations in providing an urban environmental forestry program, and for other purposes.....	3
Statement of:	
Abbitt, Hon. Watkins M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia.....	14
Allen, R. C., chairman, Southern Forest Resource Council.....	81
Baring, Hon. Walter S., a Representative in Congress from the State of Nevada.....	109
Bennett, H. D., executive vice president, Appalachian Hardwood Manufacturers, Inc.....	49
Capps, Osal B., State forester, Missouri Department of Conservation..	67
Cleveland, Hon. James C., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Hampshire.....	110
Cliff, Edward P., Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.....	17, 39
Cobb, Samuel S., director, Pennsylvania Bureau of Forestry, representing the National Association of State Foresters.....	25
Collier, Hon. Harold F., a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois.....	111
Diamond, Henry L., commissioner, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.....	121
Ellefson, Paul V., director, environmental programs, Society of American foresters.....	55
Falkner, Edgar H., Fotofore Consulting.....	120
Glascock, H. R., Jr., executive vice president, Society of American Foresters.....	54
Goldwater, Hon. Barry M., Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	75
Griffin, Hon. Charles H., a Representative in Congress from the State of Mississippi.....	112
Hafer, A. B., consulting forester, Laurinburg, N.C.....	32
Haley, Hon. James A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.....	113
Hammerschmidt, Hon. John Paul, a Representative in Congress from the State of Arkansas.....	113
Johnson, Hon. Harold T., a Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	12
Kaylor, Joseph F., Jekyll Island, Ga.....	121
Kimball, Thomas L., executive director, National Wildlife Federation.....	107
Kyros, Hon. Peter N., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maine.....	114
Long, Hon. Speedy O., a Representative in Congress from the State of Mississippi.....	117
McGrath, Marshall, representing the Forest Farmers Association....	78
McIntire, Hon. Clifford, director, Natural Resources Department, American Farm Bureau Federation.....	47

	Page
Moore, Robert, consulting forester, representing Association of Consulting Foresters.....	28
Moran, Lewis, California State forester, representing the National Association of State Foresters.....	51
Muench, Dr. John, Jr., forest economist, National Forest Products Association.....	102
Pickelner, Joel M., legislative information specialist, National Wildlife Federation.....	99
Pomeroy, Kenneth, chief forester, American Forestry Association, representing Trees for People.....	61
Scherle, Hon. William J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Iowa.....	118
Shirley, A. R., director, Georgia Forestry Commission.....	87
Sikes, Hon. Robert L. F., a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.....	3
Sisk, Hon. B. F., a Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	118
Stuart, Edward, Jr., president, Eastern Forestry, Inc.....	122
Thompson, Charles P., executive director, American Landowners Association.....	123
Ullman, Hon. Al, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon.....	119
Zimmerman, Gordon K., executive secretary, National Association of Conservation Districts.....	57
Correspondence submitted to the subcommittee:	
Bagwell, Colin, Huntsville, Ala., letter of May 11, 1971.....	129
Bradley, John M., Jr., president, Resource Management Service, Inc., letter of May 10, 1971.....	124
Brown, Mrs. Earl A., president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, letter of May 11, 1971.....	129
Carswell, Johnny, president, Hardwood Research Council, letter of May 10, 1971.....	128
Ganser, W. R., Jr., Southern Forest Products Association, letter of May 19, 1971.....	139
Hibbard, John E., secretary-forester, Connecticut Forest and Park Association, Inc., letters of May 12, 1971.....	130, 134
Huntington, Mrs. Mary H., chairman, Conservation Department, Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs, letter of May 14, 1971.....	136
Johnson, Reuben L., director of legislative services, National Farmers Union, letter of May 14, 1971.....	137
Lack, Wendell, D., State forester, Mississippi Forestry Commission, letter of May 7, 1971.....	124
Lederer, Robert F., executive vice president, American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., letter of May 14, 1971.....	136
Leonard, Mrs. Warren H., president, Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs, letter of May 15, 1971.....	137
Pritchard, H. Wayne, director, Soil Conservation Society of America, letter of May 3, 1971.....	124
Ripley, Thomas H., director, Division of Forestry, Fisheries and Wildlife Development, Tennessee Valley Authority, letter of January 12, 1971.....	126
Scott, John W., master, National Grange, letter of May 17, 1971.....	137
Sipe, F. Henry, Elkins, W. Va., letter of May 20, 1971.....	139
Steigerwaldt, Edward, and Son, Tomahawk, Wis., letter of May 13, 1971.....	135

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT AND FIRE PROTECTION AND URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1971

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:20 p.m. in room 1302 Longworth House Office Building, Hon. John L. McMillan (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives McMillan, Teague, Burlison, and Vigorito.

Also present: Mrs. Christine S. Gallagher, chief clerk, and Lacey C. Sharp, general counsel.

Mr. McMILLAN. The committee will come to order.

The committee will consider H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084, and H.R. 6086. (H.R. 6082 authorizing the appropriation of additional funds for cooperative forest management, sponsored by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Sisk, Lennon, Andrews of North Dakota, Hansen of Idaho, Pepper, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Messrs. Slack, Johnson of Pennsylvania, Saylor, Garmatz, Harrington, Scott, Jones of North Carolina, Obey, Moorhead, Fuqua, Wyman, Melcher, Duncan, Wyatt, Griffin, Kyros, Preyer of North Carolina, and Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts, is similar to H.R. 6083, by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Whitten, Taylor, Quie, Cleveland, Johnson of California, Winn, Hathaway, Casey of Texas, Fascell, Haley, Halpern, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Abbitt, Chappell, Abourezk, Dellenback, and Gude; H. R. 6498 by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Staggers, Blatnik, Abernethy, Ullman, Pryor of Arkansas, Baring, Williams, Hungate, McClure, Montgomery, McCormack, and Hammerschmidt; H.R. 6692, by Mr. Hays; H.R. 6888 by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Hays, Scherle, Kee, and Long of Louisiana; H.R. 7172 by Mr. Andrews of Alabama; H.R. 7328 by Mr. Adams; H.R. 7853 by Mr. Hull; H.R. 8552 by Mr. Collier; and H.R. 8817 by Mr. Sikes. The text of H.R. 6082 follows:)

[H.R. 6082, 92d Cong. first sess.]

A BILL To authorize the appropriation of additional funds for Cooperative Forest Management

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Cooperative Forest Management Act of August 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 473), as amended by the Act of September 25, 1962 (76 Stat. 569; 16 U.S.C. 586c, 658d), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this Act, the sum of \$15,000,000."

(H.R. 6084 authorizing the appropriation of additional funds for cooperative forest fire protection, sponsored by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Sisk, Lennon, Andrews of North Dakota, Hansen of Idaho, Pepper, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Messrs. Slack, Johnson of Pennsylvania, Saylor, Garmatz, Harrington, Scott, Jones of North Carolina, Obey, Moorhead, Fuqua, Wyman, Melcher, Duncan, Wyatt, Griffin, Kyros, Preyer of North Carolina, and Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts, is similar to H.R. 6085 by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Whitten, Taylor, Quie, Cleveland, Johnson of California, Winn, Hathaway, Casey of Texas, Fascell, Haley, Halpern, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Abbitt, Chappell, Abourezk, Dellenback, Gude, Ichord, Hicks of Washington, and O'Neill; H.R. 6497 by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Staggers, Blatnik, Abernethy, Ullman, Pryor of Arkansas, Baring, Williams, Hungate, McClure, Montgomery, McCormack, and Hammerschmidt; H.R. 6517 by Mr. Collier; H.R. 6693 by Mr. Hayes; H.R. 6889 by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Hays, Scherle, Kee, and Long of Louisiana; H.R. 7173 by Mr. Andrews of Alabama; H.R. 7330 by Mr. Adams; H.R. 7852 by Mr. Hull; and H.R. 8817 by Mr. Sikes. The text of H.R. 6084 follows:)

[H.R. 6084, 92d Cong. first sess.]

A BILL To authorize the appropriation of additional funds for Cooperative Forest Fire Protection

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Clarke-McNary Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture shall expend such portions of the appropriations authorized herein as he deems advisable to study the effects of tax laws, methods, and practices upon forest perpetuation, to cooperate with appropriate officials of the various States or other suitable agencies in such investigations and in devising tax laws designed to encourage the conservation and growing of timber, and to investigate and promote practical methods of insuring standing timber on growing forests from losses by fire.

"There is authorized to be appropriated annually not more than \$40,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of this Act."

(H.R. 6086 authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States and other public bodies in providing an urban environmental forestry program, sponsored by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Sisk, Lennon, Andrews of North Dakota, Hansen of Idaho, Pepper, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Messrs. Slack, Johnson of Pennsylvania, Saylor, Garmatz, Harrington, Scott, Jones of North Carolina, Obey, Moorhead, Fuqua, Wyman, Melcher, Duncan, Wyatt, Griffin, Kyros, Preyer of North Carolina, and Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts, is similar to H.R. 6087 by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Whitten, Taylor, Quie, Cleveland, Johnson of California, Winn, Hathaway, Casey of Texas, Fascell, Haley, Halpern, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Abbitt, Chappell, and Abourezk; H.R. 6499 by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Staggers, Blatnik, Abernethy, Ullman, Pryor of Arkansas, Baring, Williams, Hungate, McClure, Montgomery, and McCormack; H.R. 6518 by Mr. Collier; H.R. 6694 by Mr. Hays; H.R. 6890 by Mr. Sikes and Messrs. Hays, Scherle, Kee, and Long of Louisiana; H.R. 7171 by Mr. Andrews of

Alabama; H.R. 7329 by Mr. Adams; H.R. 7851 by Mr. Hull; and H.R. 8817 by Mr. Sikes. The text of H.R. 6086 follows:)

[H.R. 6086, 92d Cong. first sess.]

A BILL To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and furnish financial and other assistance to States and other public bodies and organizations in providing an urban environmental forestry program, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to provide for the protection, improvement, and establishment of trees and shrubs in open spaces, greenbelts, protection zones, roadside screens, community parks, woodlands, private land developments, and other planting and beautification areas, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with State or other appropriate public agencies and to furnish financial, technical, and other assistance in carrying out a program of urban and community forestry.

SEC. 2. Federal assistance under this Act shall be extended in accordance with cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and State or other public bodies containing such conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate for the purposes of this Act. No such agreement shall provide for financial assistance by the Secretary under this Act in any State during any fiscal year in excess of 75 per centum of the total budgeted expenditures or the actual expenditures, whichever is less, of the undertakings of such agreement for such year, including expenditures of local and public and private nonprofit organizations. Payments by the Secretary under such agreements may be made on the certificate of the appropriate State or other appropriate public official that expenditures as provided for under such agreements have been made and funds may be made available, as determined by the Secretary, without regard to the provisions of the Act of July 31, 1823 (3 Stat. 723; 31 U.S.C. 529), concerning the advance of public moneys. Such agreements shall be carried out in such manner as to encourage the utilization of private agencies, firms, and individuals furnishing services and materials needed in the conduct of an urban and community forestry program.

SEC. 3. To effectuate the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may share the cost with State or local public agencies or private landholders of practices or measures on public or private land which carry out the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That no such cost-sharing shall provide for a Federal contribution in excess of 75 per centum of the total cost of the practice or measure. The Secretary may terminate any agreement by mutual agreement with a State or local public agency or private landholder if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interests, and may agree to such modification of agreements as he may determine to be desirable to carry out purposes of this Act or facilitate its administration.

SEC. 4. Loans authorized by section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (50 Stat. 525, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1011 (e) (Supp. III)) may also be made to State and local public agencies and local nonprofit organizations to further the purposes of agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and State or other public bodies pursuant to section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this Act the sum of \$5,000,000 annually.

SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the "Urban Environmental Forestry Act".

Mr. McMILLAN. At this time we will be happy to hear from our colleague, the Honorable Robert Sikes of Florida.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. SIKES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am most appreciative of your time and interest in permitting me to testify on these bills. I know that yours is an extremely busy schedule. I am sure that this

interest on your part is reflected in your support for sound and needed forestry legislation.

Gentlemen, the interdependence of forests, wildlife, land and people—the ecology that binds us all—has been apparent since the beginning of time. But in today's world of teeming populations and intense industrialization, this interdependence has become more crucial.

Under the circumstances, most lands today must be managed with more than one use in mind. In fact, some lands are so situated that they must satisfy a variety of widely disparate needs.

But the forest is a living thing. To serve its fullest potential, it must stay healthy and vigorous. Such forests can be attained while maintaining a balanced harmony among uses.

I have seen a definite need for a long time for bolstering forestry programs throughout the United States. Both my constituents and those from other sections of the country have amply confirmed these needs. Consequently I have introduced bills on three programs in this, the first session of the 92d Congress. Many of my colleagues join with me in sponsoring these bills. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss these bills with your committee.

The 47 years of successful Federal-State relationships exemplified by the Clarke-McNary Act and the nearly 21 years of similar successful operations under the Cooperative Forest Management Act attest to the validity of the proposed amendments to these acts. I am also confident that the parallel relationships envisioned in H.R. 6086 and companion bills would be the most feasible and logical approach to accomplish the objectives set forth in the bill and provide for the needs of our people.

And now to discuss the bills themselves.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Never have the pressures on the Nation's forest resources and forest resource managers been directed from as many sources with as great a force as they are today.

The crescendo of many voices—solo and in concert—rises daily. They come from timber industries, homebuilders and buyers, recreationists, conservationists, preservationists, environmentalists, and others. These people have a sincere, deep, and abiding concern. The effect, however, is neither harmonious nor always constructive.

The voices for the most part are directed at managers of the public commercial forests which make up about 30 percent of the Nation's total and currently produce about half of our timber supplies. Harvesting draws heavily on the old growth of the western national forests for lumber and plywood for building construction. Managers of these national forests are subjected to especially heavy pressure of a highly critical nature by both the timber consumers and environmentalists, but for different reasons. A recent article in "U.S. News and World Report" vividly describes the controversy in which this respected Federal land management agency is caught in the middle.

There are other pressures of a quieter kind—the ceaseless pushing back and liquidation of productive forests to make way for highways, utilities, industrial sites, housing, and in some parts of the country

for agriculture. The clearing of high-production hardwood forests in the Mississippi Delta continues to make way for soybeans.

The physical pressures against our forest resources, however, are not as selective as the voices of critics. Public and private forests together must bear the impact of changing and increasing demands for the wood, water, recreation, clean air, and other benefits both material and environmental.

Although we can expect further increases in production from the public forests—funds for more intensive management and increased access permitting—and some increases from the relatively well managed industry forests, the point of diminishing returns on investments and the upper limit of physical productive capability of these forests is in sight, especially for softwood lumber and plywood. After 1985, they cannot be expected to supply the increased softwood demands. Short supply and higher prices will follow. The implications for home construction are clear. They have been for over 2 years.

We must look to the nonindustry private forests to fill the supply gap. This 300 million acres of commercial forest (60 percent of the total) can and should supply at least 50 percent of our long-term needs for softwoods, hardwoods, and other forest products and values. The importance of this supply source has been documented repeatedly in recent years. It was emphasized in the Timber Resource Review of 1955, Timber Resources for America's Future in 1958, Timber Trends in the United States in 1965, the South's Third Forest in 1969, the report of the Working Group of the Cabinet Task Force on Lumber in 1969, by Trees for People, and through various efforts of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to formulate programs for dealing with the softwood supply problem.

It has been pointed out that timber growing sites on these lands are relatively good, in fact, probably better than on most public forest lands. Also they are generally more accessible. The fact remains, however, that the condition of the growing stock is deteriorated because of past abuse and poor management. Many owners do not have the financial resources or technical capabilities for bringing about needed improvements.

From all of this documentation and emphasis there has come remarkably little new or accelerated public effort to help the private owner improve his level of forest management.

The cooperative forest management program may be pointed to as a needed exception, but not presently a major one. Although the Federal Government provides a share of the cost and limited technical support, this is essentially a State action program with State-employed service foresters providing direct assistance to private forest owners. In 1960, 82,000 owners were assisted with forest management problems on 4.1 million acres. In 1970, 115,000 owners were assisted on 6.9 million acres. During the period the gross sale value of products harvested from these lands through this assistance increased from \$14 million to \$31 million.

Other public programs have contributed to the progress made. Various cost-sharing programs for practice establishment have helped to make substantial gains in tree planting and improvement of timber stands—in the aggregate about 9 million acres in the last 20 years. The

technical assistance needed by landowners to carry out this work was provided largely by State-employed cooperative forest management service foresters. Various other programs also contributed in land-use planning and education. CFM, however, provided the bulk of the on-site technical effort, without which the work could not have been done.

The accomplishments are impressive, but there is a long and costly forest management road to be traveled to improve the productivity of the nonindustry private forests, not only for filling the future timber supply gap but also for dealing effectively with environmental problems.

According to the recently (1967) updated National Inventory of Soil and Water Conservation Needs, tree planting or seeding is needed on 103 million acres of non-Federal rural land. Timber stand improvement such as thinning and cull tree removal is needed on 178 million acres. Nine million acres of tree planting and over 5 million acres of timber stand improvement are needed in Florida alone. The bulk of these needs are on nonindustry private lands.

The needs, challenges, and opportunities for moving ahead are many. For example, in the Southeast, 6 million acres of pine plantations established in the last 20 years need thinning and harvest cuts. Technical assistance is needed to carry out this work.

Technical expertise is needed to encourage the application of research developed knowledge on the management of bottomland hardwood forests in the entire Coastal Plain area. River basins such as the Escambia, Choctawhatchee, and Apalachicola support valuable forest resources that need more intensive management.

Technical assistance is needed to carry out tree planting for reclaiming spoil banks from clay removal in southern Georgia and Florida, and from coal mining in Alabama and elsewhere in the Nation.

Assistance is needed to initiate programs for improving efficiency and economy of logging consistent with restraints and modifications needed in harvesting timber in heavy recreational-use areas in the Florida Panhandle.

Workshops, training, and other educational and troubleshooting technical assistance is needed in forest products utilization, processing, and marketing. There are nearly 100 sawmills in Florida alone, many of which need such assistance.

Stretching the timber supply to cover our needs will require acceleration of assistance in wood residue utilization. This would primarily be in the adoption of chip-making practices. The north Florida-southern Georgia area is the greatest woodpulp producer in the world.

The wood-using industries of the South and the rest of the Nation are urgently in need of advice on adapting their equipment and modifying their practices to meet requirements of State air and water pollution laws.

These examples, drawn largely from the South, convey a small picture of the "many faces" of forestry assistance needed throughout the Nation.

During the past 20 years the CFM program in the States has changed from an almost single objective (timber) program to one including growing concerns for recreation, environment, and other

values. State-employed service foresters are playing a key role in advising private forest owners on multiple-use management. While calling upon other resource specialists for soils, recreation, and wildlife data, they serve as the "frontline" contact in guiding forest owners to the improved management and protection of our private forest resources. They provide valuable contributions to rural community development and serve as a focal point for referral and coordination of assistance by private consultants, contractors, and the forest-based industries.

During this period, however, attention has been drawn to the increasing dependency on the nonindustry forests for future timber supplies, with attention focused sharply on filling the softwood lumber and plywood gap. Although the program has proven its effectiveness in providing multipurpose forest management assistance, its growth has not kept pace with changing needs. Its growth is dependent on Federal and State appropriations. Many of the States today are in desperate straits for lack of sufficient State appropriations to effectively carry on the work.

In fiscal year 1970, the Federal appropriation was \$4,130,000. The States' share was \$7,971,000.

In fiscal year 1971, the appropriation is \$4,950,000. When supplemental funds for pay act costs are added, the upper limit of the authorization for the Federal appropriation will have been reached.

It is extremely necessary, therefore, at this time to increase the Federal authorization.

An increase to \$15 million is needed.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Last year was one of the worst years for forest fires in recent history. This year is off to an even worse start than last year. Firefighting crews have been hard pressed all across the South and up much of the east coast. Oklahoma, Missouri, Alabama, Georgia, the Carolinas have all been hard hit. Most recently, Virginia and New Jersey have been having a bad time of it. My own home State of Florida has probably had the roughest time of all this spring. All of you know it has been one of the worst years and costliest in history from the standpoint of forest fire loss.

In the Everglades we have had something like 600,000 acres burn to varying degrees, some of it destroyed. The only sure way fire can be put out in that area is by rain. The firefighting crews, bolstered with all the help that could be provided, including equipment from military reservations, have performed heroically in an effort to bring this problem under control.

We have many, many thousands of acres of ruined land. So we have really taken a terrible beating.

Since the first of January, International Airport at Miami has had to limit traffic to instrument flights only on 41 days due to limited visibility caused by smoke from forest fires. The airport has been closed down completely on two occasions. Other airports in the southern part of the State have been similarly hampered. Smoke blowing across highways has disrupted traffic on innumerable occasions. The highway

department reports that five multiple-car accidents occurred in 1 day in south Florida because of smoke. The Lakeland Patrol Station lists 41 accidents caused by smoke since the first of the year. Two fatalities resulted from these accidents. Cross City Station reports four very serious accidents with three deaths as a direct result of smoke from forest fires. Lauderdale Station has reported 12 accidents caused by smoke. These are only three stations out of a total of 150 to 200.

Part of the reason for this situation all across the South lies in the fact that many areas have been suffering a prolonged period of drought. Underground water levels are dangerously low. This has, of course, tended to increase the fire hazard. Much of the area has received only a little more than half the normal amount of rainfall so far this year.

Medical experts say these conditions have brought about a definite increase in the number of asthma and chronic lung disorder cases this year. Wildlife experts say that this year's fires will have a devastating effect on game populations, particularly quail and turkey.

The number of fires and the damage they have done are staggering. During the 12 months of 1970—a bad fire year—Florida had 8,992 fires that burned a total of 139,605 acres. In only 4 months so far this year the State forestry department has tallied 7,120 fires with an estimated 506,956 acres burned. But impressive as these statistics may be, they can tell only part of the story. The cost of fighting these fires is an almost unbearable burden to the State; but the losses, financial and otherwise, occasioned by the destruction of natural resources are of far greater magnitude. Even if we could place an accurate dollar and cents value on the soil, timber, wildlife, and other resource values destroyed by fires, we would be seeing only a fraction of the total loss. It has been estimated that for every day the Miami Airport is closed, Florida loses \$1 million in tourist trade. While the airport has only been closed twice, the tourist trade has been cut drastically.

The aesthetic or environmental damage is almost incalculable. Many natural areas have been torn up. The Everglades Park has been greatly damaged and has been threatened with even greater destruction on many occasions.

The Florida Forestry Division has done a heroic job of fighting these fires. I want to commend them here and now for the splendid work they have done. But, gentlemen, I submit that these men have been defending national resources and that the State of Florida has had to bear a disproportionate share of the cost. I am talking now about Florida, but only because of recent events there. The same situation has obtained in many other States and who knows which State will be next. Forest fires respect no political boundaries. All of our States have had serious forest, prairie, or other wildfires in the past and will, in all probability, continue to do so.

The Federal responsibility to share the cost of fire protection has been recognized. Congress first acknowledged it by enacting the Weeks law in 1911 and again by the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924. All 50 States are active participants in the cooperative forest fire control program authorized by this legislation. The Clarke-McNary Act authorized the Federal Government to share up to 50 percent of the

total program expenditures. However, Federal appropriations have failed to keep pace with the rising costs of fire protection. For example, in fiscal year 1948, total program expenditures were nearly \$24 million of which \$9 million or 37.7 percent was furnished by the Federal Government. In fiscal year 1970, the total program cost had risen to over \$113 million of which only \$16.4 million or 14.5 percent was supplied by the Federal Government. If adequate protection is to be provided for all eligible lands, the Federal partner must do better. It must carry its share of the load.

Many more homes are being built in rural areas. Resource and improvement values continue to rise. Recreation use is increasing. Thus higher values are at risk. The public demands protection appropriate to the risk and normal increases in the cost of doing business keep pushing protection costs up.

Fire prevention efforts, including the Smokey Bear program, have been helpful in holding down the number of fires, but even our best prevention efforts can never eliminate forest fires. With rising resource values and expanding land uses, a more intensive prevention program must be provided. Man-caused fires still constitute more than 90 percent of the total.

More funds are needed for specialized fire control training and for more adequate equipment to cope with large, potentially disastrous fires. In 1970, large fires accounted for one-half of 1 percent of the total number of wildfires on State- and privately owned lands, yet they accounted for over 36 percent of the area burned.

Periodically, a study is made to determine the cost of providing adequate protection for lands eligible for Federal cost-sharing under the Clarke-McNary Act. In 1949, the annual cost was determined to be about \$40 million. Based on 50-50 matching the Federal share would be \$20 million. Legislation for the present \$20 million authorization was passed by Congress that same year. The latest study and analysis was made in 1965 and the estimated annual need was placed at \$123 million. Converting this to present prices the estimated cost for doing the same job is at least \$138 million. Various studies have been made in attempts to determine an adequate Federal share of the total fire protection costs. In 1958, the Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio, concluded that the Federal share should be from 40 to 59 percent of the total. A 1969 study by the Southern Forest Resource Analysis Committee (the South's Third Forest) estimated that the Federal share of fire control costs in the South should be 29 percent. Applying this recent data to the total estimated cost of \$138 million we get an indicated Federal share of at least \$40 million.

It seems to me that \$40 million is a minimum Federal contribution needed to maintain a high level of fire protection for the Nation's State- and privately owned forest and nonforested watershed lands. It also seems to me that we must provide such protection if these lands are to contribute their share toward meeting the forest products, services, and environmental needs of the American people. That is why I and my cosponsors have introduced H.R. 6084 and why I continue to support it. I believe we cannot in good conscience do less.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

Anyone who enters a city these days can observe, at firsthand, how the urban environment is deteriorating. Many trees are removed to make room for new highways that make concrete-gray or asphalt-black the dominant colors in the cityscape. Streets are widened and the trees that line them are cut. Shopping centers, high rise office and apartment buildings with their needed parking space, housing developments, airports, and similar developments all take their toll of the existing green environment, trees, shrubs, and other plants.

In many cities the air has become so foul that trees are no longer thrifty. Some species that are particularly vulnerable turn color and slowly die; others become weakened and are susceptible to insect and disease attacks. Many trees have difficulty in obtaining enough moisture because rainfall is caught by manmade surfaces and channeled off. Only a small part of the precipitation reaches the soil and is available to tree roots. This, also, weakens the tree and makes it more susceptible to insect and disease attack.

Trees are of great importance to the life in an urban environment. In forests and parks they afford the population a chance for solitude and recreation. They harbor wild animals and birds that form part of the ecological forest community. In strips along highways trees dampen traffic and other noises. Constantly high levels of noise in the city may have severe adverse psychological effects if present indications hold true. Trees filter out particles that pollute the air. They slow down wind and provide shade from the sun. In short, they make for a healthier environment and noticeably soften the climate of the city. Trees greatly improve the looks of the cityscape. Americans with their predominantly rural and pastoral background, appreciate the ways trees soften the harsh outlines of buildings, give interest to open spaces, hide much ugliness, and give privacy if placed correctly.

The Nation's Capital is fortunate indeed in having a Rock Creek Park, a George Washington Memorial Parkway, a multitude of city parks, and wide tree-lined avenues. Washingtonians can observe, in these instances, how trees in an urban setting can make life healthier, safer, and more enjoyable. At the same time, if one wanders around the innercity or drives the interstate highways that lead in and out of the area, the penalties of neglecting to maintain trees in the environment are demonstrated with equal force.

The problem of the urban environment, viewed against the projected nationwide population increase and the firm trend toward greater concentration of the population in urban areas, has reached crisis proportions. There are 133 cities in the United States with a population of more than 100,000 and 594 cities in the 25,000 to 100,000 population level. In these and smaller cities a forestry program is urgently needed to improve the environment to make the cities liveable again, but also to guide growth and expansion of existing and new cities in order to minimize damage to the environment.

The city governments are well aware of the problems but lack the skills and resources to tackle it. An urban environmental forestry program is needed to provide technical assistance to States and urban communities as well as private agencies and individuals. Types of

technical assistance should include long-term planning, overall coordination, guidance in setting up programs, training, and specialized forestry services.

The management of trees and plants for environmental values involves a wide variety of technical disciplines, careful planning, concerted community action, continuity, and financial support.

Some urban forestry services are available but they are not comprehensive and fall woefully short of present needs. The larger cities frequently employ arboriculturists or foresters who deal with segments of the problem. The States have programs of technical assistance in forestry nearly all in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service. These latter programs, however, deal only with rural forest lands. Notable exceptions are the urban forestry services initiated by the forestry agencies of Georgia and Missouri to serve Atlanta, St. Louis, and Kansas City. These services, however, are not adequately funded and are sometimes carried out at the expense of other programs. Private enterprise in the persons of arboriculturists, nurserymen, and consultants have many of the technical skills required and would have a major role in the program. Some specialized assistance is available from the Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service, but only for small segments of the overall problem.

The Department of Agriculture has the resources needed to provide the leadership, coordination, and technical support required to back the States and communities. The Forest Service, through years of administering a cooperative forestry program, has already established administrative and professional linkages with the State forestry agencies. The Federal role in this program is envisioned as one of providing national leadership and coordination, not of initiating large-scale involvement of Federal personnel. The program primarily is intended for action at the State and local level.

Through cost-sharing agreements with the States technical and financial assistance would be provided to urban communities and public and private organizations and individuals for planning, establishing, managing, and protecting trees and associated woody plants in towns and cities throughout the country. Planning would be directed to the proper use of trees in parks, greenbelts, and buffer strips, as well as residential, industrial, and commercial developments.

Implementation of research results on arboriculture, tree improvement, ecology, protection, and equipment design will be carried out through technical advice and services provided by Federal and State program specialists. Technical advice and assistance at the community level will be provided by State and local foresters and other specialists.

On-the-ground treatments, including tree planting and care, pest control, and other cultural measures, along with supplies and equipment to do the work, will be furnished by private enterprise.

Benefits to be derived from this program will include the renovation and rejuvenation of impoverished and blighted urban centers. Newly developing suburban areas and small towns will offer a more pleasing and attractive place to live. The mental, physical, and social well-being of many people will be greatly enhanced.

As soon as authorization is obtained, the urban forestry program can be set in motion.

An authorization of \$5 million is needed for the program envisioned in the Urban Environmental Forestry Act to be carried on at a proper level.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much indeed.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Sikes, we are delighted to have your statement and assure you that this committee will give your statement every consideration.

At this time, Mr. Teague, do you have questions?

Mr. TEAGUE. No questions.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Burlison?

Mr. BURLISON. No questions.

Mr. VIGORITO. No questions.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Harold Johnson.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Johnson came in and left his statement and requested that I ask that it be inserted in the record at this point in support of these three bills.

Mr. McMILLAN. Without objection, it will be inserted in the hearing at this point.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, as co-author of these three bills, I want to commend our colleague from Florida, Bob Sikes, for his leadership in this matter and to endorse the comments which he has made before this fine committee as the hearings on these bills open.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Never have pressures on the Nation's forest resources been as great as they are today. Constantly, new demands are made by home builders and buyers, recreationists, conservationists, and others who clamor for forest uses.

Most of the pressure is directed at managers of the public commercial forests which make up about 30 percent of the Nation's total and which currently produce about half of our timber supplies. There continues to be heavy demand on the western National Forests for lumber and plywood for building construction. However, both public and private forests together must bear the future impact of changing and increasing demands for wood, water, recreation, clean air, and other benefits. Although we can expect further increases in production from the public forests, the point of diminishing returns is in sight.

Therefore, the nonindustry private forests must step into the breach. This 300 million acres of commercial forest (60 percent of the total) can, and should, provide at least 50 percent of our long-term needs for forest products.

Timber-growing sites on these private forest lands are relatively good; in fact, probably better than on most public forest lands. However, growing stock has deteriorated because of past abuse and poor management. Many of these forest owners have neither the financial resources nor the technical knowledge necessary to bring about improvements.

The Cooperative Forest Management Program is a State-action program with State-employed service foresters providing direct assistance to private forest owners. This, and other cost-sharing programs, have resulted in gains in tree planting and timber stand improvement . . . about 9 million acres in the last 20 years.

However, to improve the productivity of the non-industry private forests will require much effort and large expenditures of money. Tree planting or seeding

is needed on 103 million acres of non-Federal rural land. Timberstand improvement is required on 178 million acres.

Assistance is needed to initiate more efficient and economical logging methods, consistent with restraints and modifications needed in harvesting timber in heavy recreational use areas in my home State. Workshops, training, and other assistance is needed in forest products utilization, processing, and marketing.

During the past 20 years the CFM program in the States has shown a growing concern for recreation, the environment, and other values. State-employed service foresters serve as "front-line" troops in guiding forest owners to improved management and protection of their forest resource. These service foresters are also a great aid to rural community development and provide valuable assistance to private consultants, contractors, and the forest-based industries.

Although this program has proved to be effective, its growth has not kept pace with changing needs. Many of the States today are in desperate straits because of a shortage of appropriations to carry on the work.

In Fiscal Year 1971, the appropriation is \$4,950,000. The authorization allotment for this program is only \$5,000,000.

It is extremely necessary, therefore, to increase the Federal authorization.

An increase to \$15,000,000 is needed.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

A major threat to our federal and private forests is, of course, fire. I fear that the Federal Government has not been meeting its responsibilities in the Cooperative Forest Fire Protection Program. The Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to recommend adequate systems of fire prevention and suppression for each forest region of the United States. It also authorizes him to share the cost of such protection up to a maximum of 50 percent. While this does not commit the Federal Government to spending the full 50 percent of such costs, I believe it does place upon us the responsibility of providing enough funds to ensure adequate protection without placing too great a burden on the individual States. At the present level of Federal financing, about 14.5 percent, I believe that we are not carrying our share of the load, and therefore co-sponsor H.R. 6084, to authorize additional funds for this program.

The need for well-equipped, well-trained, efficient firefighting forces increases constantly as our forest resources per capita diminish and their value increases. We can no longer afford the losses occasioned by large forest fires. We must provide the means to reduce the number and size of such fires as much as is humanly possible and economically feasible.

Last fall in California, alone, we suffered intolerable losses. In one nine-day period, Southern California had forest fires that caused, at a conservative estimate, \$200,000,000 worth of damage to resources and improvements. May I point out that the increase in fund authorization requested in the bill being considered is equal to only one-tenth of that amount and that it would be spread over all 50 States and over a whole year's time.

Gentlemen: We are talking about money and properly so. H.R. 6084 is a bill to authorize the spending of more money. Furthermore, it is relatively easy to place a monetary value on the tangible resources and improvements, thus giving us something concrete to talk about. However, where forest fires are concerned, there are other values that cannot be reduced to dollars and cents. Last fall's fires in Southern California blackened over 430,000 acres. This would be equal to a strip of land one mile wide extending from Los Angeles to the Oregon border or from Washington, D.C. to about 40 miles South of Atlanta, Georgia. Try to imagine what a blot that makes on the landscape. Who can estimate the thousands, perhaps millions of birds, animals, and fish that lost their lives in those fires? Who can imagine the collective sorrow and inconvenience brought upon the 795 families that lost their homes in those fires or of the families of the 14 persons who died there? Who can imagine the anxiety of the thousands of families forced to flee their homes, not knowing whether they would have homes to return to? Many of them had to abandon pets and other cherished possessions. Who can place a monetary value on any of these things or on the pollution these fires caused to California's lakes, rivers, and air?

Gentlemen: We cannot continue to sustain losses like those we suffered in California last fall and in Florida this spring. We don't have the resources to spare and our environment can't stand the impact of such violent assaults. We must build up our capability to prevent and suppress wildfires to the point that such occurrences are rare rather than commonplace. We can't expect the States to do the job alone. Most of them are extended about as far as they can go in this direction now. No, the Federal Government must face up to its responsibilities and carry its share of the load. Enactment of this bill would be a step in the right direction. Therefore, I recommend approval of H.R. 6084.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

And finally I turn to the third bill in this package, H.R. 6086, to authorize an urban environmental forestry program.

Much like giant air-conditioners, trees help to cool the city. They provide shade and protection from the elements, and they soften harsh contours of crowded buildings. They clean the air. They deaden sound. And, perhaps most important of all, they provide each city with a much needed measure of beauty and serenity. In fact, a single tree in the city can be appreciated more than entire clusters of its country cousins.

The problems inherent in our modern urban environment have reached crisis proportions. Throughout the United States, both in large cities and in smaller communities, a forestry program is urgently needed—needed not only to improve the environment, but also to guide growth and expansion of existing and new cities.

Leadership, coordination, and technical support necessary to assist the States and local communities in an expanded and revitalized forestry program is available in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Forest Service, by virtue of many years of administering a cooperative forestry program, has already established the necessary working relationship with State forestry agencies. The Federal role is envisioned as that of providing national leadership and coordination. Primarily the program is intended for activation at the State and local level and should not involve large numbers of Federal personnel.

Many benefits are to be derived from this program. It will rejuvenate blighted and impoverished slums and urban centers. Suburban areas and small towns will once again become healthy and attractive places in which to live.

Without doubt, the program envisioned in H.R. 6086 will enhance the mental, physical, and social well being of millions of our citizens throughout the Nation.

As soon as authorization is obtained, the urban forestry program can be set in motion. Accordingly, I hope this committee will take the initial step toward this goal and approve the Urban Environmental Forestry Act.

Thank you.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is the Honorable Watkins Abbitt here?

At this time I will ask permission to place Mr. Abbitt's statement in the record at this point.

Without objection, it will be placed in the record.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to appear before your Subcommittee with reference to H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084 and H.R. 6086 which I co-sponsored with Congressman Sikes. In these days, when so much emphasis is being put on our environment and conservation of our natural resources, the importance of these bills cannot be over-emphasized. There is an interlocking significance to them but, for emphasis, I have chosen to address myself to them each individually.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

A very real timber supply crisis will soon face the Nation unless action to increase supplies is taken now. Construction materials must be available to provide housing at prices the American public can afford to pay. Uses of softwood lumber and plywood, including nonhousing construction, packaging, and pulp-

wood, may be expected to continue to grow as the economy expands. If this indicated demand is to be met, it means that softwood supplies will have to be increased by over 25 percent by 1975.

The Nation has about 510 million acres of commercial forest in all ownerships. Nearly 19 percent, or 97 million acres, of the total commercial forest land is in the National Forests. Timber harvest on these public lands can be increased if an improved management and research program is put into effect first. But they can only supply a portion of the demand. Projections indicate that there must be intensified multiple-use management programs on private forest lands, including the non-industrial lands if the Nation's demands are to be met. The importance of the Nation's non-industry private forests in meeting the Nation's wood supply gap has been emphasized previously. Examples are: The Timber Resource Review of 1955, Timber Resources for America's Future in 1958, Timber Trends in the U.S. in 1965, The South's Third Forest Program in 1969, The Task Force Report of 1970, The Trees for People Program, and recent Department of Agriculture studies of an incentives program to stimulate output of forest products and multiple use values.

Although the importance of these lands has long been recognized, only limited funding has been provided through a Federal-State cooperative program.

I can testify to the effectiveness of this program by citing how the program has operated in Virginia, where 80 percent of our commercial forest land is owned by farmers and other small private land owners. Some 80 foresters are serving these landowners—66 of them on multiple-use forest management and forest products utilization under this program. In Fiscal 1970 they serviced 9,108 requests and had a backlog of over 1,000.

Nationally, in 1960 some 82,000 owners were assisted with forest management problems on 4.1 million acres through the Cooperative Forest Management Act. In 1970, the record shows 115,000 owners were assisted on 6.9 million acres. During this period the gross sale value of products harvested from these lands through this assistance increased from \$14 million to \$31 million.

The needs, challenges and opportunities for moving ahead are many. Tree planting or seeding is needed on 103 million acres of non-Federal rural land. Timber stand improvement such as thinning and cull tree removal is needed on 178 million acres. Assistance is needed to initiate programs for improving efficiency and economy of logging and at the same time, protect soil and water values and recreational areas. Workshops, training, and other educational and trouble-shooting technical assistance is needed.

The CFM Program can provide technical assistance for timber management as well as for recreation, wildlife, soil and water management and other values. State-employed service foresters play a key role in advising private forest owners on multiple use management. They also provide valuable contributions to rural community development and serve as a focal point for referral and coordination of assistance by private consultants, contractors, and the forest-based industries.

Many of the States today are in desperate straits for lack of sufficient State appropriations to effectively carry on the work. In Fiscal Year 1970 the Federal appropriation was \$4,130,000. The States' share was \$7,971,000. In Fiscal Year 1971 the appropriation is \$4,950,000. When supplemental funds for pay act costs are added, the upper limit of the authorization for the Federal appropriation will have been reached.

It is extremely necessary, therefore, at this time to increase the Federal authorization.

An increase to \$15,000,000 is needed. I urge your consideration of this request and testimony.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Wildfires continue their depredations as unauthorized and unwelcome timber harvesters of the Nation's forests. They destroy the habitat and food supply of our wild game; are often the cause of erosion and floods. As custodians and managers of this great natural resource we cannot condone these losses, particularly when the urgent need for increased supplies of wood fiber has recently been pointed out to us by the President's Task Force on Softwood Lumber and Plywood.

My own native State, Virginia, already has had a serious wildfire problem this year, characteristic of what has been happening along the entire drought-stricken Eastern seaboard. Because 80 percent of Virginia's commercial forest land be-

longs to farmers and small private owners and only 11 percent is industry owned and less than 10 percent is in Federal ownerships, Virginia's problem has always been one of preventing and controlling wildfires on privately owned lands. The average annual fire record shows about 2,000 fires and 10,000 to 12,000 acres burned. This year in April alone Virginia has had 10,000 acres burned, caused by well over 800 fires, nearly all of them man-caused. Some 50 fires were being started daily.

I cite this State record in some detail because it characterizes much of the South, where approximately 141 million acres of the region's 198 million acres of commercial forest land belong to nearly a million non-industrial private owners, who own mostly small tracts. Nationally, in all forest regions on all protected land, Federal and private, 2.9 million acres were burned in 1969. In the U.S. as a whole, 65 percent of the 113,000 fires that caused the damage were man-caused. In the Southern, Central, and Eastern regions, about 98% of the fires were man-caused.

These figures document the urgency of having the Federal Government meet its full responsibilities in the Cooperative Wildfire Protection Program. The Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to recommend adequate systems of fire prevention and suppression for each forest region of the United States. It also authorizes him to share the cost of such protection up to a maximum of 50 percent. While this does not commit the Federal Government to spending the full 50 percent of such costs, it does place upon the Congress the responsibility of providing enough funds to ensure adequate protection without placing too great a burden on the individual States. At the present level of Federal financing, about 14.5 percent, I believe that the Federal Government is not carrying its share of the load.

Well-equipped and well-trained efficient firefighting forces are needed as our forest land per capita shrinks and as forest land values increase. The expansion of suburbia near all our metropolitan areas gradually encroaches on forested lands and sets the stage for even more man-caused fires, many caused by children. Large fires destroy timber and environmental values which in some areas have assumed greater importance than wood losses. Some of these indirect losses are well known to you—damaged watersheds, wildlife, destruction of recreation facilities, and perhaps loss of human lives. Everybody loses when a wildfire sweeps through the forest.

One of the major problems in obtaining full values from presently funded cooperative wildfire fighting appropriations is the increased cost of goods and services. Tools and tractors cost more. Man-power wages have accelerated. Specialized equipment is needed in many areas—at increased costs. The approved authorizations are inadequate because of the shrunken buying power prevailing in the 1970's.

Gentlemen, we are talking about money. H.R. 6084 authorizes money for a needed purpose—the protection of our total forest environment and the continued production of timber crops. We can't expect the States to do the job by themselves. The Federal Government must assume its full fiscal responsibilities to meet its social responsibilities. Passage of H.R. 6084 would be a proper step in the right direction. I recommend its passage.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY

In our present decade, more than ever before, trees in the city are being recognized as Man's best friend, his link with a Nature that sometimes is otherwise inaccessible to him. These urban trees offer an escape from the harsh environment of cement sidewalks, asphalt streets, and high speed expressways. They offer relief from the monotony of masonry, metal and glass, pyramiding into smoggy skies. They temper the scream of screeching brakes and the whine of jetcraft. They help neutralize the impact of dust, dirt, nauseous odors, and factory and auto exhaust.

An urban forestry program is urgently needed to provide urban and suburban planners with information on proper tree species and planting methods; technical assistance on ways to maximize the benefits derived from trees, including their contributions toward reducing noise, moderating temperature, reducing city erosion and in providing a desirable environment for birdlife as well as man.

State Forestry Departments are seeking ways to provide the public with scientific advice on urban forestry. The Forest Service is cooperating with State

forestry agencies in providing full-time advice and assistance. Already there are several successful urban forestry programs. The Metroforestry program in Atlanta, Georgia, administered by the Georgia State Forestry commission, is an outstanding example of what can be done in urban forestry. In 1970, Metroforesters serviced 3,645 requests in addition to making radio and television appearances and preparing many news articles.

Some urban forestry services are available today, in my State, but not enough. My State participates in cooperative programs with the Department of Agriculture. But more effort is needed. The Forest Service by virtue of many years of administering cooperative forestry programs has established a good working relationship with State forestry agencies. The basic organization for doing the job is already available, but special assistance is needed.

Technical and financial assistance, through cost-sharing agreements with the States, should be provided to urban communities, public and private organizations, and individuals for planning, establishing, managing, and protecting trees and associated plantings in towns and cities. Planning should be directed toward the proper use of trees in parks, greenbelts, and buffer strips, as well as residential, industrial, and commercial developments.

Scientific skills should be provided by Federal and State specialists and technical advice and assistance at the community level should be provided by State and local foresters.

Many benefits will be derived from this program. It will rejuvenate blighted and impoverished slums and urban centers. Suburban areas and small towns will once again become healthy and attractive places in which to live.

Without doubt, the program envisioned in H.R. 6086 will enhance the mental, physical, and social well being of millions of our citizens throughout the Nation.

As soon as authorization is obtained, the urban forestry program can be set in motion.

An appropriation of \$5 million is required to fund the Urban Environmental Forestry Act.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service. We would be delighted to hear any statement you care to make on these three bills.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD P. CLIFF, CHIEF, FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CLIFF. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to present testimony on the administration's position on H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084, and H.R. 6086 this afternoon.

I personally appreciate this opportunity to join you in your consideration of forest management on private lands, and in the consideration of H.R. 6082, which is directed toward this end.

We, in the Forest Service, view the question of private forest land management as one of the most pressing environmental issues of today. Improvement in the level of management of these lands is essential to meet a wide range of national resource needs.

In 1955, the importance of the nonindustry private forests was brought clearly into focus. In that year, the Timber Resource Review, prepared by the Forest Service, presented the broad picture of forest lands in relation to timber supply. It clearly established that the nonindustry private forests are a key factor in maintaining a satisfactory national timber supply.

Timber Trends in the United States, published in 1965, again pointed to the nonindustry private ownerships as a factor of major importance in dealing with the timber supply problem in the years ahead.

Late in 1968, and in the early months of 1969, we were brought face-to-face with a sample of the kind of problem that we had hoped to avoid—shortage of softwood lumber and plywood for home construction and excessively high prices. The basic problem was abated, but not solved. A long-term solution was only deferred.

To deal with this problem, the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy appointed a Task Force on Lumber and Plywood in March 1969. The task force reported its findings and recommendations to the committee in June 1970. It underscored our earlier findings that steadily increased supplies from private forest lands will become progressively more important in the timber supply and price picture.

The private sector is the crux of any solution because it must ultimately supply half of our future supplies. The national forests are presently shouldering more than a proportionate share of the total burden, and have a limited capacity. Forest industry, with only about 13 percent of the total forest land, cannot be expected to fill the supply gap. Private, nonindustry ownerships, with nearly 60 percent of the total forest lands, must fill the gap if we are going to supply the lumber needed for home construction and other uses in the years ahead, at tolerable price levels.

This is an attainable objective. The private, nonindustry, forest land base is adequate. There remain excellent opportunities for increasing timber production on nonindustry private lands which include a greater proportion of good timber growing sites and are relatively more accessible than are the public forests. Better harvesting and utilization methods for the timber on these lands can yield significant increases in production.

Up to this point my focus has been on timber. There are other equally important considerations. Good forest management also means enhancing environmental quality, increasing recreation opportunities, and improving many other forest values in addition to growing wood. Good forest management is just as essential on the nonindustry private forests as it is on other forests if we are to have a healthy environment for living. The relatively close proximity of nonindustry private forests to metropolitan areas accents this need, especially in the East.

Individual forest landowners need to think beyond mere forest management planning and practice establishment for timber production. They should give attention not only to minimizing any impacts of timber production on the environment, but also to modifications of practices or to new practices for enhancing the environment. They should give the same attention in harvesting and processing forest products to prevention of pollution of air and water. Their planning should include consideration of recreation, wildlife, and all other values found in, or coming from, the forest.

Because of the magnitude of the work that is needed, the many areas of interest involved, industry and consulting foresters must carry a heavier share of the technical assistance load. Industry already is doing this in some parts of the country. More is needed. We are also encouraging and promoting new efforts by consultants and groups of landowners.

Of course the major question on your minds is just how we all get the job done. The administration believes that this job can be accom-

plished under the framework of the proposed special revenue sharing program for rural community development. This program will transfer principal initiative for encouraging improved private forest land management to the State governments who have the basic familiarity with local problem situations. It is designed to make more funds available to the States for these and similar purposes than are available under present programs. It will also relieve the State governments from the burdens and complexities of present grant limitations and conditions.

We strongly believe that the need for better private forest land management should influence widespread and concerted State actions to meet these objectives. In our report to your committee on H.R. 6082, we have outlined why we believe H.R. 6082 should not be enacted. We will continue to assert our leadership role as the Nation's principal forestry agency in seeking accomplishment of these objectives.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my prepared testimony on H.R. 6082. I will be glad to answer questions on this bill now or, if you prefer, I can present the testimony on the other two bills and then have the questions all at once.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is all right with the committee if you go ahead and submit all the reports that you have.

Is that agreeable, gentlemen?

Very well, you may proceed.

We shall next take up H.R. 6084, a bill to increase the authorization for appropriations for cooperative fire protection.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. CLIFF. This program is becoming more and more important as the Nation seeks ways to insure the fullest possible protection and wise use of our natural environment.

The earliest recognition that wildfire protection is a public responsibility originated with the Weeks law of 1911. Inclusion of cooperative forest fire protection measures in the Weeks law was a direct result of the great fire disasters of 1910. In that year Minnesota, Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon all had tremendous fire losses.

Primarily the result of the Clarke-McNary Act, much progress has been made in fire protection since 1924. But in spite of this progress, some States still have thousands of wildfires and suffer millions of dollars worth of losses due to their destructive forces every year. No doubt we will always have forest fires. There is very little we can do to prevent the buildup of conditions that are conducive to the starting of fires. All it takes is warm temperatures, low humidities and a run of days without rain to dry out the vegetation and other fuels. Neither can we entirely eliminate the causes of wildfires: human carelessness, incendiarism, and dry lightning storms. Our challenge then is to keep the number and size of fires small.

What is the answer to our fire problem? How can State and local governments reduce losses and help maintain the quality of the forest resources and of the environment? The best way is to prevent them from starting. The need for prevention efforts like the threat of fire

itself is ever present. The national fire prevention campaign launched in 1942 has been tremendously effective. The campaign, with Smokey Bear as its central figure, is a cooperative effort of the advertising council, the U.S. Forest Service, and the State forestry agencies. Many others also lend a hand. Free public service advertising time and space donated by radio, television, transit companies, outdoor advertisers, magazines and newspaper in 1969 was estimated to be worth more than \$25 million.

However, this mass media effort is only a portion of the total prevention effort. Other significant elements that are being utilized are the management of fuels, law enforcement, zoning ordinances and one-the-ground contacts.

Without this prevention program I believe our burned acreage would have been much greater. The trend during the 10-year period from 1961-70 when compared with the previous 10 years from 1951-60 shows the number of fires have reached a plateau or leveled out while burned acreage has been reduced significantly. This reduction in acres burned has been accomplished in the face of tremendous increase in numbers of people using forested areas. This is particularly true in the East where many types of wildland recreation activity mounts steadily with increasing affluence and leisure time.

When a fire does start the important factor in keeping firefighting cost and fire damage down is to keep fires small. The key to keeping fires small is early detection and speedy attack. This requires adequate on-the-ground organization, including manpower and equipment. It also requires adequate training of firefighting and support personnel so that they can do the job quickly and efficiently.

Research and development in the past few years has given us many new and improved tools and techniques to use in our battles against wildfire. We now utilize a full range of new techniques including power tools, motorized vehicles, modern aircraft, two-way radio, radar and infrared scanners.

We need to provide the kind of fire protection that will insure America an adequate supply of products and services from her forest resources.

As explained in our report on the bill, we recommend that H.R. 6084 not be enacted.

Instead we believe that the emphasis needed for intensification of cooperative fire protection can best be accomplished under the proposed special revenue-sharing program for rural community development. This program will facilitate the framing of local actions needed to meet local situations. Special revenue sharing will not just maintain, but increase the level of funding that will be available for cooperative forest fire protection and similar programs.

In sum, we fully support efforts toward improved wildfire protection. On the question of how to accomplish this most effectively, we believe that special revenue sharing provides the most effective feasible approach.

That concludes my statement on H.R. 6084.

Mr. McMILLAN. We will be happy now to hear your statement on H.R. 6086.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

Mr. CLIFF. Thank you for this opportunity to present a statement for the Department of Agriculture on H.R. 6086, the proposed Urban Environmental Forestry Act.

The Forest Service understands and supports the objectives of H.R. 6086. The basic goal of the legislation is to improve the natural environment in our urban areas and communities.

Intense economic pressures for development, growing populations, and increasing competition for land have worsened the growing conditions for trees and associated plants. Air pollution, drought, erosion, heat, mechanical hazards, and other adverse influences resulting from construction, tree disease and insect problems, and from concentrated use of the land, are taking a heavy toll of trees and woods in urban areas.

Trees and shrubs have many benefits in an urban environment. They ameliorate climate by reducing our temperature and humidity. They dampen harsh city sounds, diminish air pollution, protect water supply, provide habitat for birds and small animals, and add variety and beauty to the landscape.

Although we think efforts in the field of urban and environmental forestry have merit, we recommend that H.R. 6086 not be enacted. As indicated in the Department of Agriculture's report to you, the President's plan for both urban and rural community development revenue sharing recognizes varying conditions from area to area. Funding levels that would be provided under these new programs would give local officials adequate means to frame solutions to individual urban and environmental forestry problems.

Special revenue sharing is designed to avoid the problems of narrow, categorical funding, and to help local governments utilize urban development programs efficiently. Therefore we suggest treatment of urban forestry programs through special revenue sharing in lieu of the approach which would be established by H.R. 6086.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That completes my prepared testimony on all three bills.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Cliff, for your usual able statements. You may rest assured they will all be given every consideration by this subcommittee.

Mr. Teague?

Mr. TEAGUE. Well, this is not exactly a question.

I am inclined to support the revenue-sharing principle in toto, but I find little enthusiasm about it among most of my Democratic colleagues. We may be faced with a practical proposition here, if the objectives of these bills, or some of them anyway, are worthwhile and if we are not able to generate enough enthusiasm for the revenue-sharing program, then where are we?

Mr. CLIFF. I think you have expressed the problem, a dilemma.

As I have testified, we support the purposes of these bills, but the administration recommends a different method of funding.

Mr. TEAGUE. Well, this is not exactly a fair question for me to ask you, so I will not insist that you answer it, but I am presenting a problem which exists.

Let me ask you one question, though.

Under one of these bills, having to do with firefighting, someone suggested to me an amendment authorizing you to purchase aircraft, more than you have now, particularly the Canadian water-scooping aircraft which I believe the Forest Service does not own. You do not own one of those at this time, do you?

Mr. CLIFF. No; we do not own one of the new Canadian aircraft.

Mr. TEAGUE. You would not need any special legislative authority to do that, would you, if you were so disposed?

Mr. CLIFF. No; we would not need special authority for this purpose.

Mr. TEAGUE. That was my understanding. Thank you.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Teague.

As I understand it, if the Congress does not pass this revenue-sharing-proposed legislation, you would be in favor of these bills, is that right?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, I am not authorized to testify in favor of these bills. I have testified that the needs for improved management on the nonindustrial forest lands and improved fire protection are urgent, and also that there is much merit to the idea expressed in a proposal for increased efforts in urban and environmental forestry.

In the event that the revenue-sharing bill is not passed, then these needs would still remain.

Mr. McMILLAN. Under this H.R. 6084, I believe the Clark-McNary Act authorizes the Federal Government to pay up to 50 percent of the fire protection; is that correct?

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct. The act limits the authorization for appropriation to \$20 million; \$20 million is only about 15 percent of what States are now spending.

Mr. McMILLAN. What percent is the Federal Government paying at the present time?

Mr. CLIFF. At the present time the appropriation is \$16.4 million. This amounts to 14.5 percent of total Federal and State expenditures.

Mr. McMILLAN. Do you happen to know why the States' expenditures have risen so sharply recently?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, the States, of course, recognize the need for more adequate protection of State and private forest lands in the various States, and they have responded by appropriating, progressively more money over the years. There have been increases in the Federal appropriations, but the increases have not kept pace with the increases in the State appropriations and, consequently, the proportion of Federal-State money has been going down. The States have recognized the need and have responded—They recognize the great increasing importance of getting adequate fire protection for these vitally important natural resources.

Lacking the Federal funds, they have gone ahead on their own and appropriated such money as they could.

This varies a great deal among the different States, but virtually all States have moved forward very well in this field.

Mr. McMILLAN. If this proposed revenue-sharing bill comes along, can we be certain that the Forestry Department will get its share of the funds?

Mr. CLIFF. No. There would be no guarantee that forestry, any one of these aspects of State and private forestry would get a share proportionate to the needs. The decision on that matter is left up to the individual States. Cooperative fire funds and the cooperative forest management funds that are now being given to the States under these programs would be transferred into the rural community development category. When the funds go into that grouping, forest fire protection and forest management will have to compete with other rural community development needs. The States would then have the choice as to how much of the money they would put into forest fire protection and how much they would put into other things such as water and sewage projects, and other rural community development activities. There is no guarantee, but we would hope that with the additional \$179 million the President proposes to put into this group of activities, there would be more funds available that could be distributed, and that the States would put adequate priority on the forestry activities. Under the proposal, the Federal Government couldn't require any amount on any one of the activities, once it gets into the special revenue-sharing fund.

Mr. McMILLAN. The reason I asked that question, I just returned from South Carolina at noon today, and while I was home, a number of farmers asked me was I certain that the Soil Conservation people would get the treatment they are receiving at the present time, if we had the revenue-sharing program. They are a little skeptical in that they think their funds would be reduced if it was taken in a lump sum under the proposed sharing plan. I wonder if the forestry people felt the same way or not.

Mr. CLIFF. This would be a distinct possibility. It would depend on the priority that the various States put on these different programs. It is possible that some States would increase their expenditures for forestry activities and soil conservation activities, and others that have weaker programs and other needs which they consider of higher priority, might reduce funds for these activities. The basic idea was to give the States this option.

Mr. BURLISON. Chief Cliff, under the revenue-sharing proposal of the President that you explained, would it be a fair statement to say that the revenue that is shared in each State would go to the priorities as formulated by that particular State?

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct, but expenditures would have to be within these six program areas including, one for urban problems, one for rural community problems. We are talking about the rural community development activities, and the money that goes into that pot would have to be spent for rural development programs. The forestry activities are in that category.

Mr. BURLISON. As would soil conservation programs?

Mr. CLIFF. That is my understanding.

Mr. BURLISON. And numerous other programs. Would it not be fair to say that the agency which exerted the greatest political muscle in the particular State involved is the one that would be more likely to get its share of the funds or possibly its disproportionately large share of the funds.

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, I think that could happen.

Mr. BURLISON. And isn't this a real danger of the revenue-sharing proposal that you have enunciated?

Mr. CLIFF. This gives us some worry, but we would do our best on a salesmanship basis, a persuasion approach, to influence the States to properly fund forestry activities. However, we would have no decision in this matter.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLISON. Yes.

Mr. TEAGUE. You will get a lot of help from the Sierra Club and other conservation groups when that power structure starts to function. You wouldn't be out there all by yourself.

Mr. CLIFF. I am sure that the conservation groups would be in favor of increased fire protection, and for the urban and environmental forestry proposals. I am not so sure about the feelings of a group like the Sierra Club and other organizations that favor preservation. I am not so sure what attitude they have on cooperative forest management, since one of the objectives of that program is to increase the production of wood for commerce, as well as to increase the production of other forest products and services.

Mr. BURLISON. Following up the point that has been raised by my distinguished friend from California, Mr. Teague, isn't it true that the influence which conservation forces might have on legislation would certainly vary with the particular State and the particular area involved?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes; I am sure that is true.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Cliff, you have made reference to departmental reports in each of your statements. My colleague, Mr. Vigorito, and I do not have them. Does the Clerk know about this?

Mr. CLIFF. I think I can comment on that. We have the report on H.R. 6082. The other two are due soon. They essentially express the position which I explained in my testimony.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Cliff, the Cooperative Forest Management Act authorizes the Federal Government to pay up to 50 percent of the cost of the cooperative forest management program. What percentage of the total cost is the Federal Government actually paying, and who pays the balance of that?

Mr. CLIFF. In fiscal year 1971, the Federal Government funded 31 percent, and the States and local units of government, mainly the States, financed 69 percent. Our appropriation is now right up against the authorization. It is just a few dollars less than the \$5 million authorized. The States are spending nearly \$8 million as against the \$4.9 million appropriated for the Federal share.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you very much, sir. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Cliff, it seems that before we can take final action on these bills, we would have to wait to see what is going to happen on the revenue-sharing proposal.

Mr. CLIFF. That is the burden of my testimony, that we attempt the revenue-sharing approach first.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Cliff. We appreciate your coming down and giving us your opinion on these bills today.

Mr. CLIFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Samuel S. Cobb, director, Pennsylvania Bureau of Forestry, representing National Association of State Foresters. Mr. Cobb, we are happy to have you.

STATEMENT OF SAMUEL S. COBB, DIRECTOR, PENNSYLVANIA BUREAU OF FORESTRY, REPRESENTING NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE FORESTERS

Mr. COBB. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Samuel S. Cobb. I am the director of the Bureau of Forestry for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. As such, I am the State forester, and I am here today representing the National Association of State Foresters, an organization that includes all of the 50 men who direct forestry activities for the State governments.

This Nation today faces a paradox with respect to our forests. A paradox which is perplexing to the public administrator of forestry programs at all levels of government, to those in public and private life who are concerned about providing a better life for all of our citizens, and to a vast nationwide industry concerned with producing products derived from wood or wood fiber.

The administration and the Congress have both indicated a goal for the improvement of the housing situation for large numbers of our citizens who live under substandard conditions. To meet this goal and to supply the other vast needs of our people for products derived from wood, the wood and wood fiber must come from three basic units of this country's 510 million acres of commercial forest lands.

The first of these is the approximately 130 million acres owned by government, the vast bulk of which is owned and administered by the Federal Government, through the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

The second of these is the approximately 63 million acres owned and managed by segments of the forest industries.

The last is the approximately 317 million acres owned by private individuals, groups, or businesses.

That the government lands will be able to supply a decreasing proportion of this demand for wood and wood fiber is quite evident from the increasing public concern for the forest environment, for preservation of larger areas of public lands for wilderness purposes, and for provision of benefits such as recreation, water, wildlife habitat, and esthetics. These often legitimate demands on public forests are certain to limit the areas of commercially available timber as sources of raw wood material.

The second area, that owned by forest industries, is not a real problem. In terms, of size, however, it amounts to only 12 percent of the total and thus cannot conceivably meet the need. It is, to a degree, also subject to pressures for the supply of other benefits.

Thus, increasingly, the ability to meet projected wood fiber needs must be met by the third area, the privately owned commercial forests.

If this segment of our forests is to meet this demand, within the time limits which appear in most projections for wood requirements

through the year 2000, much will have to be done to improve the capacity of these forests to meet this demand.

Although they represent about 60 percent of the total commercial forests and are generally the most accessible and contain the best growth potential, our privately owned forests are in the poorest condition at present. Only 29 percent of these private forest acres are considered to be properly managed, by those who compiled the recent conservation needs inventory; 26 percent of these lands were found to be in urgent need of planting or seeding, to establish acceptable forest cover or to reinforce substandard tree stocking; and 45 percent were found to be in urgent need of timber-stand improvement treatments, to improve the individual tree quality, species composition, and growth rates.

To achieve the maximum possible timber production from these private forest lands, together with providing from them a balanced multiple-use supply of the other forest benefits cited earlier, is the task Congress recognized in enacting the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950.

Unfortunately, at present levels of State and Federal funding of this effort, we State foresters and our staffs are barely scratching at the surface of the problem. As is the case with the cooperative forest fire program, the Federal funding is falling behind the originally contemplated sharing between the State and Federal Governments. In my State, the Federal share of CFM during the current year amounts to 34 cents on the dollar spent, instead of the originally conceived 50 cents. A significant priming of Federal funds will inevitably stimulate further increased State investment in this vital program.

The cooperative forest management program has changed drastically in the 20 years since its inception. No longer is it simply a program to get farmers to plant or cut trees scientifically. The demands of today call for our service foresters to consider the full range of owner interests and public demands, of which timber production may well be a low priority owner interest in many cases. Products have become more diverse and the program has to be much more sophisticated. Today the farmer-owner is in the minority in many States. There is no more demand for public relations and educational activity. Timber owners no longer have the rural background of forest knowledge, so it takes more effort to sell them a rounded program of forest management.

To better illustrate the urgency for both an increased congressional authorization, as proposed by H.R. 6082, and for early funding of this authorization, I would point to the situation in my own State, Pennsylvania. I believe, based on my discussions with other State foresters, that it is typical, not exceptional.

Considering our 13½ million acres of privately owned forest lands in Pennsylvania, we currently have approximately 278,000 owners who hold 100 acres or less. This is the ownership group at which our CFM program is primarily directed. Utilizing our current staff of 36 service foresters, supplemented by part-time assistance from some 18 forest technicians, we are averaging about 3,000 assists for requested services a year. Of these over one-third, or some 1,100, are repeaters. At the rate we are achieving, it would take us over 145

years to service all such owners, based on present performance levels. Our data indicate that, on an average, our forest lands are changing owners about every 20 years. We currently do almost no promotional work for this program since we carry large carryovers from what we receive from the soil and water conservation districts, the two RC and D districts in Pennsylvania, from the Public Law 566 watersheds and from those owners who come to us by chance. To compound our problem the forest area in my State, as in many others, is actually growing. Between 1955 and 1965 we gained almost 2 million acres and we expect to gain another 2 million by 1975. Almost all of this new forest land is privately owned. Thus the area needing technical assistance is growing far faster than the area our program is influencing. As the job to be done in total forest resource management, as opposed to primary emphasis on timber management, grows larger and more complex, we face the fact that existing programs are increasingly inadequate in relationship to the job to be done.

Passage of H.R. 6082 and its subsequent funding through the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 would enable the 50 State foresters I represent to move forward aggressively to tackle this vital environmental need.

Gentlemen, the NASF thanks you for this opportunity to present our views on this significant legislation.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Cobb, we are indebted to you for your fine statement. I would like to ask the ranking Republican member of the committee, Mr. Teague, if he has any questions.

Mr. TEAGUE. No questions.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Vigorito?

Mr. VIGORITO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I would like to state that Mr. Cobb is the director of the bureau of forestry for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. He and his bureau are doing a tremendous job. When I received your statement several weeks back I was surprised and amazed that 66 percent of Pennsylvania is covered by trees and that it is growing, as you say, every year. It is a job well done, and I am sure it takes a lot of effort and a lot of money.

Evidently by your statement you don't wish to wait for revenue sharing.

I have one question. On page 3 you mention, "in my State," that is Pennsylvania, "the Federal share of CFM during the current year amounts to 34 cents on the dollar spent instead of the original conceived 50 cents." Is that because you are receiving less Federal funds, or is it because you are spending more State funds, or is it a combination of the two?

Mr. COBB. I think the answer to that is the fact that at least in our State, and I think this is true in most of them, the States have recognized the need for this program. As has been the case in the fire area, which was discussed by Chief Cliff, the States have moved ahead. They have tried to fund the program as they see it.

The problem as I see it, at least in my State and I would guess that this is true in many of the others, is the fact that the ability of the States to fund much further, at least at this time, has been reached. It is increasingly difficult. I do believe, however, that if the Federal

funding can be increased to any degree, whether it is up to the 50-50 matching or not I don't think is critical, I think this in turn will stimulate further State spending. The State spending will probably stay ahead of the Federal spending. I won't argue this point.

We do need some help. I think as I pointed out, we are not really touching the vital needs in Pennsylvania, and I am sure that this is true in most of the other States.

Mr. VIGORITO. Thank you, Mr. Cobb.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Cobb, has your association, the National Association of State Foresters, specifically confronted the issue of supporting this legislation or waiting to see if the President's revenue-sharing program is enacted?

Mr. COBB. I think, Mr. Acting Chairman, that the fact that I am here speaking in favor of this legislation answers that question. We feel that the need for this assistance, in both this case and the fire case, I believe it is 6082 that you will be hearing tomorrow, that it is imperative that we move ahead now.

I am sure that if revenue sharing comes about, any increase that you may make through this legislative action would be incorporated, but we feel the need is here now and has been here for some time, and we would like to see action now.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. COBB. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT MOORE, CONSULTING FORESTER, DANVILLE, PA., REPRESENTING ASSOCIATION OF CONSULTING FORESTERS

Mr. BURLISON. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Robert Moore, consulting forester, Danville, Pa., representing the Association of Consulting Foresters.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Robert Moore and I live in Danville, Pa. I appear in behalf of the Association of Consulting Foresters and am chairman of the legislative committee on the association which is the only organization of its kind having members in every forested State, or working in every forested State, and in Canada, and New Zealand.

The Association of Consulting Foresters is opposed to H.R. 6082 which will authorize increased appropriations under section 2 of the Cooperative Forest Management Act of August 25, 1950, as amended by the act of September 25, 1962.

The position of the association is compatible with the association's policy statements adopted November 12, 1952. My appearance here is at the special request of and with the unanimous approval of the officers and the executive board of the association.

We object to the passage of this bill and any increase in the authorization for four major reasons.

1. We object to the passage of this bill because the program which it finances is economically unsound and expensive.

Eley C. Frazer III, a former president of the Association of Consulting Foresters, has pointed out that a study of the work of 1 year by consulting foresters, and their work cost the United States nothing and they also paid taxes, resulted in timber cut or harvested with a

value of \$65 million and a sales cost of \$4,600,000 or 7 percent of sale value. CFM foresters, according to U.S. Forest Service data, harvested timber with a sales value of \$23,264,542 at a sales cost of \$8,900,000 or 38 percent of sale value. How much extra was paid by the public treasuries I cannot say.

Consulting foresters are forced out of territories and work areas they have developed by the proliferation of free services by public-paid foresters who come in and compete with them. In 1958 one consulting forester told how he was forced out of the northern neck of Virginia, into a different area and into other States. When he set up in the northern neck there was one State employed forester who covered 11 or 12 counties, some on the mainland. When he moved there were eight State and Federal foresters assigned to work in the four counties which make up the northern neck of Virginia. He predicted he would be forced out of his newly developed territory. I talked to him in Nevada Friday at his current headquarters. Why should not CFM foresters develop new territory?

2. We object to this amendment because the program as administered in the past has not met the requirements and clearly mandated provisions of the act of August 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 473) as amended by the act of September 25, 1962 (76 Stat. 569; 16 U.S.C. 586c, 658d). The act provides that the Forest Service and the State Foresters act in cooperation with, if not in conjunction with, privately employed and consulting foresters. The Association that I represent is the only organization of consulting foresters. There has been no meeting of any sort and no arrangement of any sort with the association. I know of no member of the association who has been approached by either the Forest Service or a State Forester in an effort to comply even in a casual way with the terms of the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

This is not to say that some individual who calls himself a consulting forester but does not meet the membership standards of the association may not have been approached and given some referrals. Indeed at a somewhat similar hearing in 1950 a man who styled himself a consulting forester testified in favor of a legislative proposal which the association opposed. He stated that he had been a consulting forester for 6 to 7 months. He has never appeared since nor has he been listed as a member of the Society of American Foresters nor has he applied for membership in the Association of Consulting Foresters. A telephone search for him has been instituted several times, the latest was last Saturday, but he has never been found. While I do not wish to suggest that a committee of the Congress was knowingly and willfully deceived, his statement was not supported by subsequent developments. I am acquainted with consulting foresters in that same State who did not support the legislation and have been in business as long as 32 years.

We are of the opinion that as the United States requires observance of its laws by the citizens; so the citizens expect no less than scrupulous observance of the laws by the United States. What we ask is simple law observance and compliance with the law by an arm of the United States. This committee might well inquire into this matter and determine whether the results have been commensurate with the expenditures.

3. A better program which is less expensive than the program which the Congress is being urged to extend, one which will improve the management of privately owned forest land, can be developed. We do not express the opinion that the ultimate in forest management has been reached on either public or private lands.

Such a program has been developed and is now in effect. The example is provided by the contract between Tennessee Valley Authority and the Association of Consulting Foresters. I shall be happy, if you wish it, to file a copy of the subject contract with your committee. It may not be the ultimate answer to the problem stated but, gentlemen, we do not state the problem. We are only trying to solve it in the best and most economical way.

In a news release the TVA indicates this is an effort on their part to provide forest management services for the valley's 18,300,000 acres of privately owned forest land. The economy of the effort is proved by TVA when it asserts that its estimate of the cost of providing forest management services and advice in the usual manner, hiring men and staffing offices as it has done in the past, would be \$3,750,000 per year. The cost to TVA per year under the contract with the Association of Consulting Foresters will not exceed \$10,000. So over the life of the contract, 5 years, the cost under the system now being discarded by TVA, and a system which will be expanded nationwide under the bill you have before you, would be \$18,750,000. Under the contract with the Association of Consulting Foresters the total cost to TVA cannot exceed \$50,000 and it may be less for payments only when invoices have been rendered and with cutoff points that may fall short of the \$10,000 annual cutoff point for TVA payments.

I leave to your computations what the savings would be if the plan was applied on a larger scale. Of course it would not provide the foundation and the framework for price reporting and the regulation of all timber cutting. We do feel that a plan such as this one should meet the clear provisions of the existing act. Those provisions have not been met up to the present moment.

4. This is, we believe, the entering wedge of an effort to implement the plans of a small working group employed by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture which prepared and completed what has become known as the Barrett Proposals. They were prepared and completed between May, 1959 and August, 1960. They were first disclosed and discussed by a member of the working group, Leonard I. Barrett, at a meeting of the Association of Consulting Foresters on November 13, 1960. They have never been denied nor disavowed as to parentage, content, objectives, or correctness. Although they have aroused strong condemnation and very bitter opposition to the best of my recollection, and I have sought both correction, which I could not find, and corroboration, which I could find, no defense of these proposals has ever been made.

This package of proposals was, and I will quote Barrett, developed with eye to gaining public support. The success of this effort is manifest by this bill and this hearing. To quote from Barrett's paper:

First, we decided that no measure would be developed proposing legislation to regulate cutting practices no . . . proposing the permanent expansion of public ownership . . . because, in group judgment, their inclusion in the program would attract so little public support that no chance would remain of reaching objectives in the time specified.

This can only be the public relations way of saying that a minimum of opposition could be tolerated. So the objectives were those approved and controlled by the Public Relations-Madison Avenue type approach. I refrain from asking whether this is the scientific approach to public problems.

The objectives were designed to be accomplished in 20 years and over half of them were to be accomplished in the first 10 years. So the first 10 years is now behind us and we can expect the drive for "accomplishment" to be intensified.

5. Tax improvements were one objective and I suggest you look at the content of H.R. 6084. Other objectives were forest management-marketing cooperative associations, forest credit, forest insurance, research, improved forest practices (which can mean regulation of cutting), consolidation and rehabilitation of forest properties (What vistas for profits that opens to a promotion-minded real estate operator), production of nursery stock, local committees, protection, and that includes fire and pest control, and so on and on.

Price reporting was proposed as a research subject. But gentlemen, we are reliably informed that if the funds for which authorization is sought are made available they will be used to establish and staff offices to be converted to and used for price reporting and if they can be used for price reporting they can be used to control timber cutting and control lumber and timber markets as well. They will be used for preparing an annual forest tax index showing the level and trend of average property taxes per acre for significant forest conditions. This provides the basis for relating taxes to income and for appraising the need for adjustments.

I will not comment on nor express in detail my opinion and that of the Association of Consulting Foresters on the merits or demerits of these proposals. The whole set of proposals should be considered by the Congress as proposals and the decision should be made on the basis of the whole package. There should not be attempts to pass a part of it because it has the "public support" potential and to put select parts of it into effect by enclosing the nauseous dose in the sugar coating of an otherwise appealing project and thus assure the accomplishment of the objectives without the public, the forest owners, the timber operators, and most importantly, the Congress, from being aware of the Pandora's Box they may be opening.

Another aspect of these proposals should be emphasized. They are based on 1952 data in the main. Some studies were conducted after that. Thus the needs which these proposals are designed to meet date back about 20 years. Even Barrett's paper setting forth the proposals is over 10 years old. Were the pressing problems and the conditions in the Nation and in the world the same at that time as they are now? Is the balance of payments the same now as it was then? If the Barrett Proposals are worth discussing, and the very failure to bring them as proposals before the Congress in a clear and straightforward manner makes the answer a final negative, there is hardly any reason to ask you to initiate and forward them in disguise, as is being done today.

I am quite sure that my analysis as presented to you will bring forth loud and vehement denials from the highest levels. But the facts are not to be denied and any denials you will hear are *ex post facto* denials. Why would they be made more than 10 years after the Barrett

proposals were made public? The facts cannot be controverted by mere words.

Gentlemen, you are being asked to appropriate funds to provide for government action in geographic areas where foresters would like to establish their own businesses accepting the chances for profit and for loss to which all businesses, large and small, are subject. Consulting foresters ask no guarantees and will ask for no loans of staggering size to maintain their businesses if they make the usual errors of management. All that we ask is that you give careful and sympathetic consideration to the other side of the coin and look at the extremes to which a program can be carried when the terms of the act establishing it are disregarded.

We ask that you reject this bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Moore. We certainly appreciate your statement, and I am certain the committee will give your statement thorough consideration.

Mr. MOORE. Thank you.

Mr. McMILLAN. At this time we will hear Mr. A. B. Hafer, consulting forester, Hafer & Gelbert, Laurinburg, N.C.

I notice you are just across the line from where I live.

STATEMENT OF A. B. HAFER, CONSULTING FORESTER, HAFER & GELBERT, LAURINBURG, N.C.

Mr. HAFER. I am A. B. Hafer, president of the North Carolina Society of Consulting Foresters, also a member of the South Carolina Society of Consulting Foresters. I have submitted the statement on bill 6082, which I would like to ask that you include in your consideration of this bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Without objection your statement will be received for the record at this point.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF A. B. HAFER, CONSULTING FORESTER, LAURINBURG, N.C.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, I am A. B. Hafer of Laurinburg, North Carolina, a consulting forester. I have been practicing forestry for thirty-eight years, of which the past twenty-two have been as a consultant, covering a territory from Virginia to Florida.

For this hearing I represent the North Carolina Society of Consulting Foresters as the president; am a member of the Forestry Council (an advisory body to the Governor on all forest matters); Ralph Winkworth, State Forester, Dr. R. J. Preston, Dean of Forest Resources at North Carolina State University and president of the North Carolina Forestry Association, Walter Keller, State Extension Forester and chairman of the Forest Council, J. E. Jackson, chairman of the Appalachian Section of the Society of American Foresters. I am also a member of the South Carolina Society of Consulting Foresters, American Forestry Association, Society of American Foresters, National Association of Real Estate Boards and the Farm and Land Brokers Association (Vice President of the North Carolina Chapter).

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Since two-thirds of North Carolinas 33,000,000 acres are forested and these forests employ twenty percent of North Carolinas labor force, producing \$1,700,000,000 worth of forest products annually, they are highly important to the economy of the state. North Carolina does not differ greatly from the remainder of the twelve southeastern states from Louisiana and Arkansas to Virginia and

Florida. True, we have the largest wooden furniture industry in the nation and rank first in hardwood plywood production.

The state has 250,000 individual land owners (non-industrial) from which 85 percent of our forest products are derived. Sixty percent of these 250,000 owners own less than 500 acres. Less than five percent of these tracts have any forest management. Fortunately, nature provides re-establishment after a lapse of time. This re-establishment time can be greatly reduced and the new crop improved with management and know-how. Urbanization and ecological changes in my lifetime have seen the shifting of industry, wildlife, and recreation to combat these changes. It behooves this great nation that reduces the productive forest by hundreds of thousands of acres annually for developments, rights of way, recreation, lakes, etc., to do a better job on the remaining land. For instance, in 1930, North Carolina averaged thirty bushels of corn per acre. No North Carolina farmer can stay in business today with that low production. This year, the champion corn producer hit the 200 bushel per acre mark.

In 1930, we foresters produced one to two hundred board feet per acre per year under management. Today, we expect five hundred board feet per acre per year on decent soil. But this is only the beginning. Tree breeding programs have shown that we can even double this volume. The problem is that we are not doing it. Unmanaged forests are still in the one to two hundred board foot class. Few landowners are familiar with superior planting stock. The wood-using industry will buy timber from the landowner at the best bargain he can make. Without some forest knowledge, education, demonstration, and experience, the landowner is cheated on the scale, raped of his choice species and left with slow growing, defective, cull trees from which he expects to generate another timber crop.

We have one hundred counties in North Carolina with only twenty-two service foresters who can average one hundred clients per year, or a total of 2,200 landowners. Many of these landowners could be assisted by a consulting forester and not depend upon the free services of a service forester. But, he does not know whom to contact, the area is loaded with pin-hookers, and unscrupulous dealers that barely stay within the law and have never been known to make a fair purchase. They brokerage the standing timber within a few days with unreasonable profits. The service forester can help advise a landowner on such pitfalls, show the advantages in good forest practice and educate the public to think of timber as a crop to be harvested regularly, leaving adequate and desirable growing stock.

The following paragraph is attributed to Ralph Winkworth, State Forester for North Carolina:

There are eighteen million acres of privately owned forest land in North Carolina. Sixty percent of this forest land is in ownerships of less than 500 acres. Future timber supplies will depend upon proper management to sustain continued timber growth of these acres. The Forest Service program of forest management assistance to small landowners is the only means available to maintain and improve the productivity of these lands. The demand for forest management service in the areas for which these positions are being requested exceeds the capability of our foresters. The demand for services continues to grow and this has denied many landowners the technical assistance necessary to manage their forest properly.

North Carolina is in an excellent position to take advantage of additional education and demonstrations to landowners. Two very outstanding forest schools have school forests for laboratories. The State Forest Service is progressive. The extension program has long been recognized.

May I suggest one word of caution. The present program of service foresters is only as good as the administration. Some states have done better than others. An example is South Carolina where service foresters were instructed on their role to educate and demonstrate. They were not permitted to take over a large tract and manage them free for the landowner. By showing the landowner the advantages of good forest management, they have to date gotten twenty percent of the entire non-industrial acreage under wise stewardship. This is handled by sixty-two consulting foresters without any public subsidy, and they are gainfully employed with a nominal income.

North Carolina did not have that attitude until six years ago. The state is bigger, has more forest land and greater potential, but had only seven consulting foresters. With an administration change, the service foresters doing

education and demonstration, there are now sixteen consulting foresters with possibly two to three percent of the land under management.

A question of long standing has been that the consultant is not justified in handling small tracts of land. What is small? Generally, this is said to be less than five hundred acres. Gentlemen, 75 percent of my clients have less than five hundred acres. My average sale may be 300,000 feet which means cutting 3,000 board feet per acre on one hundred acres. A ten percent service fee will gross about \$1,200. I shall never be wealthy, but I live comfortably and sleep well, knowing I have contributed to the better management of our natural resources and each client has a potential repeat performance in five to seven years. The service foresters can make a cursory inspection and know immediately what general principles to follow for wise management. If this exceeds a demonstration, the service forester knows who to recommend and suggests the practices to be followed. He does not have to do the actual marking of the trees to be cut, write up the conditions of sale, advertise for the highest and best bidder, escrow the compliance bond, or do the detailed work. He would probably want to check the completed job to make sure it provided the desired results.

Additional service foresters is a small price to pay for the added advantages if properly administered.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT,
FOREST SERVICE

North Carolina Forestry Facts, 1969

Area of commercial forest land acres:

Total	20, 027, 300
Farm ownership (45.6 percent)	9, 133, 000
Miscellaneous private ownership (33.2 percent)	6, 655, 100
Forest industry ownership (12.5 percent)	2, 496, 200
Public (Federal, State, county and municipal) (8.7 percent)	1, 743, 000

Number of forest owners:

Total	245, 100
Farmer (55.0 percent)	134, 760
Miscellaneous private (44.3 percent)	108, 500

Volume of growing stock cords:

Total	260, 650, 000
On farm-owned acres (45.1 percent)	117, 600, 000
Miscellaneous private (33.3 percent)	86, 750, 000
Forest industry (12.7 percent)	33, 020, 000
Public (8.9 percent)	23, 280, 000

Number of forest landowners:

With less than 100 acres	218, 450
With less than 500 acres	243, 600

[Dollars in millions]

Income to forest landowners from stumpage	\$66
Value of round logs at mill	\$172
Full time equivalent jobs in harvesting timber	\$21, 000
Wages for jobs harvesting timber (based on \$1.90 hour)	\$80
Value of products from primary wood products manufacturing establishments	\$680
Employment in primary wood products manufacturing establishments	\$41, 000
Value of wages in primary wood products manufacturing plants	\$190
Value of products from secondary wood products manufacturing	\$1, 300
Estimated employment in secondary wood products industries	206, 000
Employment in secondary wood products industries directly attributed to timber	\$70, 000
Value of wages for employment attributed to timber for secondary wood products industries	\$316
Value added in construction attributed to timber	\$240
Value of transportation and marketing attributed to timber	\$284

Pulpwood (1969 data)

Number of mills using pulpwood-----	7
Capacity in tons per day (24 hours)-----	5, 820
Pulpwood cut 1969 (round wood) :	
Softwood -----	1, 910, 100
Hardwood -----	919, 800
Total cords-----	2, 829, 900
Wood residues used :	
Softwood -----	531, 300
Hardware -----	155, 700
Total cords-----	687, 000
Total pulpwood used, cords-----	3, 516, 900
Stumpage to landowners for pulpwood at \$5.10 per cord for pine and \$3.60 per cord for hardwood-----	\$13, 100, 000
Value to loggers at \$18.70 pine and \$14.10 hardwood-----	48, 688, 000
Value to mills for residue at \$14.80-----	10, 168, 000
cost to pulpwood for wood delivered to mill-----	77, 371, 800
Total pulp and paper mill payroll for North Carolina (1969)-----	64, 468, 700

Sources: Pulpwood—USDA, Forest Service Resource Bulletin SE-18. Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association Economic Analysis (1968). Landowners, Ownership, and Volume—USDA, Forest Service Resource Bulletin SE-5 and correspondence. Other—Derived from "The Economic Importance of Timber in the United States," miscellaneous publication 941, USDA, Forest Service. Adjusted by applying current timber cut data to 1958 published data. Some employment and wage data from North Carolina Department of Labor and Bureau of Labor Statistics.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Since two-thirds of North Carolina's 33,000,000 acres are forested and these forests employ twenty percent of North Carolina's labor force producing \$1,700,-000,000 worth of forest products annually, it is highly important to the economy of the State that these lands should not be destroyed by fire, insects, and disease. North Carolina does not differ greatly from the remaining fourteen southeastern States from Texas and Arkansas to Virginia and Florida. True, we have the largest wooden furniture industry in the Nation and rank first in hardwood plywood production, but the other States have equally important forest products.

Like the public schools or the post office, forest fires, insects, and diseases cannot be combatted by individuals, but only by a unified effort. There are 250,000 individual, non-industrial forest landowners providing 85 percent of North Carolina's forest products. We have a forest fire protection system for ninety-six of the one hundred counties. This is costing nine cents per acre per year. To adequately cover the State, the expense would approximate eighteen cents per acre per year.

The North Carolina Forest Service now has sixty-nine fire fighting units, ten scout planes, and three tanker planes. The following is an excerpt from the State foresters budget request to the State legislature:

Adding more ground crews of the crawler tractor-fire plow type alone is not the answer. The only known answer lies in the coordinated use of air tankers with a strong ground attack. The air tanker delivers a chemical retardant solution which checks the spread of the fire. This allows ground crews time to reach the fire before it becomes too large and to accomplish successful control. The success of this method has been proven operational by the N.C. Forest Service and other fire control agencies.

The latest Forest Fire Damage Survey conducted by the North Carolina Forest Service in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service showed timber damages alone at the rate of \$37.00 per acre. The initial cost of \$53,000 per unit is saved by the reduction of 1,432 acres of loss over the estimated twelve year life of the tractor, or only 120 acres per year. The requested tractor-plow units are capable of this much damage reduction in one fire per year.

This State loses 89,000 acres per year (a five year average, ranging from 69,000 acres to 126,000 acres). The average number of fires is five thousand, with a low of 3,000 and a high of 6,372. North Carolina's loss is 0.4 percent (4 tenths

of one percent) which is considered average or below, but not all States have one of the best fire protection foresters in the Nation as its State forester.

This State loses 89,000 acres per year (a five year average, ranging from economy and ecology. The increased appropriation suggested in H.R. 6084 amounts to 1/100,000 percent of the Federal budget. Gentlemen, can you find 100,000 items more important to our wealth and health!

Mr. HAFER. Rather than read the statement, I would merely like to emphasize a few parts of it. In the first paragraph you will notice the importance of forestry to the economy of North Carolina, where one out of every five of our labor force works in some sort of wood-using industry. Our timber-product sales amount to \$1,700 million a year, where the business is second only to textiles, so far as the income in the State of North Carolina is concerned; and that North Carolina is not radically different from 12 other Southeastern States of the United States, where timber is a very important product. For that reason, we are interested, all of us who are foresters, in this bill, and would like to see it passed.

There is one word of caution, and I would like to give an example or two, as mentioned in here. In South Carolina, where the cooperative forest management program is being used for some years and the State forester has been in favor of using it to its fullest, they have 62 consulting foresters, which do not cost the Government 1 penny. They make their own way. The reason for this is, the cooperative management foresters refer commercial forest jobs to the consultant, because they certainly don't have time to do them themselves. As a result, South Carolina has about 20 percent of its private forest-land holdings under management by consulting foresters, or under management.

North Carolina did not have this cooperation for a good many years. It changed 6 years ago, and the Forest administration brought about a change in the attitude of the cooperative management forester. We now have 16 consulting foresters in the State of North Carolina, whereas 6 years ago we had only seven. With a continued service administered the proper way, the consulting foresters would be much better off than they have been in the past. This would not cost the Government anything.

So much for H.R. 6082. If you have any questions, I would be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. McMILLAN. I heartily agree with your statement that the people are just beginning to find out in South Carolina that wood products are among our leading crops. At one time, they looked at it haphazardly in taking care of the forests, but now they are really working at it.

Mr. HAFER. South Carolina is probably doing the best job of any State in the Union as far as cooperative forest management is concerned, and I cannot criticize the present operation in North Carolina. There are some State foresters who think the cooperative forest managers should do all of the forest management work on private nonindustrial forest land. In those States it is correct, what Mr. Cobb and several others have said, about the consulting foresters being pushed out of business where the State is being administered that way; and also there are very few new consulting foresters. For instance, going back to South Carolina, with 62 consulting foresters, that is 20 percent of all the consulting foresters in the Nation in that one State, which is not one of the bigger States.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is a small State.

Mr. HAFFER. Are there any other questions?

Mr. TEAGUE. I am sorry I had to leave to go to vote, but I have no questions. I have read your statement.

Mr. McMILLAN. The members have your statement in full.

Mr. HAFFER. May I give a statement on H.R. 6084?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, we will be happy to hear you at this time.

Mr. HAFFER. It is needless to report the importance of forestry to you again, since you have already had it. Of course, there are 14 South-eastern States that find the forest fire protection to be a great thing, whereas I only mentioned 12 in the bill H.R. 6082, since Texas and some of the other States do not have forestry as a major part of their revenue. They do all have trouble with forest fires, and there is a situation from the coastal plain of North Carolina clear down around the gulf to Louisiana, where fires are exceedingly bad. They are large, and the States are not always about to finance the cost of protection in these areas. I am more familiar with North Carolina than with the other States. The present North Carolina cost of fire protection is about 9 cents an acre. The State forester estimates to do an adequate job would require about 18 cents per acre per year. In exceedingly dry weather we have to pick up extra labor, bring in extra equipment, and these things are not possible to plan in advance, because we don't know what the weather is going to be. As a result, there should be some standby equipment which the State has not been able to afford.

So far North Carolina has had no firelane plows or heavy equipment in the mountain area, the whole western third of the State. They could not afford it. They had been using hand labor for their fire-fighting. Hand labor is now becoming scarce. Our State law required a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour. We are now going, in a two-stage increase, to a minimum of \$1.60, which the State forester estimates will cost his budget \$90,000 a year just for increased hand labor alone.

The heavy firelane plowing units which are needed, five this year, are \$53,000 apiece, but if they save only 120 extra acres a year over their 12-year life, in damage that a forest fire does, it will amortize the equipment, but the State does not have the funds to go into this all at one time or to get started on this basis.

In just the last 30 days we have had some extremely dry weather and fire hazards. In a 10-day period we had 1,200 fires that caused \$240,000 damage on 44,000 acres. This all happened in 10 days, and this is hard to budget. With an increase in the cooperative fire protection fund, the State feels they could do a much better job in protecting the forests adequately. Thank you.

Mr. McMILLAN. During the last 6 weeks we have had hundreds of fires in South Carolina. It seems like they pop up overnight any place. I don't know if they are caused by cigarettes or the drought. Everything is so dry, the leaves, that is all that is needed, just a little spark.

Mr. HAFFER. The wind has been rather high in the last 60 days, too.

Mr. TEAGUE. I stopped smoking 2 weeks ago so it is not my fault.

Mr. McMILLAN. I don't believe as much of it is caused by cigarettes as they claim any way. Sparks from trains and lots of other things cause it.

Mr. HAFFER. Our main cause are brush burning and incendiaries. We still have people who think they ought to burn the woods to get satisfaction and so forth.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is certainly good to have you come to Washington and give us your opinion on these proposed bills. I am sure that your statement will be very seriously considered by the committee concerning this proposed legislation.

Mr. HAFFER. Thank you very much.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you.

The committee stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

(Whereupon, at 3:55 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned to reconvene at 2 p.m., Tuesday May 18, 1971.)

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT AND FIRE PROTECTION AND URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1971

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:10 p.m., in room 1302, Longworth House Office Building, the Hon. John L. McMillan, presiding.

Present: Representatives McMillan, Vigorito, Dow, and Teague.

Also present: Mrs. Christine S. Gallagher, chief clerk; Lacey C. Sharp, general counsel; and Hyde H. Murray, associate counsel.

Mr. McMILLAN. The committee will come to order. Mr. Cliff, I appreciate your taking your valuable time to come back with us this afternoon. We had a few questions prepared to ask you yesterday, and in the rush between all the bells, I didn't have a chance to ask them. So, at this time I will ask counsel if he will just ask those questions, and see if you can give us the answers. Mr. Sharp, counsel for the committee, if you would proceed to ask Mr. Cliff the questions we have at the desk.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD CLIFF, CHIEF, FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Resumed

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Cliff, in your testimony yesterday, you presented an adverse administration report on revenue sharing. In contrast, many have lent strong support to this bill. Isn't it dangerous to put all of your eggs in the revenue-sharing basket?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, Mr. Sharp, the administration, I assure you, has considered this and has decided to recommend revenue sharing in lieu of increasing the authorizations for carrying out section 2 of the Clarke-McNary Act and the Cooperative Forest Management Act. The urban environmental forestry program would be a new program, not now authorized by legislation, and the administration feels that this effort should also come under the revenue-sharing umbrella. There was some uncertainty expressed yesterday by members of the committee, as to whether revenue-sharing legislation would pass very soon, and that there would be some risk that these desirable approaches would be postponed pending resolution of the revenue-sharing proposal. The thing that gives us some concern, from where I sit personally, and this is a personal opinion, is that the States might not act

uniformly under a revenue-sharing program. Some States undoubtedly would give proper weight to these important State and private forestry programs, whereas other States might consider them less important than other programs in the rural community development category, and we could lose ground in some places.

There would be no Federal requirement that the States move ahead uniformly or in accord with any unified national program. It would all be up to the States.

Mr. SHARP. Yesterday, also, you testified that 31 percent was Federal contributions in the cooperative forest management program. Why have State expenditures risen so sharply?

Mr. CLIFF. The 31-percent figure relates to the cooperative forest management program which is the subject of H.R. 6082. The States generally have recognized the urgency of doing more work on the nonindustrial, privately owned forest lands, and they have consequently more than matched the Federal contribution. They have gradually increased the State and private contributions to this program, and I think it emphasizes the importance that most States place on cooperative forest management.

The States also recognize, as reflected by testimony here yesterday, that we should be moving faster in getting good forestry practices on these nonindustrial forest lands, and I likewise emphasized the need for doing this. The only difference is the approach that the administration favors over the approach that these bills would foster.

Mr. SHARP. Can you see any signs of progress in improving the management levels of private, nonindustry forest?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes. There has been progress under the cooperative forest management program and the cooperative fire protection program. There has been considerable progress over the years. The States have employed more service foresters. They now employ about 850 service foresters. Each year they are providing services to more landowners, but even so they are reaching only a little over 2 percent of the landowners each year.

Mr. SHARP. They're just keeping their heads above water, aren't they?

Mr. CLIFF. Well the number of landowners that are getting help compared with those who need this kind of assistance, is a small proportion.

Mr. SHARP. Now, are the nonindustry private forests a significant factor in supplying timber for the future?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, sir. Very much so. I testified yesterday that these nonindustry private forests make up 59 percent of all the commercial forest land in this country.

They are supplying only about 30 percent of the softwood timber, which means that they are being managed at a level far below what they should be if they are to make a full contribution. These lands are generally more productive than most public forest lands. They are more accessible. They are closer to markets, generally.

But they have, over the years, been neglected. There is some progress, for which we are grateful, but there is great opportunity to increase productivity on these lands.

In the future, if we are going to come anywhere near meeting our wood needs and needs for other resources and services, we must bring these private forest lands into more nearly full productivity.

Mr. SHARP. Assuming that the nonindustrial private forests are an important factor, why do the owners need increased technical assistance supported with public funds?

Mr. CLIFF. With Federal funds?

Well, many of these owners are small in size, measured in terms of the average acreage that they own. Many of them are not financially well enough off to be able to do all of this work on their own, or to employ foresters to do it for them.

Forestry requires relatively long-term investments. There is a long delay before revenue is obtained from forest crops, and the kind of owners that we have in this nonindustry ownership class need technical assistance. They may need help in other ways, such as through credit, and through other kinds of incentives to enable them to move forward on a good conservation program. A good many of them just can't afford to do it on their own.

But I feel the public interest in getting these lands into good condition justifies public contributions to help them on their way.

Mr. SHARP. All right, sir. If improvement of the nonindustrial, private forests presents such a problem, what are the chances that increased technical assistance will solve the problem?

Mr. CLIFF. Increased technical assistance should definitely help solve the problem. Many of these owners—about 4 million of them—have an average ownership less than 100 acres, and many of them are not knowledgeable about what their lands are able to produce, how to market the products to the best advantage, or how to apply the best forestry measures. They do need this kind of advice and assistance in order to make proper decisions as to how to manage their lands.

They can get some of this assistance from industry foresters, and the industry foresters are contributing to this effort. They can get it from consulting foresters, and we are encouraging the use of more consultants. But the job is just so great that the consulting foresters and the industry foresters can't cover all of the eggs.

There's really no guarantee that this will solve the problem. I think, as I stated before, that many things might be necessary in the way of incentives and credit to enable the small landowners to fully implement a sound, forestry program.

The first thing that they need is good technical advice on what their lands are able to produce, and what they need to do in order to start improving them.

Mr. SHARP. The nonindustrial, private forest owners do not recognize that now?

Mr. CLIFF. Many of them don't. The ones that have the benefit of these programs do.

But, as I stated earlier, only a small percentage of these people are reached by these cooperative programs at the present level.

Mr. SHARP. Well, let me ask you one more question on H.R. 6082.

Discussion of the nonindustrial, private forests has been almost exclusively toward timber. Aren't they important for other reasons, many of which are incompatible with timber production?

Mr. CLIFF. These forests are important for other purposes, certainly. They are important as watersheds, they are important for maintaining green space, natural beauty, and for producing wildlife habitat and outdoor recreation. Many of these lands are located close to urban and urbanizing areas and can contribute greatly to these nontimber resource uses.

And I think this is really more important to the general public than it might be to the private landowner himself, and this, in itself, justifies public participation. The watershed protection benefits from forest fire protection and good forest management have long been recognized as a prime reason for public participation in these cooperative forestry programs.

There is a great deal of compatibility between good management for timber production and good management for watershed protection. If the timber is properly managed, it can be beneficial to wildlife and other values. If it is improperly managed, it can be detrimental.

So, under good management, under what we call a multiple use approach, these various uses can be highly compatible. There could be some incompatibility between timber harvest and maintenance of the scenic qualities, but even this can be harmonized if it is properly done.

Mr. SHARP. Turning now, Mr. Cliff, to H.R. 6084. The Clark-McNary Act authorizes the Federal Government to put up to 50 percent of the cost of the cooperative forest fire protection program. What percentage of the total cost is the Federal Government actually paying, and who pays the balance?

Mr. CLIFF. The Federal Government is appropriating money in the amount of \$16.5 million or 14.5 percent of the total. The balance, 85.5 percent is paid largely by the States, with some contributions from counties and from private industry. But it is largely by the States.

Mr. SHARP. How did the 14.5 percent Federal contribution compare with previous years' contribution?

Mr. CLIFF. It is less than previous years, because even though the Federal contributions have been rising slowly, the State, county, and industrial contributions have been rising more rapidly. So the percentage has declined over the years.

A number of years ago, the percentage of the Federal contribution was several times the percentage of today.

Mr. SHARP. Why have the State expenditures risen so sharply?

Mr. CLIFF. The price of protecting forest lands has increased, of course, just like the cost of other services and goods and labor in this country. But there are other important things.

The use of these lands has increased. The hazards are greater. The States are employing more sophisticated firefighting methods which involve the use of equipment, new techniques in firefighting which are more effective but more expensive.

I think one of the major reasons for rising costs is the added hazard that accompanies greater impact from the public in making use of these forest lands. That and the general rise of costs of doing business of all kinds.

Mr. SHARP. Can you see any signs of progress in prevention, detection, and suppression efforts?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, very much so. The average size of fires being fought by the States has decreased, which indicates more efficiency in attack. The total number of fires being fought has reached a plateau. It is about the same this last 10 years as it was the preceeding 10 years.

But this in itself indicates considerable progress, because there is a great deal more use being made of these forests, and the hazards are greater. Just to hold our own in total numbers of fires and total burned acreage indicates considerable progress, because the conditions with which we are dealing, and with which the States are dealing today, are quite different.

The number of fires started has been fairly constant during the past 10 years as compared to the preceeding 14 years. But if you go back further, the number of fires prevented has dropped remarkably as a result of fire preventing campaigns of various kinds, and we mentioned some of these yesterday.

The States are moving as vigorously as they can into new prevention methods to handle unsolved problems, so I am sure that both in their programming and in their results there has been a good payoff from these programs at the level at which they have been financed.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Cliff, I understand there is concern about the distribution of funds based on rural population factors as proposed in the rural community development category of special revenue sharing.

What would you propose to do?

Mr. CLIFF. I don't know just how we would approach it. There is a problem here.

Under the revenue-sharing proposal the money would be distributed in part on the basis of population. Those States where there are few people in rural areas would get a lesser share of the money than areas with a denser rural population. And forested areas generally are in the lighter or in the less densely populated parts of the country. So, this could create a problem of distribution.

The States must recognize the problem and be willing to put emphasis on forestry even though the measures applied would be in the less densely populated parts of the country. Here again under revenue sharing, the decision on these matters would be entirely up to the States. Each one would have to assess its needs and make its own decision.

We propose to continue our educational work with the States and help them in any way we can by advice, but the final decision would be up to them.

Mr. SHARP. The Office of Emergency Preparedness made a study and prepared a report on forestry and grass fires. What were the key points which relate to the program?

Mr. CLIFF. This is a study that was published as a Senate document in the 90th Congress, First Session. It is rather an extensive study—I won't attempt to try to summarize it all for you.

One of the recommendations in this study was that there be an increase in cooperative forest fire work. The recommendation was that there be funding to the full authorization, which, at that time, was \$20 million.

The report summarizes studies of fire problems in several states, Alaska, California, Florida, Idaho, Minnesota, Oregon, and, West Virginia. The figures and the information presented in this report I think clearly demonstrate the need for increasing the effort in fire control on state and private lands.

Mr. SHARP. All right.

Yes, Mr. McMillan?

Mr. McMILLAN. In order to save a little time, we expect to have some rollcalls later on this evening and some more witnesses to be heard. I wonder if we might submit these question to Mr. Cliff and he can answer them in the record afterward. I do want to thank you Mr. Cliff for taking time to be with us during these hearings.

Mr. CLIFF. We would be very happy to respond in any way that you suggest, Mr. Chairman, and we'd be glad to do that.

Mr. McMILLAN. If that would be all right for you.

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, that would be fine. I do appreciate the opportunity to testify on these important matters, and I want to thank you and the members of the committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you and we'd have a hard time getting on without you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Sharp if you will present these questions, and Mr. Cliff will give you the answer, we will include them.

Mr. SHARP. Yes, sir.

(The questions and answers referred to above follows:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

FOREST SERVICE,

Washington, D.C., May 25, 1971.

Mr. LACEY C. SHARP,

General Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHARP: In your letter of May 19, 1971, you asked a series of questions relating to recent hearings on cooperative forestry legislation. We are pleased to provide our responses to these questions. Our answers are presented below in the same order as the questions, which are also restated for your convenience.

H.R. 6084

1. *How do you rationalize your negative position. You make a case of the great need for fire protection. What if the special revenue sharing doesn't pass or there should be a long delay? Should we then delay going with the increased authorization?*

We have made the assumption that the revenue sharing program will move forward as proposed. In face of the need, it would be undesirable to delay this program.

H.R. 6086

2. *Some supporters of this legislation suggest that authority be provided through amendment of the CFM Act. Would this be more appropriate?*

A broadening of the basic provisions of the Cooperative Forest Management Act to cover urban forest management would be an alternative way of providing the new authority included in H.R. 6086.

3. *You have presented an adverse report because of revenue sharing. In contrast many have submitted strong support for this legislation. Isn't it dangerous to put all our eggs in the revenue sharing basket?*

Revenue sharing is an important component of the President's program. We assume that as much or more financial support will flow to this activity under that program.

4. *But can you be sure? Is there any requirement that this occur?*

Under the revenue sharing proposals, States would not be required to continue the existing levels of financing for cooperative forestry programs.

5. *What is your assessment of the present situation with respect to trees and other vegetation in our urban environment?*

Intense economic pressures for development, growing populations, and increasing competition for land have worsened the growing conditions for trees and associated plants. Air pollution, drought, erosion, heat, mechanical hazards, and other adverse influences resulting from construction, tree disease and insect problems, and from concentrated use of the land are taking a heavy toll of trees and woods in urban areas. The loss of trees has, in turn, accelerated destruction of the environmental values that are important to man.

The ameliorating effect on air temperature and humidity, dampening of harsh sounds of the city, reduction of air pollution, protective influence on water supply, habitat for birds and small mammals, and the appearance of the landscape, these are all affected by the presence or lack of trees, shrubs, and other plants in and around urban communities.

6. *What, in your opinion, is needed to deal with the situation?*

Clearly the urban situation now and in the years ahead demands the most competent and effective assistance that can be brought to bear in the creation of more attractive, livable cities and communities by (1) stopping the deterioration of environment resulting from loss of trees and associated plants, (2) restoring trees and related plants where needed and feasible, (3) planning to make the best use of trees and plants in expanding urban areas, and (4) applying and disseminating the results of research and experience in making better use of trees and related vegetation to improve the human environment.

Unless there are efforts to stop deterioration of the natural environment in and around population centers, correction may well become impossible. Once a tract of urban forest is destroyed, it is, for all practical purposes, gone forever as a unit of the living environment.

7. *What would be the benefits of such a program?*

The benefits of efforts to encourage wise urban environmental forestry management will be substantial and will be felt in population centers of all sizes from small towns to the emerging megalopolis. Physical deterioration and blighted appearances can be reversed. Growing communities would be offered new opportunities to provide for the establishment and protection of greenbelts, mini-forests, and improved conditions for a growing population.

8. *Where, in your opinion, should the primary responsibility rest for an Urban Forestry Program?*

Basic responsibility should rest with the States and local communities. Many States and cities, however, have not given high priority to the need for arresting trends which lead to deterioration of the urban forest and tree environment. Many local units of government do not have available to them the scientific information and data which would enable them to undertake urban forestry programs. As the ongoing local programs expand in number and size, there will be a need to collate program experiences and provide a mechanism for distribution of information among responsible agencies.

9. *Do you see a useful Federal role in this effort, and if so, what would that role be?*

The Federal Government has much to share with the States in this effort, particularly through the programs and responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture. Over the years this Department has provided information and education relative to growing trees and plants for shade and beauty. We have conducted extensive research and provided technical assistance in rural and urban communities on problems related to urban forestry. The scientific knowledge applicable to our forest management and soil and water conservation activities are also applicable to urban environmental problems.

10. *Does your agency have the skills and the authority to deal with the problem?*

The Department of Agriculture has the people with the full range of skills and knowledge needed to provide general technical assistance and guidance to State and local governments in connection with urban and environmental forestry programs. Our basic authorities, which relate primarily to rural functions and problems would need to be broadened to permit an active and affirmative role in such programs.

11. If such authority were granted, how would the program function?

The recommendation of the Administration is that such programs be handled at the State and local level. Should the Department of Agriculture become involved in urban forestry programs, efforts would be directed through the institutional arrangements that are consistent with the objectives of revenue sharing proposals.

12. It was my understanding that Departments such as HUD already provide assistance to cities and towns including assistance in park planning, open space, etc. H.R. 6086 appears to duplicate these services.

HUD programs deal mainly with acquisition and development of lands and facilities. There are no provisions for providing units of local government and the urban developer with technical assistance on protection, management, and care of trees and associated vegetation and the urban landscape.

13. Why can't the needs for technical assistance and advice be met through private enterprise by our nurserymen, arborists, and landscape architects?

These people possess many of the individual skills required and should be called upon to provide such services.

14. Would you propose to furnish free advice to municipalities regarding the establishment and maintenance of tree nurseries?

Our recommendation is that State and local governments should provide such assistance. We would share our experience and related information with these governments.

15. Would you propose to offer advice and assistance to individual homeowners?

Such assistance should be handled by State and local governments.

16. How would the Department plan to handle this program?

Should the Department become involved in such a program, existing agencies with related responsibilities would work through institutional arrangements consistent with the objectives of revenue sharing.

17. What about State responsibilities?

These would be left to individual States.

18. What is the relationship of this proposed program to the Park Service programs?

There is essentially no conflict between the program proposed in H.R. 6086 and the Park Service programs. In a few areas, such as the District of Columbia, the Park Service has the existing framework for implementing urban forestry and the capabilities to backstop such a program.

19. Would the proposed program provide for protection from insect damage such as the recent gypsy moth invasions?

Insect and disease problems relating to urban vegetation should be treated by State and local urban forestry programs.

20. Would people be paid to cut down dead and dying elm trees and other potentially hazardous material?

Each local unit of government would need to treat this question.

21. Would this program provide for the production of trees, shrubs, and seedlings and other plants needed by cities and towns?

We expect that under any program for urban environmental forestry commercial nurseries would provide trees, shrubs, and ornamental plants for cities and towns.

H.R. 6084

If the Federal Government is authorized to expend up to 50 percent, why did they only spend only 14.5 percent?

The Weeks Law of 1911 and Clarke-McNary Law of 1924 provided the strong base for the Federal-State partnership in getting fire protection to non-Federal forest and watershed lands. Through the years the States have recognized the need to protect their forest investments and have obtained accelerated State financial support for this program.

Sincerely,

E. M. BACON,
Acting Chief.

Mr. McMILLAN. At this time, we would like to hear from our colleague, the Honorable Clifford McIntire, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. McIntire, it's a pleasure to have you back on the Hill again. I know as a member of the Agriculture Committee who was here during your regime, I am certainly delighted to see you and be with you, anytime you can honor us with a visit to Capital Hill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, before Cliff starts, I too, of course, would like to welcome him. I would like to suggest, if I may, so that we won't run out of time. We are, as you said, likely to have several rollcalls this afternoon, so I would hope that all of the witnesses would be as brief as they can and put their complete statement in the record and try to summarize it, if they are lengthy at all. Summarize it orally.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLIFFORD McINTIRE, DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. McINTIRE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. May I just say here that it is a pleasure to be back in the sitting of a hearing by this subcommittee on which I had the pleasure of serving for so very many pleasant years.

I have a statement, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in relation to each of the bills, H.R. 6082 and H.R. 6084. I would ask that these statements be filed for the record, as they are prepared, and I need only to add the very last line, that is, in representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, we favor the enactment of each of these two bills.

Mr. McMILLAN. Without objection, these statements will be included in the hearing at this point, and if you care to make any additional statement, we would be glad to hear it.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE, DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

H.R. 6082 introduced by Mr. Sikes of Florida for himself and at least twenty-four other members of the House of Representatives proposes to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act of August 25, 1950, to increase the authorization for annual appropriations by Congress from the present statutory level of \$5,000,000 to \$15,000,000.

The Federal-State Cooperative program authorized by P.L. 729 (The Cooperative Forest Management Program) enacted August 25, 1950, has developed into a most effective and helpful program of assistance in technical forest management on privately-owned, nonindustry forest lands. Over 60 percent of the nation's commercial forests are included in this program and more than half of our future timber supplies must be developed on these lands.

Technical assistance involves a broad range of activities including forest management plans, disease and insect control timber stand improvement, reforestation and many related management problems including important aspects of water resources, recreational potential and environmental quality.

At the 1970 Annual Meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation the voting delegates of the member State Farm Bureaus expressed their deep interest

in federal-state cooperative programs relating to privately-owned forest lands in the following policy statement:

"Private forestry

"We favor a privately owned, sustained-yield forest industry.

"The private industry should be assisted by essential public services such as education, research, fire protection, and pest control. We urge cooperation of state and extension service foresters to provide advice on effective management and utilization."

Current appropriations by Congress have virtually reached the present statutory ceiling of \$5,000,000. Appropriations have been as follows:

Fiscal year:

1969 -----	\$3, 559, 000
1970 -----	4, 097, 000
1971 -----	4, 950, 000
Budget, 1972-----	4, 970, 000

If this program is to remain effective there must be a level of authorization in the statute sufficient to permit it to respond to the needs of private forest land-owners to maximize the capabilities of the vital forest resources of these lands and to meet the expanding needs of the nation.

We recommend that the Committee report favorably on H.R. 6082.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

The bill H.R. 6084 introduced by Mr. Sikes of Florida on March 15, 1971, for himself and at least twenty-four other members of the House of Representatives proposes an amendment to existing law to increase the authorization for appropriations by the Congress for The Cooperative Forest Fire Control program from the existing authorization of \$20,000,000 to a new level of authorization of \$40,000,000.

This legislation relates to the funding of the long-standing Cooperative Forest Fire Control program which has been effectively developed in forest fire control programs with all 50 states as active participants. The Clarke-McNary Act, which includes this program, provides for the federal government to share up to 50 percent of the total program expenditures. It should be emphasized, however, that the states find this program so helpful that traditionally they have exceeded their 50 percent share of the funding. In Fy 1970 the total program totaled over \$113 million of which \$16.4 million, or 14.5 percent was federal funds.

The voting delegates of the member State Farm Bureaus to the 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation expressed their deep interest in federal-state cooperative programs relating to privately-owned forest land in the following policy statement:

"Private forestry

"We favor a privately owned, sustained-yield forest industry.

"The private industry should be assisted by essential public services such as education, research, fire protection, and pest control. We urge cooperation of state and extension service foresters to provide advice on effective management and utilization."

Forest resources on these lands are vital to a successful program or adequate forest resources for needed forest products for the needs of the nation and also vital to management of those lands for other purposes including recreation, water resources, fish and wildlife and their place in environmental quality.

Protection from destruction by fire is elementary as all surface resources are lost if fire destroys the forest cover of these lands.

We note with interest that appropriations by Congress for this program have been as follows:

Fiscal year:

1969 -----	\$14, 396, 000
1970 -----	16, 440, 000
1971 -----	16, 550, 000
Budget request, 1972-----	16, 494, 000

We appreciate that appropriations have not yet reached the authorization level of \$20,000,000, however, the relationship is close and consideration of an increase in the authorization is very timely.

The increasing importance of privately-owned forest lands to meet the needs of a growing population and an expanding economy requires that the Congress carefully appraise the importance of this Cooperative Forest Fire Control program. It is important to continue to improve the capabilities of this program by increasing the authorization for the federal government to share in its funding.

We recommend Committee approval of this legislation as embodied in H.R. 6084 by Mr. Sikes of Florida and other members of Congress.

Mr. McINTIRE. Well, thank you kindly, Mr. Chairman.

May I just take a moment, because these statements are predicated on policy as developed by the voting delegates of the member State Farm Bureaus, and in relation to private forestry. May I just comment at this point, reading from the policy statement:

The private industry should be assisted by essential public services such as education, research, fire protection, and pest control. We urge cooperation of State and extension service foresters to provide advice on effective management and utilization.

That is the policy statement on which we are basing our recommendation for the increase in the level of authorizations under these two statutes.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you.

Mr. McINTIRE. Thank you very kindly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Any questions, gentlemen?

Next we'll hear from Mr. Howard D. Bennett, executive secretary, Appalachian Hardwood Manufacturers.

Mr. Bennett, we'd like to hear any statement you'd like to make.

**STATEMENT OF H. D. BENNETT, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT,
APPALACHIAN HARDWOOD MANUFACTURERS, INC., CINCINNATI, OHIO**

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. I appreciate the opportunity to present a statement here today. I am H. D. Bennett, a professional forester and a member of the Society of American Foresters, and executive vice president of the Appalachian Hardwood Manufacturers Association, a trade association of Appalachian hardwood lumber manufacturers and landowners in the Appalachian hardwood region, an area lying in the mountains between Maryland and Georgia and this area has been both legally and botanically identified as a distinct hardwood timber-growing area. The area is the source of the major rivers of the East and the playground for millions from the teeming cities which surround the area. It is probably the most densely populated wilderness area in the country. Game abound, and thousands of hunters bag their favorite prize of deer, bear or small game which prevail in goodly numbers.

In the mountain area are some 38 million acres of commercial forest land.

Fire is the most destructive force we have in our forests in the Appalachian hardwood region; 95 percent of the damage found in our forest trees today can be traced to forest fires. But this is only part of the story. An even greater destruction is found in the air and water pollution created. The air pollution created is dissipated in a relatively short time. However, as the forests burn down into the soil, the conditions for erosion are such that water pollution may be felt for a long time after the fires have passed.

We are somewhat amazed that people can get excited over a relatively small area of the clear cutting phase of even-aged management and sit idly by and watch 2 to 3 million acres of forest land threatened with fire.

Here is a little booklet we prepared for West Virginia which is the only State completely within the boundary of the Appalachian region. It shows the pattern of rainfall, the number of days without rain, the number of fires which occur, and the area of land that burned over.

Forest fires follow the rainfall pattern and especially the occurrence of consecutive days without rain. Whenever we have a fire season where there occurs 10 or more consecutive days without rain we have, in the parlance of the forest fire fighter, a "bust" condition. When fires start under these conditions there is little that can be done to control them.

These conditions are predictable and occur about every 10 years and the weather records and forest fire statistics bear this out.

Where there is no effective program of forest fire prevention the fires start, the fires burn and the destruction of the timber, the wildlife and the recreational opportunities, along with air and water pollution, is complete.

Intensive forestry programs started in the mountains in the mid-1940's. The first job we had was an effort to intensify the forest fire control effort. The perfectly predictable 1952 was before us and it happened, because of the complacency of everyone concerned except the newly employed professional foresters. Following the 1952 season some landowners saw the light, and with the cooperation of professional foresters in State and private employ, developed forest fire control programs with very gratifying results as the following figures show:

Now, the figures are here in detail in my statement, but I will just mention that in 1952 the landowners who had programs of forest fire control burned over 7 percent of their land in an extremely bad fire season.

In 1953, they burned over 3 percent, and the landowners who in 1953 had no plans of forest fire control burned over 33 percent of their land.

And the landowners who between 1953 and 1953 developed effective forest fire control and prevention programs under the direction of the professional foresters in the area burned over 5 percent.

Those people who took no interest in forest fire prevention in both years burned over 25 percent and 21 percent, respectively.

We continue to emphasize the importance of forest fire prevention but during the quiet years the hot areas, of particularly West Virginia and Kentucky, never had the financial resources to do an effective job and when 1963 and 1964 came along in the 10-year dry cycle, we again found ourselves in the midst of a disastrous fire season. In 1972, 1973 or 1974 we are again facing the same "bust" conditions. This is the 20-year dry cycle and conditions could duplicate this 1952, 1953 period.

This red area we have identified on the map here is the hot spot of the country, you might say, as far as forest fires are concerned, and it is also the area of the country where we have the least amount of money invested in effective forest fire control programs.

And this chart, which is to be filed as a part of the testimony, we have the amount of money spent in West Virginia, and here we have

the amount of money spent in Kentucky, and here we have the number of fires that burned in the hot periods in West Virginia and here we have the hot fires that burned in the hot periods in Kentucky. So, there's a definite relationship between the forest fires that burned and the amount of money and effort that is spent in controlling them.

Private landowners in West Virginia anticipating the situation and knowing the need for an effective forest fire prevention program presented a bill to the State legislature that would tax themselves 4 cents per acre to generate funds for an effective forest fire prevention program. The State division of forestry and landowners have shown effective programs ready to go, but lack of funds have made it impossible to move effectively. To our utter amazement the bill failed to become law.

When people refuse to help themselves you may take a dim view of helping them from here. However, the importance of our forests and the importance of our environment is such that these should be overriding considerations to all others. I am not sure exactly what revenue sharing may do, but it looks like it would be a good idea to invest money where it is most needed. The attached booklet shows conclusively the relative nature of forest fire control funds and the resulting forest fires that burn.

Also, it should be remembered that the forest fires that burn in the "bust" periods are far more destructive than those which burn in the quiet years. But this is often like the difference between first and second degree burns—both are painful and destructive.

If H.R. 6084 could be enacted, raising the authorization for Forest Fire Control Funds to \$40 million, we would be in a better position to have increased appropriations that would fund a more intensive forest fire prevention program and bring about the protection of not only our forests, but our environment as well. These funds are not an expense, but an investment. An investment in forest fire prevention is far better than an appropriation for forest fire suppression.

Thank you, very much.

Mr. VIGORITO. Thank you, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Teague, do you have any questions?

Mr. TEAGUE. No; I would like to thank Mr. Bennett for his conciseness. That is a very good statement.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. No thank you.

Mr. VIGORITO. Thank you.

Now, we will have Lewis A. Moran, California State Forester, representing the National Association of State Foresters.

STATEMENT OF LEWIS MORAN, CALIFORNIA STATE FORESTER, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE FORESTERS

Mr. MORAN. Gentlemen, my name is Lewis Moran. I am State forester of California but I am appearing here today representing the National Association of State Foresters in support of H.R. 6084.

Last year California experienced one of the worst forest fire years on record. Both Washington and Oregon also suffered serious losses.

Disaster conditions in the Okanogan areas of Washington caused 57,700 acres of State and private lands to be burned.

From September 25 to October 3, 1970, 535,000 acres of vegetation were burned in California. Dry santana winds of up to 70 miles per hour with low humidities and high temperatures caused this disaster in California. Eight hundred homes and 200 other structures were burned during this short period of time. Fourteen persons died as a result of these forest fires.

Already this spring Florida, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Missouri, West Virginia, and New Jersey have suffered severe forest fire losses. The Federal interest in protecting the invaluable forest resources of soil, water, wildlife, recreation, and forest products in the 512 million acres included in the cooperative forest fire control program has long been recognized. Certainly the Federal Government has an equal interest in preventing the annual loss of life and property resulting from disastrous forest fires. The public concern about the protection of the quality of our environment poses a tremendous challenge to all wild-fire protection agencies. In spite of increasing demands on their financial resources to fund other programs, the States have been expanding their capabilities to face the fire problem.

However, Federal appropriations have not kept pace with the State's efforts. In fiscal year 1948, Federal expenditures were 37.7 percent of total program costs. By fiscal year 1970 total costs had risen to over \$113 million of which only 14.5 percent was Federal. Federal sharing is authorized by the Clarke-McNary Act up to 50 percent of the total expenditures.

An updated 1965 study indicates that \$138 million is needed annually to provide adequate forest fire protection. The existing \$20 million authorization level for Federal appropriations was approved by Congress in October 1949. Recent data applied to the \$138 million level indicates the Federal share should be \$40 million. If the Federal Government were to fully fund the \$40 million authorization set forth in H.R. 6084 the Federal share in the current cooperative forest fire protection program would be 30 percent.

Supplemental Federal funding will provide the way for protection of 31 million acres of unprotected land and will better the present inadequate protection on 200 million acres.

I have four pictures I would like to show. This one is a canyon fire in Los Angeles County in 1968. Eight lives were lost in that particular fire.

This was in 1968, the Pesco Grande fire in Riverside and Orange County, and that was one home that was totally involved. There were about a hundred homes burned in that fire. The fire was over 40,000 acres in size.

There is the Wright fire of last year in Los Angeles County and there is a Nike site there in the background.

This is a result of 1968 fire, the Pesco Grande fire where you saw the home totally engulfed in flames. This is the wintertime result of flooding in Riverside and Orange County that year. We did have serious flooding in Orange County, and there you can see the mud slides.

Gentlemen, on behalf of the National Association of State Foresters, I urge you to endorse the increased authorization as spelled out in H.R. 6084. Thank you.

Mr. VIGORITO. Thank you, Mr. Moran.

Do you have any questions? Mr. Teague?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Moran, thank you. You know, my congressional district consisting of the good part of Los Padres National Forest in Los Angeles County. I have been through a lot of these forest fires, so I know what you're talking about.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. Yes; I have a question for Mr. Moran.

Mr. MORAN. All right.

Mr. Dow. Mr. Moran, I am a little bit puzzled by some of the ratios. Now, on page 2, you indicate that by fiscal 1970, total costs have risen to over \$113 million, of which 14.5 percent was Federal. Then the next sentence says, "Federal sharing is authorized by the Clarke-McNary Act up to 50 percent of the total expenditures."

What was the trouble here, that the actual funding was only 14 percent and yet the act authorizes up to 50 percent? How do you explain that disparity?

Mr. MORAN. That is a good question. I really don't know why the act provides—it doesn't say that it is mandatory to provide 50 percent on a matching basis, it says it can be expended up to 50 percent, so it is a permissive section, and it has just never been possible to get funds enough to increase the percentage.

At one time, as it is shown here in 1948, we were up to 37.7 percent, but since then, the States have put more money into the program, but the Federal Government hasn't put in a corresponding amount, so they have been lagging. In putting money in, they have lagged to the point now where they are at 14.5 percent.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will you yield, Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. Yes.

Mr. TEAGUE. I think the Forest Service has just not requested the amount of money that they really needed. During my years in Congress, I don't remember they have been turned down in Congress. They might have been cut back, but it might just be—possibly be—the influence of the Bureau of the Budget. They haven't been requesting the amount of money that they might have been able to get from Congress.

Mr. Dow. Well, if the Clarke-McNary Act authorizes up to 50 percent, these bills that we are considering here, authorizing an amount of \$60 million, I guess, which seems to be the annual rate, and not only comes to 14 percent, I am a little bit puzzled about the relationship between the authorization in the Clarke-McNary Act, and the authorization in this act here.

Mr. TEAGUE. I don't know that I can answer that, but at least this will help move up the Federal contribution.

Mr. Dow. It would be interesting to know that relationship, just so you can get a fix on what this bill means.

Mr. MORAN. I think there is sort of implied in some people's mind as you start reaching the ceiling that you are about there, and at \$16.5 million, you request \$20 million.

So it looks as though maybe you have done the job. If you put a ceiling of \$40 million, and say that that would be an adequate Federal share, then you look \$16.5 million, 16.5 percent looks big.

So I think actually increasing the authorization shows that there is a—that 16.5 to 20 is a lot smaller when it is compared to 40.

Mr. DOW. Well, I am not satisfied just what these relationships are. I hope that somehow either the staff or the committee can figure out this so it will be clear. Maybe the others understand it, but I don't.

Mr. VIGORITO. Is that all?

Thank you, Mr. Moran.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I've got to go answer the rollcall, we all do. Mr. McMillan will be back shortly. Oh, yes; here he is.

(Pause.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Paul V. Ellefson, we would be happy to hear any statement you may decide to make.

Mr. ELLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, the Society of American Foresters welcomes this opportunity to present its views on authorization for funding for the cooperative forest management program, and the cooperative forest fire protection program, and the establishment of an urban-environmental forestry program.

If the chairman will allow me, I would like to file our testimony on the CFM program and cooperative forest fire program with you for later placement in the record.

Mr. McMILLAN. So it will be.

Mr. ELLEFSON. I would like to read testimony on the urban environmental forestry program.

Mr. McMILLAN. Without objection, it will be included in the record.

You may proceed whenever you desire.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF H. R. GLASCOCK, JR., EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, SOCIETY OF
AMERICAN FORESTERS

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Society of American Foresters, with more than 17,000 members, represents the profession of forestry in America. The Society is vitally interested and directly involved in the sound management of the forested third of the nation.

Some four million private, nonindustrial land owners control nearly 60 percent of the nation's commercial forest land. The extent to which these lands will contribute to meeting the future timber needs of the nation depends on the forest management practices of their owners. The level of timber management on the major portion of these lands is low. In many cases poorly managed lands stem directly from the owner's lack of knowledge as to available forest opportunities and his limited experience with sound forest management practices. It is in such cases that the Cooperative Forest Management Program (CFM) can play a major role. The CFM Program acts as a vehicle by which technical forest management assistance is made available to owners of small woodlands. This assistance frequently overcomes many difficult management problems and helps ensure that small forests will play a major role in supplying future timber needs.

The technical assistance required by the small forest owner embraces a host of activities which include: preparing multiple use forest management plans; providing knowhow to improve timber stands by thinning, cleaning, cull tree

removal, and encouraging replanting efforts; assisting owners interested in increasing water and wildlife yields, recreation and forage production; and referring owners to consultants for more extended services. It is such activities which are of direct concern to the CFM Program.

The Society of American Foresters urges that federal programs granting aid for cooperative forest management be authorized at levels sufficient to meet the needs of forest owners and the public.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

The Society of American Foresters with a membership of more than 17,000 forestry professionals is vitally concerned with and directly involved in the sound management of the forested third of the nation's lands.

Recent environmental concern has focused attention on forest lands. These important resources must be protected from wildfire if they are to meet the needs of the nation. Certainly, the expected demands for timber make it imperative that fire-caused mortality and subsequent growth loss be kept at a level which can be economically and socially justified. Furthermore, population increases and rising standards of living have moved the nation's forest resources into the forefront as producers of water and recreation. Continuous production of these necessities relies heavily on adequate protection of the resources.

The need for additional protection of the nation's forest lands has increased in recent years. This has become apparent in light of the rising risk of life and property losses. One need only look at the large number of homes recently constructed in rural forested areas. In the 1950's only 40,000 second family homes occupied forested sites. By the mid 1970's this total will have blossomed to nearly 70,000 homes, a 75 percent increase. Construction of this type will undoubtedly grow in the future and will place added burdens on public and private fire control efforts. Unprecedented public participation in a host of forest recreation activities has also increased the exposure of life and property to the danger of wildfire. Future use of forest lands for such purposes is almost certain to increase.

Additional concern over forest protection is also warranted in light of recent increases in the value of the resources being protected. Present and projected public demands for timber, water, and recreation create a growing awareness of the values attached to forest lands. The need for protecting the rising value of these public assets is all too apparent.

It is the view of the Society of American Foresters that protection commensurate with the value of the benefits produced on forest lands is essential. Coordinated, intensified efforts should be made by protection organizations and land owners to reduce and prevent forest losses. Private forest owners and the general public share the responsibility and the benefits of forest protection. The Clarke-McNary law is based on a 50-50 sharing arrangement. The federal share has never even approached this 50 percent level. The Society of American Foresters urges the Congress to enact legislation which will authorize a substantial increase in the federal funding for forest fire control and pledges to work for full funding under such authorization.

The society appreciates the opportunity which the Chairman and members of the committee provided for it to present this information.

STATEMENT OF PAUL V. ELLEFSON, DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS, SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS

Mr. ELLEFSON. The Society of American Foresters, with more than 17,000 members, represents the profession of forestry in America which is vitally concerned and directly involved with the sound management of the Nation's forests.

More than half of the surface area occupied by the Nation's metropolitan centers is covered by trees and forests. These trees and forests range all the way from rural forest, located on the fringe of the suburbs, to wooded parks and rows of trees situated in the heart of large cities. Their role in enhancing urban beauty and reducing pollu-

tion of various forms is recognized. Worthy of note is the special ability of trees and forests to serve aesthetic and recreation purposes. Their use can effectively screen highways, factories, junkyards and airfields as well as provide islands of quiet and beauty amid a sea of people, traffic, and general congestion. Well managed urban forests also serve as environmental amenities, a use which is not fully appreciated. A single well watered tree can produce a cooling effect equal to 10 room-size air conditioners operating 20 hours per day. Furthermore, trees absorb polluted air and emit air rich in oxygen and free of pollutants. Dampening city noise and protecting watersheds are additional merits associated with urban forests.

The future role of urban forestry is somewhat clouded. The rapid sprawl of the city highlighted by new housing, shopping centers, highways and parking spaces has led to a noticeable decline in trees and associated plants. In New York City alone only half of the 10,000 trees which succumbed to the ravages of the urban environment were replaced in 1965. Continued trends in this direction will certainly compound the environmental problems of the city. Unless strong, early action is taken to manage actively our cities' forests, future corrective efforts may well become very costly.

An urban environmental forestry program would play a major role in enhancing urban environments. Existing programs are not capable of moving urban forest management forward so that forests of the city will play a vital role in urban life. Such a new program would encourage the following forest management practices, among others: selection of tree species which would effectively withstand the onslaught of insects; diseases and the adverse effects of air pollution; planning where trees should be located in order to enhance recreation and esthetic qualities and reduce noise pollution in the city; and, where appropriate, encouraging sound maintenance practices, including periodic pruning, thinning, cutting and replanting. These practices require that urban communities and governments have adequate resources in terms of forestry professionals, financial support, and the ability to develop and carry out long-run urban forestry plans. An urban environmental forestry program could play a vital role in these respects.

For these reasons, the Society of American Foresters supports the establishment by the Federal Government of a program of matching grants to State and local public agencies that will stimulate professionally prescribed urban forestry practices.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, sir. Do you have any further statements you care to make?

Mr. ELLEFSON. No, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. We appreciate your taking the time for giving us the benefit of your thinking on this proposed legislation, and I can assure you that, when we begin checking and reviewing these bills that your statement will be considered.

Mr. ELLEFSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Gorden K. Zimmerman, executive secretary, National Association of Conservation Districts.

Mr. Zimmerman, we would be very happy to hear any statement you would care to make.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Thank you, sir.

I have prepared statements on 6082, 6084 and 6086. The National Association of Conservation Districts supports these bills, I would like to file those for the record, if I may.

Mr. McMILLAN. Without objection, they will be made a part of the hearing at this point.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT BY GORDON K. ZIMMERMAN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

My name is Gordon K. Zimmerman, Executive Secretary of the National Association of Conservation Districts (NACD). I wish to present the views of our Association in support of H.R. 6082, a bill that would increase the authorization for Cooperative Forest Management (CFM) funds from \$5 million to \$15 million annually.

First, I want to commend Rep. Sikes and the other sponsors of the several bills being considered by your Subcommittee during these hearings. A national effort to upgrade the effectiveness of forest management is essential. Consideration must be given to private lands as well as public. There should be a balance between federal, state, and local assistance to the private, non-industrial forest owner. Even though these hearings call for testimony on each of these bills on separate days, I want to take the liberty of stating, if I may, that NACD supports the package of H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084, H.R. 6086, and the associated bills. Their passage will help insure a more satisfactory balance between forestry programs on the national forest lands and on private forest lands. Certainly, each of these legislative proposals must stand on its own merits, but they must also be seen as integral parts of the total effort.

The nation's 3,000 soil and water conservation districts, which are subdivisions of state government, include within their boundaries about 97 percent of the private farm, ranch, and forest lands of the nation. For more than three decades, these districts have served as local units of government responsible for the conservation of soil, water, forests, and wildlife. Certain types of technical and other conservation assistance, available to private landowners from federal and state sources, is routed by way of conservation districts—not because these agencies must follow this procedure but because this has been the most effective way of accomplishing results on the land. Typically, conservation districts have memorandums of understanding with state forestry departments as a basis for working together.

There are about 1.7 million conservation district cooperators throughout the nation; about three-fourths of them own forest lands. Some 1.1 million are contacted on conservation matters each year by federal and state agencies working throughout districts. It is only natural, then, that district officials are vitally interested in adequate funding of federal and state conservation programs which offer assistance to landowners.

Over the past two years, NACD has participated with a number of other national conservation, professional, and forest industry groups on the Trees For People Task Force studying America's forestry needs. We also have a special subcommittee on the South's Third Forest composed of representatives from each of the 12 southern states.

Most state associations of conservation districts have a forestry committee which studies state forestry problems and recommends needed programs and actions. Thus, we are actively involved in forestry affairs at every level—that of the individual forest owner, the local district, and the state and national levels.

In looking at the total forestry situation in the nation, we see little needed which is really new—little that is not already being done. However, we do see an overriding need for substantial acceleration of many existing forestry programs. Specifically, we believe that funding of the Cooperative Forest Management program is inadequate to meet the forestry needs of landowners and to serve public needs in forest management.

District officials repeatedly tell us that one of the outstanding forestry needs is for more technical services so that their cooperators can receive advice when they need it. We cannot achieve good forest management without an adequate force of foresters.

The present staff of 850 CFM foresters can only assist about two percent of the private forest owners each year. In district after district, there is a discouraging backlog of landowner requests for technical assistance. In 1969, there were more than 15,000 recorded request which simply could not be serviced. There were many more than this who went without forestry help, but whose needs were not recorded. This backlog is growing annually because of growing interest and concern for better forest management, for tree planting, and for controlling insects and disease.

What does this lag in services mean in terms of achieving better forest management, improving the environment, controlling erosion, and adding to the nation's timber output? One result is that landowners may sell to the first timber buyer who happens by, and so often, this means another woodlot decimated for decades to come. Or if that landowner wanted planting advice, he may postpone his planting for another year—with the resulting delay in private and public benefits—or he may go ahead and plant, make mistakes, and suffer the consequences. Vital marketing information does not reach the landowner when he needs it, another year goes by without adequate insect or disease control, or the woodlot is not pruned or thinned when it should be.

Another indication the federal funds are inadequate is that in 1970, the states "matched" the \$4.1 million in federal CFM funds with nearly \$8 million of their own. This is a program which was structured on the basis of equal contributions by the state and federal governments. NACD believes that 50 percent federal cost-sharing is appropriate because of the important national interest in wise management of private forest lands. The present \$5 million authorization is entirely inadequate for present conditions and is vastly insufficient in terms of future needs.

We are all aware of the current public interest in protecting and enhancing the natural environment. Trees are the backbone of many environmental improvement programs. Trees are planted for beauty, for screens, and for protection from noise, dust, and smoke. Trees are for wildlife, for erosion control, and for watershed protection and flood prevention. Trees are for shade, for recreation areas, for cooling, and for windbreaks.

The day when a forester's sole objective is timber production has gone. Today's forester is called upon to give advice for managing trees for many different objectives. We applaud this new forester, but we say there must be more of them to meet the greatly increased demand for these new kinds of services. Conservation districts need greater technical forestry support for private landowners and local governments which own lands.

I want to point out that the CFM forester is not the only source of forestry advice to district cooperators. Soil Conservation Service technicians, Extension agents, private forestry consultants, and industrial foresters all are helping with the job. District officials appreciate this assistance which has done so much for improving the level of forest management in our districts. However, most districts do not have forestry consultants or industrial foresters available. Extension agents and Soil Conservation Service technicians are limited in the amount of time they can spend on forestry although this is one of their areas of responsibility.

Large acreages of this country's forest lands are in areas of low employment. Accelerated activity in managing these lands is going to add markedly to employment opportunities and community economic development. Consider that for timber production, the average multiplier value of stumpage is about fifteen times. A great deal of employment and processing are involved in transforming trees to finished products. Furthermore, many of our forest industries are small and fit well into the needs of small rural communities. It's just what they need to keep employment up and migration to the big cities down.

Forest management also increases opportunities for recreation such as camping, snowmobiling, hunting, and fishing. These activities often play a key role in improving rural economic conditions. Even urban New Jersey now regards recreation as the most important economic use of their forests. The same is true of the rural Upper Great Lakes area and many other sections of the country. But to have these economic advantages, however, there must be that man who

starts everything off and keeps it going with advice, market information, and other assistance.

In closing, I want to cite the action of our Association's policy-making body, the NACD Council, at our 25th annual convention held in February in Chicago:

"Estimates indicate that only two percent of the woodland owners in the nation can be aided by state forestry technical personnel due to the totally inadequate level of federal assistance to the states for this work.

"The urban public is calling for forestry service centers in non-rural areas of the nation, thus creating an increased demand for forest funding.

"Accordingly, the National Association of Conservation Districts urges a three-fold increase of federal funding under the Cooperative Forest Management Act, from the present \$5 million to \$15 million."

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Over the years, the Cooperative Forest Fire Protection program of USDA has made a truly significant contribution to greater production of timber, to protection of wildlife habitat, and to the protection of the forest resource for all the many uses which people make of trees and the woods. But the federal contribution to this program has fallen behind to the point that many states are strained beyond their resources to deal with the fire problem on non-federal lands when fire conditions deteriorate below so-called normal conditions.

Already this year, we have seen too many examples where this has occurred—in Florida, North Carolina, West Virginia, Oklahoma, Missouri, and New Jersey. The present \$20 million authorization was set in 1949 at a time when costs were much lower. Last year, the federal share of expenditures had fallen to only 14.5 percent. This places an unfair burden on state governments which are already beset with many other public responsibilities.

It is abundantly clear that the present rate of federal participation in this important fire control program must be more than at present. Considering that an authorization level set this year will stand as a maximum for appropriations for some years to come, and the fact that it will be called upon to support a wider range of activities than heretofore, we conclude that the \$40 million authorization called for in H.R. 6084 is a reasonable figure.

Let me point out that the conservation district officials of this nation recognize that many of their plans and efforts to achieve better forest management on the lands in their districts can literally go up in smoke without an adequate fire protection program. Control of forest fires contributes to the most basic objectives of conservation districts: erosion and sediment control; protection of wildlife habitat, recreational areas, and watersheds; flood control; cleaner air; guarding the economic base of forest owners, their communities, and related forest industries; and the protection of life and property.

In regard to air pollution, those who have experienced forest fires which go on for days know about the constant burning of the eyes and the seemingly endless coughing. We all have heard of major airports being closed or their operations greatly curtailed for days, even weeks, because of smoke from forest fires. We read of New Jersey's Garden State Parkway being closed and of automobile accidents causing death and injury in Florida and other states with serious fire conditions.

Taking these matters into consideration, the NACD Council—representing the nation's 3,000 conservation districts in the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—passed the following resolution at our 25th anniversary convention in Chicago last February:

"Thousands of acres of woodlands were burned last year inflicting large losses of timber, wildlife habitat, watershed protection, and other important environmental values. These losses through burning offset much of the gain achieved by tree planting and forest management cultural practices and are therefore of concern to the public and forest managers.

"Estimates indicate there are 31 million acres of private woodlands in the nation which receive absolutely no fire protection and 200 million acres of private woodlands which are inadequately protected.

"The ratio of federal to state funding for forest fire control shows that nationwide the federal share amounts to only about 15 percent.

"NACD asks for an increase in the Cooperative Forest Fire Protection appropriations under Section 2 of the Clark-McNary Act from the present level of \$16.4 million to the full Congressional authorization of \$20 million."

Since H.R. 6084 was introduced after our meeting, the question of the level of CM-2 authorization was not considered. However, our Board of Directors considered this matter at their meeting in Washington, D.C. in March and took actions supporting the Sikes legislation calling for an increase in authorization of Cooperative Forest Fire funds from \$20 million to \$40 million.

I would like to mention the provisions of H.R. 6084 calling for a study of the effects of tax laws upon forest perpetuation and for investigations and promotions of practical methods of insuring timber stands from losses by fire. We are especially concerned about the tax problem because it often has a decisive influence on forest management decisions, on the economics of forest ownership, and on the conversion of forest lands to more intensive uses which may not be in the best public interest. District officials often become frustrated in their responsibilities for the conservation of the natural resources when they see conflicting fiscal policies. On the one hand they see federal, state, and local government policies supporting forest management for timber production, recreation, erosion control, and other valuable uses. On the other hand, they often see the same governments adopt tax policies which make forest management unworkable.

Finally, the fact that insurance is unavailable for woodland owners against the risks of fire, disease, and other natural disasters, is yet another deterrent for the expenditure of funds by landowners to improve the quality of their tree stands or to extend them by planting. The unavailability of insurance is also a deterrent to lending institutions to make loans for the purchase of forest property.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

Over the past three decades, conservation districts have evolved from rural, erosion control agencies to more broadly oriented natural resource conservation districts. Districts are involved in resource conservation programs for all of the lands and all the people within their boundaries, rural, suburban, and urban. We find that some of our most active districts and some of the best contributions to the conservation of natural resources are now in the urbanizing areas. Therefore, NACD is interested in encouraging more assistance in carrying out conservation programs in urban areas.

Conservation district officials recognize that 70 percent of the nation's population lives in urban areas; that these are the people who are using our forests in ever increasing numbers for camping, picnicking, hiking, and nature study; that fully half of the urban people have never lived in rural areas and know little about forests and man's dependence upon his natural resources; that trees and outdoor recreation and education areas are highly important to townspeople, young and old; and that trees are important for the urban environment because of critical needs for green space, noise screening, shade, and natural beauty.

District officials also realize that many of the rural forest lands are owned by residents of urban communities. These owners must be reached with information and education programs. They need to be shown that they have an important part to play in achieving better forest management on their lands; that their personal objectives for landownership can be enhanced by management. The urban forest owner has great potential for adopting recommended practices. He often has the capital required for management; he usually does not require an immediate return for his investment; he is often quick to adopt new ideas.

For conservation districts to respond adequately to the conservation needs of urban communities and to meet their objectives in developing programs to meet the conservation needs of all the people, there must be federal and state technical and educational assistance in the field of urban and environmental forestry. It seems reasonable for the U.S. Department of Agriculture to develop an urban-oriented program to assist states and local governments and communities in the field of forestry just as they have in soil and water conservation and in Extension.

There is one detail of H.R. 6086 which may need clarification. Line 9 of Section 3, page 3, refers to the authority for the Secretary to terminate agreements by mutual consent with a "State or local public agency or private landowner. . . ." The bill does not authorize the Secretary to make agreements with individuals, just with "a State or other public bodies." Furthermore, it is our opinion that agreements should not be made between this federal department and an individual, unless that agreement be in the form of a contract providing for certain goods or services for the Urban and Environmental Forestry program.

Should USDA make agreements directly with individual landowners for assistance or services, that could undermine the role of the conservation district in dealing with local conservation affairs in accordance with the memorandums of understanding that have been entered into by each district with the Department of Agriculture. This method of operation has proven itself successful for more than 30 years of operation, in every state and territory. I believe that we would not want to disrupt this proven method of channeling federal and state assistance to landowners by way of these local units of government and it might be desirable to spell out the potential role of conservation districts in this program in the statute.

At its meeting in March, the Board of Directors of our Association passed a resolution calling for "NACD to support the Sikes legislation calling for a new program of urban and environmental forestry with an authorization of \$5 million."

In terms of the total national forestry effort, and in light of the need for a balanced program, NACD urges the Congress to enact H.R. 6086.

I appreciate the opportunity to present our views on this legislation.

STATEMENT OF GORDON K. ZIMMERMAN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There are 3,021 conservation districts in the United States, and these cover some 97 percent of the farm, range, and forest lands in the country. There are somewhat more than a million, seven hundred thousand landowners cooperating in these districts, and about three-fourths of them have forest lands.

The condition of forested land on the privately owned, nonindustrial forests of the country is obviously of great concern to us. We would like to associate ourselves with the statement made by the National Association of State Foresters, the Society of American Foresters, and we would urge the favorable consideration by the subcommittee of these bills.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Zimmerman, we are certainly happy to have your opinion on these proposed bills, and I hope the committee can speed up action on all these three bills and I trust the Ways and Means Committee can let us know sometime soon whether we will have a share in the revenue program.

Thank you.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Kenneth Pomeroy, chief forester, American Forestry Association, representing Trees for People.

Mr. Pomeroy.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH POMEROY, CHIEF FORESTER, AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION, REPRESENTING TREES FOR PEOPLE

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am glad to be with you, I would like to digress for a moment from my prepared statements and speak for a moment if I may.

I am Kenneth B. Pomeroy, chief forester of the American Forestry Association. I am also the chairman of Trees for People.

The American Forestry Association is a citizens conservation group. About one-third of its 83,000 members own forest land.

Trees for people is an ad hoc committee seeking ways to improve the management of some 4,000,000 private, nonindustrial forests. The members of the committee include representatives of conservation organizations, forest industries, professional foresters and forest landowners.

Trees for people has been reviewing the problem of the small woodland owner for some 2 years. We feel that the best ways to help are (1) to provide technical assistance as proposed in H.R. 6082 and (2) to provide better fire protection as proposed in H.R. 6084.

Trees for people also seeks to improve the environment for urban residents as proposed in H.R. 6086.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

I would like to comment, if I may, on some of the things that have come up during the past few days. A few years ago the American Forestry Association made a thorough study of forest landownership in North Carolina. We found that the average tenure of ownership was about 16 years in that state. In that length of time, the owner might make only one or two sales of timber.

The timber usually was sold on a lump-sum basis without the benefit of professional advice. Three-fourths of the owners failed to institute any type of forest practice during their tenure of ownership, and these private forests were only producing timber at about one half their productive capacity.

These findings clearly support the need for providing additional technical advice.

Since then, I have checked frequently with State foresters in all parts of the country, and I have found that on the average, they are only reaching about 1 or 2 percent of all the forest owners in a given year. At this rate, it would take 50 to 75 years to reach all property owners once.

Obviously, the cooperative forest management program needs strengthening.

Now, let's look at some of the problems. Yesterday, we heard about the conflict between public service foresters and private consulting foresters. Some differences of opinion are to be expected when personalities clash at points of contact.

Actually, the two groups operate in different spheres. Service foresters are engaged primarily in educational efforts. They cannot give any single individual very much attention because they just do not have time to do so. On the average, a public service forester will aid 100 to 150 people in a given year, and they will answer many more inquiries. Consequently, he cannot give any one person more than 2 or 3 days attention. In fact, many States limit the amount of service that can be given a single forest owner.

Furthermore, these services cover a great variety of activities, such as advice on insect control, fire protection, grazing, recreation development and so forth. Consequently, it is not realistic to charge all costs to timber harvesting as one witness did yesterday.

Private consultants have no limitations upon their time. They are frequently called upon to serve as expert witnesses in court cases in-

volving trespass, to investigate damage claims such as when a railroad fire destroys private forests—incidentally, there was a case in Georgia a few years ago where a deisel engine broke a connection and spilled deisel fuel for about 20 miles, setting fires all the way. The railroad people hired one consultant forester to protect their interests and the claimants hired another consultant forester, and the Court issued a bigger award than either of the two consultant foresters recommended. I guess the Court, just didn't like railroads.

Anyway, consultant foresters also make appraisals to settle estates, they survey property lines, they prepare management plans and they conduct valuation studies for acquisition purposes.

I think there is a growing need for both kinds of services, and I have recommended that the service forestry program be increased at least three-fold and that the consulting forestry program be increased at least tenfold.

Therefore, I recommend enactment of H.R. 6082.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Now, I would like to examine H.R. 6084, a proposal to increase funds for cooperative fire protection.

Protection of present and future forest crops is basic to sound management, yet 6 percent of all commercial forests do not receive any protection at all. A much larger area, over 200 million acres, is not protected adequately.

I have here a map showing the status of fire protection in the United States as of December 31, 1969. The blue areas are the areas that are covered under the Cooperative Forest Fire Protection Act, the red areas are the ones that are not covered. We seek your help in trying to color these red ones blue.

I was most interested in testimony yesterday, some of which generated a question about the relationship of this legislation to revenue sharing. You discussed it again today. Revenue sharing was advanced as the cure-all for adequate federal financing for these programs.

It is not, and even if it were, we cannot wait, because fires are not respecters of persons.

Funds now available under the Clarke-McNary Act, for which an increased authorization to \$40 million is sought would be placed in the rural community development revenue sharing category. Funds in that category could not be spent in counties which are within standard metropolitan statistical areas as determined by the Bureau of the Census. Thus, in the southern California counties where the wildfire problem is most acute—more so than anywhere else in the Nation—these Federal funds could not be used.

Now, there was a question a minute or two ago as to why \$40 million. A study made by Battelle Institute several years ago indicated that the Federal share of fire protection ought to be about 40 percent. A more recent study made in the South indicates that the Federal share ought to be 29 percent. Well, the \$40 million proposed here works out to about 30 percent of the estimated cost for the current year.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you for your very effective and interesting statement. I'm glad to hear you're taking an interest in this proposed legislation. I think the majority of people feel that we should enact some legislation along this line, and I am certain your statement will be given serious consideration in marking up this bill.

Mr. POMEROY. Now, I have an additional statement pertaining to urban, environmental forestry, and if you like, I would submit that to the record. I might just say that we are very much in favor of it.

Mr. McMILLAN. How long is your statement?

Mr. POMEROY. It will run about a page and a half.

Mr. McMILLAN. Without objection, it will be included in the record. (The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF KENNETH B. POMEROY, CHIEF FORESTER, AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION, AND CHAIRMAN, TREES FOR PEOPLE

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Kenneth B. Pomeroy, Chief Forester of The American Forestry Association and Chairman of Trees For People.

Why are a forest conservation association and an Ad Hoc task force of conservation, industry, landowner and professional forestry representatives interested in a program for urban residents?

Many members of The American Forestry Association live in cities. They send in a steady flow of inquiries about what to plant for ornamental, shade or wind barrier purposes. They wish to know how to protect their trees from damage by insects and diseases. Some of the inquiries would be amusing if people were less serious.

One of the gentlemen called to say his neighbor's cat was sharpening its claws on his maple tree. Would it get Dutch elm disease? He neglected to indicate whether his concern was for the tree or the cat.

Trees For People is interested in urban forestry because many forest owners live in cities. A survey in North Carolina by The American Forestry Association indicated that one-third of the private, non-industrial forests were held by absentee owners. These people owned about one-half of the acreage in private forests. It is difficult to reach these urban residents with exhibits, field days and similar techniques for stimulating interest.

My own experience supports the need for an urban environmental forestry program. Earlier in my career I trimmed trees for the cities of Lansing and Owosso, Michigan. Then I worked for the Michigan Shade Tree Company. Almost all of this work involved tree maintenance with the emphasis on beauty. Little attention was ever given to the effect of trees upon other aspects of the environment.

How many, and what kinds of trees should be planted to deaden noise, filter the air, control wind and reduce air pollution? How should the trees be arranged? Are young, vigorous trees more effective than mature slow-growing veterans? The last question has special importance because people tend to cling to the biggest and oldest when it comes to trees.

The effect of trees upon the environment was discussed last week with Dr. Lee James, Dean of Forestry at Michigan State University. He was trying to secure research funds for a comprehensive study of the effects of trees upon air pollution. He told me that he did not know of a single such study; although there are a number of studies of the effects of various pollutants upon trees.

These experiences all indicate a need for urban environmental forestry. There also have been substantial tests of such a program.

The State of Georgia began a Metro Forestry program in Atlanta in 1967 and later extended it to Augusta and Savannah. The details are contained in an article, "Tree Power" in American Forests, October, 1970. Here is a copy for the Committee's file.

The State of Missouri launched a similar program in St. Louis about four years ago. Since then more than 25 other Missouri communities have been aided. A copy of a recent report by the State Forester is attached for your information.

The States of Illinois, Mississippi and Arkansas have begun urban forestry programs and several other States are seeking ways and means to begin.

These State tests indicate that urban forestry is desirable, helpful and practical. Therefore it is recommended that the program be extended to other communities.

How can this be done?

Past experience, going all the way back to the Weeks Act of 1911, indicates that programs of broad public interest are stimulated best through Federal-State cooperation and cost-sharing. Such an arrangement is proposed in H.R. 6086 and related bills.

H.R. 6086 also provides that Federal efforts would be guided by the Department of Agriculture. Inasmuch as the program deals with urban amenities, should it be assigned to the Department of Housing and Urban Development?

In our view, urban environmental forestry can be conducted easier by the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture because it closely parallels the existing Cooperative Forest Management program. It would not be necessary to set up new administrative machinery at either Federal or State levels. Furthermore this program is likely to require development of trees with special characteristics such as resistance to diseases, insects and air pollutants. Forest genetics already is a part of the Forest Service research program and breeding of ornamental and shade trees is being studied by the Agricultural Research Service.

If urban environmental forestry parallels Cooperative Forest Management so closely why not make it a part of that program by amending the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950?

Some State Foresters and several associations have expressed a preference for amendment of the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 to include the technical advisory provisions of H.R. 6086 on a 50-50 matching basis.

Both The American Forestry Association and Trees For People are agreeable to such an amendment. Our primary desire is to get a program of urban environmental forestry moving.

Another question has been posed by a representative of the Wilderness Society. "Could the bill (H.R. 6086) be designed to provide for utilization of the considerable quantities of wood annually destroyed in metropolitan areas due to normal tree mortality, disease control programs and clearing for subdivisions?"

Yes. Advice on utilization can be given under the provision for technical assistance in Sec. 1 of H.R. 6086 and related bills. Similar advice can be provided under the Cooperative Forest Management Act. As indicated in the attached report of the Missouri State Forester, waste material can be and is being utilized for paving blocks, novelties, lumber and fireplace wood.

In summary, it is recommended that a program of urban environmental forestry be launched under the cooperative guidance of the U.S. Forest Service and the State forestry organizations. We would prefer to see enactment of H.R. 6086 as written. But we are agreeable to inclusion of urban environmental forestry in the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950, if that be the desire of the majority.

PROGRAMS—COMMUNITY FORESTRY

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,
Jefferson City, Mo., April 12, 1971.

MR. KENNETH B. POMEROY,
Chief Forester, The American Forestry Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEN: We view our Community Forestry Program as being distinctively different than our Urban Forestry Program. Sometimes both of these programs have been referred to as environmental forestry, social forestry or people forestry. In one sense our Community Forestry Program represents a segment of our Metropolitan Forestry Program, but we consider it separate because we handle Community Forestry with our field foresters. In Metropolitan Forestry we have full-time men assigned to do the job.

In Community Forestry we help towns of any size in developing tree planting and maintenance plans on:

1. Public property
2. Institutional property

3. Private property of public concern

In the latter instance we will work on this private property only when it has been requested by a responsible city official. Usually this is a mayor or city manager. Examples of this work might be railroad right-of-ways, junkyard screenings, dumps, quarries, spoils banks or similar areas. We also work with these communities in providing disaster aid after winter ice storms by recommending tree treatment for all classes of ownership, tree replacements and tree removal. Similarly we work on insect disease and environmental damage evaluation and control.

In a little less than a year and a half of operation we have received requests from about forty Missouri communities for this type of help. Plans have been prepared for about twenty-five. We have worked on everything from sanitary land fill reclamation to city parks, from street tree plantings to cemeteries, from junkyard screenings to highway approach beautification and from industrial parks to municipal reservoir lands. Really, it has been a tremendously varied and interesting project. It has had enormous public and political support. Our main problems have been in providing quick service and maintaining high standards. Our Farm Foresters have provided most of the basic planning, but they are supported by a staff landscape architect, an insect and disease specialist and my assistant, John Wylie, who is in charge of our program.

Our Metropolitan Forestry Program (now in its fourth year) embraces four main categories of work. These are:

1. Ornamental tree work—This is a broad category which covers everything from the individual home owner to municipalities and all of their subdivisions of government. Really, this category embraces tree work of any type for ornamental purposes. It includes care and feeding, environmental influences, selection of species for the sites, protection from mechanical and environmental pest damages and the disposal of the waste from such trees. Our work is always advisory in nature. We do not plant or prune trees. We work very close with municipalities and subdivisions with real estate developers, individuals, and various trade or civic associations.

2. Information and education for urban people is vital we feel. If we are to accomplish anything in resource management in the future we must depend on an interested, knowledgeable urban society. Our metropolitan foresters work in many areas within this function. One of the most popular aspects has been our Arbor Day Program in which we distribute seedling trees to fourth grade students in public and parochial schools in Kansas City and St. Louis and several smaller cities in the state. This year we will be distributing about 80,000 seedlings and about 3,000 teachers' instruction packages. The seedlings themselves are gimmicks to instill an appreciation of and an interest in trees. Incidentally, in St. Louis, the Greater St. Louis Nurserymen's Association is the co-sponsor of this program and in Kansas City, the City and County Park and Recreation Departments co-sponsor it.

An interesting result of this program this year was covered in a report from James Rocca, our St. Louis Metropolitan Forester. Jim writes, "A man called me saying that his son had just come home from school with a tree. He thought our Arbor Day Program for schools was great. He didn't know who was responsible, but I explained our part in the program. Then he went on and asked if such trees were available for planting on his farm in a rural county. I explained our tree distribution and forestry advisory program and he said he would like to get started now for next year. He had never heard of these programs before and he admitted that the phone call was the son's idea. To quote him quoting his son, 'I got the tree from the teacher at school. Papa, why don't you get some of these for our farm?' Ten minutes later he was talking to me on the phone."

Within the same Information and Education field we make a number of talks to all kinds of organizations, we man exhibit booths at the sport shows and similar public events, and we do quite a lot of work with television and newspapers.

3. Utilization and marketing of wood products is more important in cities than most people realize. People create markets and people are in urban areas. In this area we tried to develop markets for out-state mills. We have discovered markets which most of the traditional producers ignore. I am referring to wooden paving blocks, ornamental and rail fences, fireplace wood, and playground tim-

bers. We have been quite successful in developing a bark mulch market for several of our out-state mills.

An equally important function here is the development of markets for wood wastes which are generated in the cities. This includes leaves, twigs, dead trees and trees which are cut for urban expansion. Wherever possible, we try to channel these products into the existing market structure. We have also worked to develop new markets such as mulch and soil amendment materials. We have also worked on the problems of incineration and collection of these materials.

Often the basic problem here is one of getting the producer and distributor or user together.

4. The last segment is the work we do with urban residents who own rural land. More and more of our rural forest lands are owned by urbanites. Our metropolitan foresters serve as a local contact that land owners can go talk to or phone on their special forestry problems. We have also held group forestry training meetings for these land owners. Each year we hold a tree planting demonstration in the cities. In St. Louis this month 220 people attended our seedling tree planting program. In Kansas City 150 people turned out despite bad weather. In cooperation with our State Extension Service we held a forestry short course meeting for urbanites, for three nights and as many weeks this winter. In this meeting 220 people paid a \$10.00 registration fee to attend. We found out by polling them that they owned 25,000 acres of forest land.

Ken, I am sure that you can appreciate that it is difficult to supply the information you seek in a brief fashion. I think the above description covers the essential features. To give you more background information I am enclosing a policy statement which our department has developed for Community Forestry and a copy of a talk which John Wylie has prepared and given to several groups of professional foresters explaining our environmental forestry program. I am also sending a copy of two letters which have expressed appreciation for these programs.

If you need more information, let me know.

Sincerely yours,

OSAL B. CAPPS, *State Forester.*

Mr. POMEROY. Thank you very much.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you.

At this time, we have Osal B. Capps who is State forester of Missouri, and the committee will be happy to hear from you, Mr. Capps, if you want to read your entire statement, if that's all right—if you would like to read your entire statement this afternoon and complete, you might.

STATEMENT OF OSAL B. CAPPS, STATE FORESTER, MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

Mr. CAPPS. I am Osal Capps, State forester of Missouri, and I appreciate the opportunity of being permitted to appear before your committee here today.

I do wish to file a statement, a written statement, in support of H.R. 6086, copies of which I furnished to your staff people several days ago. Then, I would like to speak briefly on the subject and submit some additional material, if I may.

I want to point out that I was born and reared in Mr. Burlison's district, several of our community forestry assists have been to towns in his district, including Bixton, Missouri, Advance, Carruthersville and Kenney.

I also want to express my support of all of the bills you are currently considering, these are H.R. 6082, 6084, 6086 and associated bills.

I now reside in Jefferson City, Mo., which is Congressman Richard Ichord's district. I know that Dick Ichord is a signer of 6085. I was a

member of the executive committee of the National Association of State Foresters for 5 consecutive years and served as president for 1 year. I have been on the legislative committee for the 2 years since getting off of the executive committee.

I would be happy to give my thoughts as to why the Federal Government has not kept pace with State appropriations, if you so desire to hear that. I also want to state for the record that I feel that the Community Forests Management Act could be amended to accomplish the same things that H.R. 6086 and associated bills in regard to urban community forestry and environmental forestry seeks to accomplish.

Now, with these brief remarks, I would like to turn my attention to some additional material which I would like to file with the committee which I did not earlier file, and these are some summaries of results that we have accomplished in the 4 years that we have been in business in urban forestry in Missouri, and in the 18 months that we have been in business in what we call community forestry—we differentiate between these two programs: we call urban forestry the work of the very large cities, and we call community forestry the work of the smaller communities and towns throughout the State, and I will just file these with you if I may, we have several copies of this.

I might briefly say that 18 months in the community forestry program—this was compiled as of a month or so ago—we have had 43 towns ask for help, so we completed 24 plans and we had 19 plans pending. In our Kansas City metropolitan forestry program, which was started on July 1, 1968, our report here indicates about 60 different types of agencies that we have assisted.

In our St. Louis metropolitan forestry program which has been going on since July 1, 1967, we have assisted 98 municipalities and local units of government, 78 business associations, 60 civic associations, and 18 real estate developers. This material is indicated in detail in the material I filed—that I now file with you.

I might just mention for your information that we are real pleased in Missouri that the Department of Agriculture did see fit to recognize by letter the work that Missouri had done in urban forestry. I might read an excerpt of Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin's letter to you, if you would like.

He says, in part:

As you know, the Department of Agriculture is committed to developing and strengthening the rural economy of the nation, beautifying the rural communities and improving environmental quality. Your community forestry program will make important contributions toward these goals. Your concern for strengthening and developing the natural resource space in Missouri has long been demonstrated with the several cooperative forestry programs which you capably administer.

Your new program is testimony to your active concern for quality and quantity in the total environment. On behalf of the Department of Agriculture I commend you for your vision and professional response in developing and implementing the community forestry program. We sincerely thank you for your public service.

Now, as a little different thing of what one local citizen says, I might read you what is somewhat of a representative letter which we

received from some people, and this is from a garden club group in Kansas City. It is addressed to me.

It says:

Several months ago, the Raymore Garden Club, wishing to make a master plan for the twenty acre city park as a community betterment project, contacted Shelby Jones, Metropolitan Forester for Kansas City. He came up with a landscaping plan that completely suited the twenty ladies—no small task in itself—and the plan has recently been unanimously approved by both the park board and the city council. In addition, Shelby gave us information on where to go for help in developing a natural spring and gully area in the park. The entire project has been completely successful. This may be all in a day's work for Shelby and the Department but it is more than that to us, and we are extremely grateful for his efforts on our behalf. A copy of the map hangs on the Post Office wall where it is studied by all when waiting for the mail to be put up.

I might add that these ladies published this map on the board and said that they needed x number of trees, that this forester said they needed in this park for various species and kinds, and they asked for contributions to buy these trees, and they received enough money from people who read this plan on the post office wall to completely finish this project and buy the trees that were needed.

I might also add—it might seem a little bit unusual that we in the forestry outfit are working with parks around the State of Missouri. I might add, that in my opinion, the reason we are doing this, is a park in Missouri without trees is a sort of a black sheep thing. In other words, no one can visualize a park in my State without having trees. I think much the same in South Carolina, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAPPS. So we have gotten into this business of helping to determine the kinds of trees that should be placed any place in Missouri where public concern is evident, and also we have done what we could to help these people take care of these trees once they got them planted. I think you must have some questions for me. This will complete my statement. I don't want to take up your time. I certainly appreciate your courtesy in speaking this afternoon.

Mr. McMILLAN. I will take as much time as you want. If you have anything you want to say, I'd be happy to listen.

Mr. CAPPS. I think I have said all I need to say on this subject, and I'll file the written material with the committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. The written material will be included in the record, without objection.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF OSAL B. CAPPS, STATE FORESTER, MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF
CONSERVATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am here today to speak in support of H.R. 6086 to authorize a new program of urban environmental forestry. Missouri has been one of the pioneers in this field and perhaps our experience may prove helpful to you.

There are 96 municipalities and the City of St. Louis (an independent political entity) inside the boundaries of St. Louis County. Each of these has its own form of government. Only one (other than the City of St. Louis), University City, has a professional forester on its staff. Several has "foresters" who have earned the classification title through work on tree service crews and by advancement through the ranks. The St. Louis County government is responsible for unincorporated portions of the county, most of which are really urban areas.

Kansas City, while organized differently, is a large metropolitan area with most of the three problems found in St. Louis.

St. Joseph and Springfield are cities of around 100,000 population which have tree problems as do several others in the 25-30,000 range. All cities, of course, need to take what steps are possible to enhance natural beauty through the proper use of trees.

The State Forestry Program in Missouri is a part of a fish, game, and forestry department. We, as a department, have been working closely with the St. Louis Metropolitan Community for many years. During the period 1938-1943 a total of 3,000 acres of hardwood forest land was acquired in St. Louis County through donations and purchase. This land is presently used as a Conservation Education Center. The land is in two tracks with one devoted to the more intensive educational effort, the other for hiking, picnicking and horseback riding. At our main center we have a large education building including a room where films and slides are shown to groups and another where a series of exhibits can be seen, in sequence, with a tape-recorded explanation at each. We have Smokey Bear featured in a glassed-in enclosure where he can be seen and heard when the educational building is closed. A wildlife zoo of native Missouri species completes this center. It, too, is electronically laid out with a taped message at each enclosure. Several self-guided nature trails are laid out which feature tree identification, management practices, etc. We work, primarily, with school classes and other organized groups but also handle the walk-ins. Kids frequently go through with a group and then later bring Mom and Dad back on the weekend. Since the Forestry Division runs this operation and a graduate forester is the Area Manager, you can be assured that all phases of forestry are well covered.

A few years ago the department opened metropolitan offices in St. Louis and Kansas City. These serve two primary functions. One is to furnish hunting and fishing licenses to the hundreds of sales outlets. The other is to promote departmental interests and answer questions. Many people, knowing that we are a combined department, ask questions about trees and other forestry matters. The offices were not originally staffed to answer such questions except to refer people to our Jefferson City office. Our entry into Urban Forestry was partly as a result of this.

We have been doing some urban forestry work for several years because our foresters answer questions that people ask them and many towns are inside district boundaries. Larger cities may have 3-4 foresters with responsibilities around their perimeter. We have assigned foresters in the past to work with smaller cities interested in the preparation of a plan to enhance natural beauty by tree planting. On July 1, 1967, we actually designated a forester as Urban Forester for the St. Louis Metropolitan Area. A year later we did the same for Kansas City. This, of course, only scratches the surface as to personnel needs.

We are still learning about the scope, intensity, priority, and coordination required in this work. Resources for the Future Incorporated in an article "NEW Natural Resources in the Urban Age" does a good job of explaining the "why" of Metropolitan Forestry.

Let me quote, "Natural resources change constantly. They change particularly in the value that people place on their products and services. These values shift as technology advances and tastes change; sometimes a resource (like flint for weapons and tools) will for all practical purposes vanish from the list and a new resource will appear (like petroleum in the 19th century and uranium in the 20th). The rise of the city in recent decades has accelerated the recognition of new resources and put at a premium clearer understanding of the relation of resource policy to the urban problem of environmental quality."

They go on to say that natural resources for the production of basic commodities (including wood products) are declining in relative importance (from $\frac{1}{3}$ of the Gross National Product in 1870 to $\frac{1}{10}$ today). (Recreation and education will soon pass farming in economic importance in terms of G.N.P.).

I quote again, "It will take quite a wrench in thinking to get away from the commodity view of natural resources and to be able to include the valued amenity features of the natural environment that count so much in our crowded urban age. A second prerequisite of coherent and effective public policy is the concept of the urban environment as a contained, highly interrelated ecosystem."

You can translate this any way you want. What it means to me is this: The most important tree in the world to Mr. Average Man is the tree in his own front

yard. He spends 68% of all of his time at home. The trees he sees every day in his neighborhood, along the streets and in the city parks are only a little less important. Multiply this man and his tree or trees by tens of thousands and you have a significant view of urban forestry.

It is not just the care and feeding of this prize baby that counts (although the owner may think so as he watches the tree through the seasons) but it is the total effect of all these trees on him. The way they make life more serene by gladdening the eye, harboring birds and other wildlife, absorbing sound, offering shade, absorbing harsh glare, and even filtering the air; all these things affect him.

A residential area may be a highly cultivated forest by forest survey definition (10% or more crown cover) or by the definition of a forest being a dynamic community of plants and animals in which trees are the dominant cover. The main difference really is man and his numbers. Incidentally, social forestry might be another apt name for urban forestry since people are so intimately associated with trees. Urban forestry has many things in common with conventional forestry up to and including slash disposal. In the past you could burn dead leaves, lumber, and dead trees, but no more—not with air pollution controls. This, by the way, is one of the problems we are tackling in urban forestry. What can we do with this stuff?

The one essential difference in urban forestry (other than people) is that trees are treated individually rather than as stands of trees.

Urban forestry, and our concept of it, is dynamic and still changing. Each project, like a farm forestry project, should be adapted to the situation at hand but this is how I see the four main categories of work which forestry can contribute to in metropolitan areas.

1. The first is tree work, ornamental, park, street, open space, and even trees growing in tubs. Care and feeding, environmental influences, selection of the right species for the site, protection from mechanical, environmental and insect and disease damage, and the disposal of wastes all come in here. In our case this work involves advice and recommendations—consultative services you might say to individuals, municipalities and their agencies, real estate developers, planning boards, and industries. Nurseries, tree service companies, city foresters, and landscape architects do the work, but we assist them too when needed. There is even a surprising amount of timber sales—salvaged before the bulldozers.

2. Information and education of urban people is of tremendous importance. If we accomplish anything in resource management in the future we must depend on an interested, knowledgeable urban society. They are the masses and they will, through our political system, control public policy and legislation. For once foresters will not be just talking to themselves, the trees, or a rural audience. Urban man needs information and education too in his role in ecology and as a producer as well as a consumer of forest products and services. It will make him more appreciative of the role these resources play in all our lives.

3. Utilization and marketing of wood products is a natural third point. People create markets and utilize wood products and most of our people are in urban areas. Perhaps we can find new markets for forest products, rails, ties, paving blocks, and more conventional products. We can also help make wood more serviceable (and therefore more competitive) by helping insure proper use. And we can even look for untapped markets—bark mulches for example. In short we can sell wood.

4. A fourth segment which is very important in our state is the high percentage of forest land which is owned by urban residents. Often these people are our best forestry cooperators. An urban forester serves as a local contact for these people and refers them to field foresters for service. He can also explain practices and problems. Because these owners are concentrated and interested they also offer a unique opportunity for special group instruction in the whys and how to's of forestry practices.

Our Community Forestry Program is different, we think, from urban forestry. In urban forestry we have foresters assigned to work in Kansas City and St. Louis. Our regular field foresters, as a part of their job assignment, handle our work in community forestry.

In Community Forestry we prepare tree planting and maintenance plans for public land and lands of public concern. We insist on a formal request from a city official or the governing body responsible for the land in question. In smaller

cities (under 10,000 population) we will prepare a community-wide plan. On larger cities we do work only on specific areas.

When I use the word public land I am referring to parks, park lawns (streets), courthouse squares, school grounds, industrial parks, airport road approaches and cemeteries. Property of public concern (for which a specific request must be made from the city with concurrence of the landowner) could include railroad right-of-ways, creek banks, old quarries, junkyards, industrial sites, or trailer parks and private campgrounds.

The types of work we do include:

1. Disaster aid following wind or ice storms. This may include evaluation of damaged trees to determine those worth saving and those to be cut. Replacements are also recommended. We plan on working with tree service concerns, nurseries, newspaper, and some private property owners to instruct them in methods of pruning, fertilization, and wound treatment.

2. More normal work would include:

- a. Insect, disease, or environmental damage evaluation and control.

- b. Planting plans for specific areas.

- c. Problem areas treatment (eyesores).

- d. Special projects such as downtown beautification, approach plantings, or Arbor Day projects.

- e. Maintenance plans for existing trees.

- f. Tree vigor evaluation and recommendations to treat or cut trees on public property.

In our tree plans for towns we first inventory needs and existing trees. From this a planting and maintenance plan is designed with the responsible people to include specific recommendations for species, sizes, and types of stock to be planted. Detailed planting instructions are given since we have observed that trees planted on public property seldom receive adequate care. We try to compensate for this at planting time by suggesting staking, wrapping, mulching, and, when necessary, fencing. Mowers are the biggest single enemy a young tree has.

Another common phenomenon we encounter is great interest in planting trees but low interest in taking care of existing trees. When work is done on them it is apt to be with a heavy hand.

We have found it highly desirable to include a financial section in our plans. We estimate costs based on prevailing nursery prices. This helps communities plan for funds. Many towns say they have no funds, so we suggest ways and means on how they might be raised. Labor to plant trees properly is often critically short and unrecognized—just the opposite of money. Most communities say they have lots of labor, "We'll get the Boy Scouts to plant them," is a common statement. This is not the way to get trees planted.

You might ask why we should be in this business? My reply is that no agency or group was doing the job for Missouri and it needed to be done. We have a reservoir of trained foresters with field experience who had acquired common sense. They knew how to analyze a problem; arrive at needed practices and sell the package. We have, or can develop, back-up staff men to support our urban foresters in such fields as insect and disease identification and control; landscape architecture; genetics and tree improvement, etc.

In neither community nor urban forestry are we trying to usurp anyone's job. On the contrary, we go out of the way to work with local nurseries, tree service companies, and city forests. In Missouri our relations have been most cordial. We believe that we can actually increase employment opportunities for these firms.

Incidentally, in many small communities there is no local expertise to call on. This is one of their problems. Landscape architects and ornamental horticulturalists are rather scarce breeds, as are well trained arborists.

These environmental forestry programs, if I may call them that, have been very well received. In fact, their popularity frightens me—I wonder if we can keep up and still maintain essential high quality and follow-up. Politically these programs may actually help carry other established and essential forestry programs which are now dependent upon urban support. I predict that this will be an expanding field in forestry.

You have heard that black is beautiful. We say green, too, is beautiful—especially green trees.

A few examples of work performed follow :

Our St. Louis forester helped design and lay out a nature trail in Forest Park, a large tract with some heavily wooded areas in the heart of the city and within walking distance of the under privileged. One of the best zoos in the world is in Forest Park.

He also laid out five nature trails on the grounds of Maryville College (for girls) in West St. Louis County.

Our Kansas City forester sold \$12,374 worth of walnut for owners within the city limits in three sales. Two involved mature trees on a 200-acre estate and another 30-acre tract. The third salvaged trees where a sewer drainage pipe was being installed.

An annual seminar is held in May for St. Louis Metropolitan people who own land outstate which is classified as Forest Crop Land under a law which grants tax benefits if land is kept in timber for 25 years under an acceptable management plan. 22% of the owners with 25% of the land involved live in the St. Louis area.

As an Arbor Day project last year a seedling tree was given to each child in the 4th grade in St. Louis and St. Louis County. Cooperating on this were the schools, the Greater St. Louis Nurserymen's Association, and our Department. Some of these may only live as long as is possible in a paper cup or coffee can in a tenement window, but each will be some child's very own tree. In Kansas City the same sort of project was carried out through the Kansas City Park Department. A total of 80,000 seedlings were furnished by our nursery at no charge to the St. Louis area, the Kansas City area, St. Joseph, and Jefferson City.

Mr. CAPPS. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you.

All right, the committee will stand adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 3:20 p.m., the committee adjourned until 2 p.m. Wednesday, May 19, 1971.)

A large number of cases of this disease have been reported from the United States, and it is now well known that it is a very common disease in the tropics.

The disease is characterized by a high fever, which is usually accompanied by a severe headache, and sometimes by a rash.

The fever is usually of a remittent type, and the patient is often very restless and irritable.

The disease is usually of a short duration, and the patient is usually able to recover in a few days.

The disease is usually caused by a malarial parasite, and is often transmitted by a mosquito.

The disease is usually of a mild type, and the patient is usually able to recover in a few days.

The disease is usually of a mild type, and the patient is usually able to recover in a few days.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT AND FIRE PROTECTION AND URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1971

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:08 p.m., in room 1302, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. John L. McMillan, presiding.

Present: Representative McMillan, Vigorito, Dow, Kyl, and Robinson.

Also present: Lacey C. Sharp, general counsel, and Betty Prezioso, clerk.

Mr. McMILLAN. The committee will come to order.

At this time, we will hear from Barry Goldwater, Jr.

Mr. Goldwater, we will be delighted to have your statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR. A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate this opportunity to appear here today. We are all joined by a common bond—a strong interest in the management and conservation of one of our most important national resources, the forests of this Nation.

Forest and grasslands cover half of all the land in the United States. In 1969, an area equivalent to the State of Maryland was totally consumed by fire—in the 5-year period from 1965 through 1969, an area equal to all of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Rhode Island was totally destroyed again by fire!

The effects of these fires are far-reaching. In addition to the loss of valuable timber, fires have a terrible impact on lives, in terms of employment and destroyed property. The greatest of all tragedies, however, is the senseless loss of life. Fires also destroy watershed cover and then the resulting floods and erosion silt our waterways.

I am amazed that in this age of great innovation, great technological achievements, so few innovations have been introduced to combat forest fires. This is certainly not to say that the agencies responsible for our forests have not done their jobs; they have done everything they could with the tools they had at hand, and I might add that I have personally witnessed first-hand our Forest Service fighting these fires,

and they do a commendable job with the tools they have available. The problem has been one of underestimation—the job is far greater than anyone realized.

We have recently entered an era in our Nation's history that is very encouraging. The American people, and I join them in this view, have become truly alarmed and very angry at the state of our environment. They care—and they are making themselves heard—about our forests, recreation areas, wildlife, and a myriad of other vital ecological problems.

Eminent forestry authorities are predicting that in many parts of the world, wood deficits may occur before the end of the century. Fires have sharply cut into our wood supplies, and an attempt to increase the yield of timber is underway. However, many otherwise suitable forested areas are actually deficient in the very elements needed to speed up the yield of timber. I have been told that experimentation is underway to fertilize large forest areas and stimulate growth, so as to realize a full-grown tree in approximately 30 years instead of the usual 60 years needed for a tree to grow. However, if the forest fires that I mentioned earlier are allowed to flare up, year after year, the battle to save our forest environment could well be lost.

Mr. Chairman, this is where the important tool of aerial operations comes in. Following World War II, excess military airplanes were used as land-based tankers. Then, flying boats and amphibious airplanes were modified to provide a "water scooping" ability. This greatly increased the effectiveness of firefighting in those forest areas where lakes, rivers, or the sea, were accessible.

Some of these aircraft that have been used and are being used today are World War II bombers, such as the F-7-F Tiger Cat, or the TBM Avenger torpedo plane, B-17, or the PBV. They have all been converted from World War II use into what they are being used for today, a kind of makeshift aerial bombardment fittage. This was, and continues to be, a "make-do" kind of operation. It uses aircraft designed for something entirely different to do a highly technical and highly dangerous job.

These aircraft, however modified, represent something less than what we should have. This was certainly an advance over fighting forest fires with shovels and buckets of water, and later with portable pumps and bulldozers, but it still isn't enough. Fire destroys over 3 million acres of land each year. The airplane can be the firefighter's most valuable single tool when used in the initial—and I emphasize "initial"—attack, especially because of its quick response time.

At this point, I would like to mention a matter that I think warrants immediate action. Now is the time to consider the value of a year-round national air tanker service as an "Emergency strike force." This tanker service should include 30 or perhaps 40 new aircraft which have been specifically designed for this role. Such a force could either be privately operated under contract to the Government, using Government equipment, or as an organization operated by the U.S. Government under jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

Prior to the establishment of such a National Emergency Strike Force, it would be in the Government's best interest to acquire a small number of this new type of air tanker, which could be assigned to the

Forest Service for an operational and test evaluation. I am confident that the results of such a move would lead to a national fleet of these tankers. Overall costs for such an evaluation, for which authorization and funding is required, would approximate \$5 million for three aircraft. I would like to point out that last year alone, we spent close to \$68 million to fight forest fires in Alaska. With the proper tools, such as an aerial tanker, the destruction and expenditures caused by forest fires will be significantly reduced.

It would be my recommendation, then, that these three aircraft be procured by the Government and made available for operational evaluation with the commencement of the 1971 fire season. To accomplish this, I refer to H.R. 6084, proposed by our esteemed colleague from Florida, Mr. Sikes, wherein an authorization is requested for \$40 million annually, which will enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out certain provisions of the Clarke-McNary Act of June 7, 1924.

In my view, this is most needed, and I suggest that the amendment be further amended to increase the amount from \$40 million to \$45 million, for the current year only. This increase of \$5 million would be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture for the U.S. Forest Service, in order that the proposed acquisition and evaluation of three aerial tankers be accomplished without delay.

In conclusion, I would like to add that in the past 30 days, 500,000 acres of American soil have been destroyed by forest fires in North Carolina, Florida, Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Minnesota, and, even today, they are just containing a 15,000-acre fire that is burning in my District in the Angeles National Forest in Los Angeles.

This terrible destruction of our resources must be stopped.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Goldwater. We appreciate you taking your valuable time to come over and give us your opinion on this proposed legislation.

Congressman Kyl, do you have any questions?

Mr. KYL. Yes. First, let me welcome my colleague and say that I assume you are testifying in regard to your fire situation with regard to H.R. 6084; is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. KYL. Now, the first amendment of that act says:

The Secretary of Agriculture shall expend such portions of the appropriations authorized herein as he deems advisable to study the effects of tax laws, methods, and practices upon forest perpetuation and cooperate with appropriate officials of the various States or other suitable agencies in such investigations and in devising tax laws designed to encourage the conservation and growing of timber.

And almost as an afterthought:

And to investigate and promote practical methods of assuring standing timber on growing forests from losses by fire.

Now, in your opinion, should this legislation be directed to controlling fires or should it be directed toward studying the tax laws, et cetera?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe my testimony and my intentions are to amend this amendment for the investigation and promotion of prac-

tical firefighting methods to insure standing timber and growing forests from loss by fire.

I envision, as I mentioned, a fleet of these tankers, but I think perhaps it warrants a certain amount of evaluation and testing before we go full force into a tanker fleet. And just in passing, airplanes and helicopters are used today, as you well are aware, and they are used to some degree of success. The problem, of course, is that the equipment is antiquated except for the helicopters, and what I would like to see is the utilization of our knowledge that we have already in aerial tankers and expand this as an added tool for the forest fighter to control these devastating fires. And in my opinion it seems to me that this might just fit into the language of this bill.

Mr. KYL. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Vigorito?

Mr. VIGORITO. No questions.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. Yes.

Mr. Goldwater, I just wanted to clear up a slight puzzlement in my mind here.

In your testimony, on page 3, you speak of what I judge to be procuring three aircraft at a cost of \$5 million. Down at the foot of the page, that is. Then, on the page you speak of \$40 to \$45 million for the current year only.

I am a little puzzled whether you are interested in three aircraft at \$5 million or what is the relation of the \$5 million to the \$45 million?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Well, the \$40 million is the money requested under the bill, and it would be my suggestion that the committee amend the amendment and increase it by \$5 million—

Mr. Dow. For three aircraft?

Mr. GOLDWATER. For three aircraft, for test and evaluation.

Mr. Dow. I see.

That is all. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Goldwater. We appreciate your appearance here today.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Marshall McGrath of the International Paper Co. of New York City, representing the Forest Farmers Association.

You may proceed, Mr. McGrath.

STATEMENT OF MARSHALL McGRATH, REPRESENTING THE FOREST FARMERS ASSOCIATION; ACCOMPANIED BY KENNETH POMEROY, AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION

Mr. McGRATH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen.

My name is Marshall McGrath, and I am appearing as a representative of the Forest Farmers Association.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

I would like to present our association's views in favor of enactment of H.R. 6082, to authorize appropriation of additional funds for cooperative forest management. My own company, International Paper

Co., is a member of the Forest Farmers Association; however, the majority of this organization's members are small- to medium-size timberland owners in 15 Southern States. My testimony will, therefore, concern itself primarily with the importance of this measure to small private, nonindustrial owners.

And I might say parenthetically at this point, that our own company is dependent upon small private forest landowners for more than one-half of our supply of pulpwood. This, perhaps, explains our interest in this.

Much of what I have to say will refer to the Southern Forest Resource Analysis, which was cosponsored by the Forest Farmers Association. This analysis resulted in the report, *The South's Third Forest*, which I believe some members of the committee may be familiar with.

As the Third Forest report indicates, over 70 percent of the South's forest area—143 million acres out of a total of 200 million acres—is owned by private, nonindustrial owners. These are the small landowners we hear so much about. From this, it is evident that a very large portion of the timber to be produced in the South for many years to come must be grown on these small acreages. The Third Forest report also estimates that the South, alone, must produce 2.3 times more wood by the year 2000 to meet its share of the Nation's anticipated needs. It follows logically that steps must be taken to greatly improve forest management activities on these small ownerships.

Therefore, the Forest Farmers Association feels that H.R. 6082, which would raise the authorized ceiling on Federal funds which could be appropriated for the cooperative management program from \$5 million to \$15 million, is highly desirable. This program was authorized by Public Law 729 in 1950 and later amended in September 1962. It provides, through matching funds with the States, a means for making technical forest management assistance available to these private nonindustrial landowners.

The Forest Farmers Association feels that this increase in authorization for the cooperative forest management program is well justified and invites the committee's consideration to recommending that H.R. 6082 be enacted by the Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. McGrath. We are glad to have you here with us today. I know that your company represents some of the finest forests we have in the Nation.

Mr. McGRATH. Thank you, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am personally proud to have your plant in my Congressional District. I believe that your company people know more about forests and reforestation than our colleges or any other group, and you have made great progress in our State.

Mr. McGRATH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that.

Mr. McMILLAN. As you know, we did not have very good forests in South Carolina. We had a lot of forests but not very good forests. The International Paper Co. came down and showed us how to replant and reforest, and now I think we have very good forests. We are producing almost a crop every 10 years—

Mr. McGRATH. That is right, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. We are glad to have you in our State. Thank you.

Mr. McGRATH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do you wish me to proceed with the other statements on the other bills, or do you want questions on this?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, go ahead and present them.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. McGRATH. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will proceed with the statement on H.R. 6084. I will not read the introduction. It is a repetition actually, but I would like to present the Forest Farmers Association's view in favor of amendment of H.R. 6084 to authorize appropriation of additional funds for cooperative forest fire protection up to \$40 million annually.

Again, we will refer to the information from the Southern Forest Resource Analysis.

While a great deal of progress has been made in protecting our forest resources from the ravages of wildfire, this program is in urgent need of further strengthening at this time. In our opinion, the steadily increasing importance and value of our forest resources fully justify such strengthening. Over the past 5 years the Southern Forest Resource Analysis shows southern forests have annually lost an average of over one-half of 1 percent of their total protected area to wildfires. This means forest lands totaling over 1 million acres are burned over by wildfires annually in the South—a tragic waste by any measure.

Since small private, nonindustrial timberlands owners hold 143 million of the 200 million commercial forest acres in the South, they and the users of forest products—the general public—would be among the primary beneficiaries from an increased program of fire protection. The national economy and the environment, as well as all the citizens benefit when our forest resources, including timber, recreation, watershed and wildlife resources are better protected.

The analysis recommends working toward a goal of reducing losses in the South from the current level of slightly over one-half of 1 percent to two-tenths of 1 percent. This would mean reducing the area burned from over 1 million acres annually in the South to roughly 400,000 acres. It is estimated this would require an annual expenditure of \$58.5 million in the South alone.

The report recommends that the Federal share be 29 percent, which would amount to \$17 million for the southern region. Using this same ratio, this would mean an annual Federal share of \$40 million nationwide. This, I understand, was one of the bases for the ceiling proposed in H.R. 6084. Experience also has shown that increases in Federal matching funds usually result in substantial increases in State expenditures. It is, of course, significant that the States would still be bearing over 70 percent of the cost of this program.

The Forest Farmers Association feels that H.R. 6084, which would raise the authorized ceiling on Federal funds which could be appropriated for cooperative forest fire protection (CM-2) from \$20 million to \$40 million is well justified and highly desirable. Our organization, therefore, invites the committee's consideration to recommending that H.R. 6084 be enacted by Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. McGrath. Do you want to proceed with the other?

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

Mr. McGRATH. On H.R. 6086, I, again, would like to present the Forest Farmers Association's views concerning this legislation to authorize an urban environmental forestry program. This program as proposed by H.R. 6086 would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for the improvement of establishment of native trees and shrubs on private land and public areas in urban and suburban areas. Up to \$5 million would be authorized to be appropriated annually for this program.

This program is quite similar to the cooperative forest management program but would apply to city dwellers. Administration would be by the States through cooperative agreement between the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agency designated by the Governor, usually the State forest service.

By the year 2000, approximately 85 percent of the population of this country will be living in cities. This will create very serious environmental problems as regards open spaces, greenbelts and natural woodlands in and near heavily populated areas. Trees and shrubs have significant environmental properties and the Forest Farmers Association feels that this program could prove very worthwhile and highly desirable by assisting city dwellers to grow and protect trees.

The association is quite familiar with the pilot program being conducted in its headquarters city of Atlanta, Ga., and to a lesser extent with the program at St. Louis, Mo. Both of these pilot programs have been conducted with State funds and met with excellent response. We feel that the adoption of a similar program on a nationwide basis would make important contributions far outweighing the amount of money involved. We do feel, however, that this could be best accomplished by modification of the present cooperative forest management program to permit expenditure of funds for this type of activity, rather than through creating a new program.

The Forest Farmers Association, therefore, would appreciate the committee's consideration of recommending modifications of the Cooperative Forest Management Act to permit expenditure of Federal funds for urban environmental activities as noted in H.R. 6086.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. McGrath. Does that complete your statements?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to ask that the statements by Mr. R. C. Allen of the Southern Forest Resource Council on the three bills, H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084, and H.R. 6086 be entered into the record at this point.

Mr. McMILLAN. Without objection, they will be printed in the record at this point.

Mr. McGRATH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF R. C. ALLEN, CHAIRMAN, SOUTHERN FOREST
RESOURCE COUNCIL

My name is Richard C. Allen and my home is Philadelphia, Mississippi. I am Chairman of the Southern Forest Resource Council and I would like to file this statement for the record on behalf of the Council.

As information, the Southern Forest Resource Council is a successor organization to the Southern Forest Resource Analysis Committee which conducted an

analysis of southern forest resources between 1967 and 1969, resulting in the report, "The South's Third Forest." The Analysis Committee was composed of Forest Farmers Association, Southern Forest Products Association, Southern Hardwood Lumber Manufacturers Association and American Plywood Association. The Southern Forest Institute is now also a member of the Council. The primary purpose of the Council is to implement the recommendations in "The South's Third Forest."

The Southern Forest Resource Analysis indicates that the South, alone, must produce 2.3 times more wood by the year 2000 to meet anticipated needs. The analysis also shows that 70% of the 200,000,000 acres of commercial timberland in the South is owned by private non-industrial owners. This clearly indicates the need for a greatly intensified program of forest management in the South and with particular emphasis on the small, individual ownerships.

The Council, therefore, endorses H.R. 6082, which would increase the authorized ceiling for federal funds which could be appropriated for the cooperative forest management program from \$5,000,000 to \$15,000,000. This program was authorized by Public Law 729 in 1950 and amended in September 1962. Its purpose has been to provide a vehicle for making technical forest management assistance available through state forestry organizations to private, non-industrial landowners, utilizing matching state and federal funds.

It is felt that this increase in authorization for this program is fully justified because of the greatly intensified forestry activities which will be required to grow timber for the nation's future needs, and because of steadily rising costs to maintain the program at its current level.

The Committee's consideration to recommending that H.R. 6082 be enacted by the Congress is invited by the Southern Forest Resource Council and will be appreciated.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

The Council wishes to go on record as supporting H.R. 6085 to authorize appropriation of up to \$40,000,000 in cooperative matching funds for forest fire control under the provisions of the Clarke-McNary Act, Section 2.

The recently completed Southern Forest Resource Analysis indicates that fire protection and control were the most important factors contributing to the substantial progress achieved by our southern forests over the past several decades. This study indicated that every dollar invested in forest fire protection and control resulted in \$4 in added value to the southern forests. It is felt that an adequate system of fire control is still a number one priority item in the South, although the cost effectiveness ratio would, perhaps, not remain as high as over the past several decades. In the Southern Forest Resource Analysis it was estimated that the federal share for fire control in the South should be 29% of the total fire control cost. Applying this on a nationwide basis would result in a federal share of \$40,000,000 as proposed in H.R. 6085.

In summation, the general public benefits most from an adequate forest fire protection system, particularly as regards the national economy and the environment. Forest resource values, furthermore, are continuing to rise steadily, along with costs of prevention and control. It would, therefore, seem that the current authorization limiting federal expenditures at \$20,000,000 for these activities is outdated. If the nation is to grow the timber needed to supply estimated needs for the future, additional fire protection must be provided, and it is felt that the \$40,000,000 in matching funds would represent a more equitable federal share.

The Committee's consideration to recommending that H.R. 6085 be enacted by the Congress is invited by the Southern Forest Resource Council and will be appreciated.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

The Council strongly endorses H.R. 6086, which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide technical assistance for protection, improvement, or establishment of native trees and shrubs on private lands and public areas in urban and suburban areas. Up to \$5,000,000 would be authorized to be appropriated annually for this purpose. The program, as envisioned under H.R. 6086, would be administered by the states through cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and the state agency designated by the Governor, usually the state forest service. The Council feels the state forest service should be the body designated by the Governor to administer this program in all instances.

As this Committee knows, there has been a great migration from rural areas to the cities in recent years. It is estimated that by the year 2000 approximately 85% of the people in the United States will live in metropolitan areas.

The Council is quite familiar with pilot programs of this type which are already being conducted in Atlanta, Georgia and St. Louis, Missouri. These are being paid for exclusively with state funds. These programs are being very well received and performing a valuable service. The Council feels it would be highly desirable if H.R. 6086 could be enacted, to permit federal matching funds to be used in these programs. We understand that financial assistance up to 75% of the cost could be provided in the initial year of any contract but that matching funds would not exceed 50% in subsequent years.

The Committee's consideration to recommending that H.R. 6086 be enacted by the Congress is invited by the Southern Forest Resource Council and will be appreciated.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was wondering if you could tell the committee just how much the International Paper Co. spends annually on reforestation and fire prevention?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I tried to anticipate that question. I thought it would be a logical question, a logical point, to which I might be able to respond.

In talking with our foresters, they tell me there is not really any good basis for giving you a hard dollar figure. This is due to the fact that in fire protection, for instance, while we do maintain a certain number of these fire engines, the little red trucks, and so forth, this is not really the backbone of a corporate fire protection service.

We use the bulldozers, the equipment that is used in land preparation, in the seedling plantings, the various other aspects of our operation which are brought into service as may be required for fire protection.

The people that man this equipment, the other people who man these firelines, are our employees who on other days are carrying on normal forestry operations.

We do not, just as a matter of accounting practice, separate out the time. We do not have a hard figure on this. We might develop some figure for the record, if you would like us to do this.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is not necessary. In my own observation, I was just wondering how much you spend on this. It requires a lot of time and a lot of effort on the part of your company down in my district.

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir. It is substantial, but, as I say, we assume this responsibility as part of our total forest management, and we do not have a separate cost breakout.

Mr. McMILLAN. The use of bulldozers has proved to be very effective, in fighting those fires.

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. They usually stop the average fire unless the wind is high.

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. Any questions? Mr. Kyl?

Mr. KYL. Yes, Mr. Chairman. You represent the Forest Farmers Association?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. KYL. And you say most of those are small farms, small farmers?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. KYL. What percentage of the members of your association has sustained yield forestry programs on their land?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Kyl, if I may appropriately respond to this, I would like to ask Mr. Kenneth Pomeroy, who is here to join me, to respond to this.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Kyl—and Mr. Chairman—I have been acquainted with the forest farmers organization for about 25 years, and I know that practically all of their membership have all their land under intensive forest management.

Mr. KYL. Almost all of it?

Mr. POMEROY. Yes, sir. I could not say all, because I do not know every individual. I know most of them.

Mr. KYL. This is not simply, then, a mining operation, a harvesting situation. These people are actually engaged in sustained yield forestry.

Mr. POMEROY. Yes.

Mr. McGRATH. Congressman, I might tell you that it is in our selfish self-interest, if you will, to avoid what you refer to as mining operations. Without these trees, without the regeneration and without another crop coming along, our paper industry would be out of business in about 20 years.

Mr. KYL. We had some testimony previously about private forest lands which indicated that only a small percentage of the operations were engaged in a scientific forestry program. Those figures covered the Nation rather than the Southern area. And I wanted to know what relation your area had to this national figure.

Mr. POMEROY. I was only speaking as to the members of the Forest Farmers Association, not to the small woodland owners, generally.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, sir.

Now, are there any sources of funds for management improvement other than this cooperative management program?

In other words, does the extension program of the various States deal with forestry for these private foresters?

Mr. POMEROY. The Extension Service carries on a very good program in all of the States, together with State programs, and these two services work together very well. North Carolina has a very excellent relationship between the Federal Extension Service and the State forestry program.

Mr. KYL. Now, are the members of your Farm Forest Association on any kind of a cutting program? How do you determine what areas are to be cut? How do you prevent overcutting? How are all of these factors managed at the present time?

Mr. McGRATH. This is generally a service of the cooperative forest management in marking the mature trees, marking the trees to be thinned. One of the provisions of the service to the small private landowners is the proper management.

Mr. KYL. In other words, the Federal funds and the cooperative management program today are used in part actually for the selective cutting of timber?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. KYL. Is this the major use of those funds?

Mr. POMEROY. Well, I think we have two different things involved there. Many of the members of the Forest Farmers Association are fairly large landowners, and each one of these has a management program tailored specifically to its objectives and its needs.

Now, for the small owners, many of them depend upon the advice of consulting foresters and public service foresters to help them develop management plans for their small properties. They are not big enough to be able to afford a full-time forester themselves.

Mr. KYL. So, they can either contract for a private forest manager or utilize the services under the cooperative programs?

Mr. POMEROY. Either way.

Mr. KYL. There are some of these people who are paying for the management service, then, and some who are taking advantage of the Federal—

Mr. POMEROY. There are about 300 private consulting foresters in the United States who make their livelihood from working with landowners in preparing management plans, making timber appraisals, making valuation surveys, helping people carry out acquisition programs.

One instance that came to my attention just recently, the Federal land bank had received an application for a loan of \$2.5 million on a large forest property in Florida. They retained a private consulting forester to appraise the property and decide if there were enough assets to back up the loan.

Now, a public service forester as proposed under this cooperative forest management program, could not undertake this kind of service. He is limited in what he can do, 2, 3, 4 days' service for an individual owner. If the job is big enough so that it takes more time than that, it is the practice to refer it to a private consulting forester and let him do it for a fee.

The basic purpose of the cooperative forest management program is one of education, not doing it for the man but showing him how to do it and giving him advice as to when to seek additional service.

Mr. KYL. And how do you contemplate the extra money that would be appropriated under these acts would be used in that cooperative management program—simply to extend the education in management?

Mr. POMEROY. Yes.

Mr. KYL. I notice on this urban bill, you recommend that again all of the money be used for technical assistance rather than for acquisition of property or planting of trees or purchase of trees. Is that a firm position with you?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir. Actually, the total moneys involved would not be sufficient to do any substantial purchasing. So, we feel they would not be adequate to do more than provide the technical service.

Mr. KYL. However, if the act did not limit specifically how those funds could be spent, the whole amount could be used for acquisition of property or for gifts of trees and planting trees, could it not?

Mr. McGRATH. I presume that that could be true.

Mr. KYL. And it would not go very far in that.

Mr. McGRATH. Not at all.

Mr. KYL. Does this cooperative management program, so far as you know, go into every State in the Union?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes. No exceptions, to my knowledge.

Mr. POMEROY. That is right.

Mr. KYL. We are not talking about very much per State, then, are we?

Mr. McGRATH. No, sir.

Mr. KYL. There is one other question : I noticed that this bill speaks of using the fund to study taxes, and so on.

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. KYL. The first objection I have to that bill is that we have studied this proposition very thoroughly. As a matter of fact, the Public Land Law Review Commission has a couple of volumes in part of this study by Banzoff Associates going into that subject.

We have very lengthy papers presented by foresters, by forest products companies regarding taxation. Is it the opinion of you two gentlemen that we need big in-depth studies of taxation in relation to forest products other than what we have now?

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Kyl, that part of the bill is also included in the parent act, the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

Mr. KYL. Yes.

Mr. POMEROY. I mean it is already in the present act. It is not an amendment.

Mr. KYL. I know it is in the present act. But do you think we need more appropriations for that facet of this activity?

Mr. POMEROY. No.

Mr. McGRATH. No, sir.

Mr. KYL. Thank you for that. The problem I have with these three bills is very simple, and it does not depend on what the foresters want or what the administration wants, or anything else. It occurs to me in all three bills we are trying to do essentially the same thing, and if we had an appropriation which was large as that called for in all three bills and turned it over to the Forest Service for forest management and fire protection, and so on, we might do just as well or a whole lot better with one bill rather than three.

Mr. POMEROY. I think we would both be agreeable to that.

Mr. KYL. You think that would be a better idea?

Mr. POMEROY. We certainly would not have any objection to that.

Mr. McGRATH. I think we feel the need for funds; and the wisdom of the committee, its method of devising a way to channel those funds, would certainly be respected by our group.

Mr. KYL. As a matter of fact, isn't it true that here we are picking on three items, or perhaps more than that, out of a whole host of needs in the forestry industry, both private and public?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. KYL. And that we ought to be talking about an overall program with an appropriation many times what is called for here to do an overall job rather than picking up the fly specks all the time.

Mr. McGRATH. Correct, sir.

Mr. KYL. There is one other question I intended to ask you, and that is in these wildfires you speak of, are most of those on large holdings, on public lands, or are they in the smaller woodlots?

Mr. McGRATH. I think they are rather indiscriminate, sir. They may occur in any area.

Mr. KYL. Do you have just as high a proportion of loss among smaller woodlots as you do in the rest?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes.

Mr. KYL. And the causes are the same relatively, regardless of which classification of land?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. KYL. Do you two gentlemen agree with Mr. Cliff when he says "It is still far more important to prevent fires than it is to find new ways to fight them?"

Mr. POMEROY. Certainly.

Mr. McGRATH. We do.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. Yes.

Mr. McGrath, why would International Paper need the help of these bills? Can't International Paper manage its own holdings of forest lands?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir; we can, and we do, and we do not receive funds or support from these programs. However, I believe I said that—perhaps parenthetically—we purchase at least half, sometimes more than half, of our pulpwood supply from the small forest landholdings, and we therefore suggest the merit of the support of these programs to these landholdings.

Mr. Dow. In other words, they are not in your judgment capable of providing the kind of attention to these holdings that they ought to?

Mr. McGRATH. I think they can use substantial help.

Mr. Dow. Thank you.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Dow. I am finished.

Mr. KYL. Following the questioning of Mr. Dow, do you make your own forest holdings available for public access?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir we do.

Mr. KYL. Do you carry on programs of stocking the game, and so on, and work with the States in the development of habitat?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir, we do. We have very substantial programs in this area.

Mr. KYL. And this is a public service——

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. KYL (continuing). For which you are not compensated?

Mr. McGRATH. This is very true.

Mr. KYL. Thank you.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Robinson?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you very much, Mr. McGrath and Mr. Pomeroy.

Mr. Ray Shirley, director, Georgia Forestry Commission, representing the National Association of State Foresters.

We are happy to have you with us. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF A. R. SHIRLEY, DIRECTOR, GEORGIA FORESTRY COMMISSION, AND PAST PRESIDENT AND MEMBER OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE FORESTERS

Mr. SHIRLEY. Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee. I am highly honored to be before your committee this afternoon to discuss these three bills that have already been named, H.R. 6082

H.R. 6084, and H.R. 6086; however, my statement is primarily concerned with H.R. 6086 even though I support the other two and I will have a few words to say about them.

I am director of the forestry commission in Georgia, and I am also the spokesman for the National Association of State Foresters on H.R. 6086, and our association consists of all of the 50 States.

I am pleased to speak on this particular bill, because this is the program that we in Georgia have actually had going on for 4 years at our own expense, without any sharing from the Federal Government, because we feel that the urban forestry program is so vital to a total forestry program and to the people of our State. We have 12 foresters assigned to this bill in 5 urban centers of our State comprising roughly 50 percent of the population of Georgia.

Nationwide, 14 out of every 20 Americans live in an urban area, and 70 percent of our people live on about 1 percent of the land.

We began in the middle of the 1960's to reexamine the forestry needs and problems for our particular State. This was vital, because we had a tremendous shift in population from rural to urban areas in Georgia.

The State legislature was reapportioned based on one-man, one-vote, and, of course, forestry being of the importance that it is in our State, it was absolutely necessary that all of our people know the vital importance of forestry to Georgia.

You see, our gross national product in Georgia is a little over \$10 billion and forests generate about \$1.3 billion annually. And, so, this is very vital to the economy of our State.

By and large, we have been following the same type of forestry programs for 30 to 40 years. So have the rest of the States in the United States. We found out that urban people with trees have tree problems just as well as people who have trees otherwise. They may not have as many, oftentimes in the city with maybe just one, two, or a few trees, but which are maybe as vital to the owner as a farm of 50 to 100 acres out in the rural areas, and we do not find any certain standards set for various tree service companies, not in Atlanta, not in the South. Most of the cities do not have an arborist association to set standards of services that they render.

And so we found out that we needed to start giving some advice and assistance, because of the fly-by-night type operators that were operating in our cities and towns.

In addition to the fact that urban people have tree problems, we find that the people who live in the urban areas are the people who are really using the forests in ever-increasing numbers, for recreation, for camping, hiking, hunting, fishing, nature studies, birdwatching, and many other things. They are not informed on the many uses of the forest and the multiple uses that the forest provides, and we like to think that the forests are large enough, big enough, versatile enough to meet all the needs and uses of our people if our people are properly informed about the forests and how they should be managed.

In addition to the shift in population, we find that over 50 percent of the people that live in the cities in our State, urban areas, are under 25 years of age, which means that unlike many of us who grew up in a rural, or semi-rural area, they have not had the advantage of know-

ing the great importance the natural resources play in the well-being of our Nation.

And so, someone must tell them about this. So, we are trying to provide some educational leadership with this group to give them some facts in a most practical way.

We have had two or more foresters in the metropolitan Atlanta area since 1952. However, we began our official urban forestry program in July 1967, with five foresters for the metropolitan Atlanta area.

Now, the Metropolitan Atlanta area consists of roughly 1,300,000 with approximately that same number of people, and in that area forests comprise 64 percent of the total area in the Metropolitan Atlanta area. So, it is really situated in the midst of a big forest.

This new type of assistance program required a change in our organization structure, so we set up an urban forestry division. We did not have have trained foresters before this, so we selected foresters who had special skills that would complement one another, and to assist in this program.

Now, what do they do? The urban foresters assist and advise on shade tree problems, particularly those dealing with insects and disease, soils, cuts and fills, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, their use and effect on various plants; proper feeding, pruning, and trimming techniques of trees. How to prepare and display exhibits relating to forests, programs for women's and men's organizations, forest recreation, species of trees to plant on city streets, working with youth groups, preparing newspaper articles, radio and TV programs, establishment of an arboretum, tree trails, protection of trees from mechanical damage resulting from construction in new subdivisions, and many special programs are included.

In addition, we have a service that when trees are thin, that we do provide tree-marking service. We try to help the people market trees where the trees must be cut for shopping centers and various types of subdivision development.

We have in the city of Atlanta, for instance, the finest hardwood forest that we have in the State of Georgia, and we have almost 26 million acres of forest land in the State, and this is to give you an example of the tremendous forests that we have in some of the open areas.

We have a weekly TV program. This is live, or either in color with sound, and we feature these particular programs by one subject: How to plant a tree; how to prune a tree; how to fertilize a tree.

Another program may be the economic value of forestry to the State; the value of the pulp and paper industry; the value of the soil timber industry; the plywood industry; and various industries that get into the economics of the forests.

And then we will have a program on recreation, the various places in the State. The tree is always the basis for most recreational facilities. And a program on the hazards of the forests. We have everybody wanting to visit the forests. Not many people know the hazards. They do not know about the snakes, the insects, poison plants, poison vines, the abandoned wells or caves, or other places that they might be injured; how they can easily become lost, and we do this through this urban forestry television program and a program with youth.

In the city of Atlanta, we began in that city an annual shade tree workshop conference for individuals and companies providing tree services for the public, sponsored by the city and by the Georgia Forestry Commission. There, we have attempted to bring together the most knowledgeable people in every field or arborculturist practices and culture, and, as a result of this, we have helped form an arborist association for the city of Atlanta that is now spreading all over the State of Georgia. So, it has given us an opportunity to give some information on the forests and their value to man.

Now, we have five urban centers with eight foresters in the Atlanta area, one each in Macon, Augusta, Savannah, and Columbus, comprising one-half of the people of our State. We do not have any of the cities that provide a forester on their staff for their park departments or trees on the city streets, and we have helped everything from the chamber of commerce in the city of Atlanta to the type trees they should plant on the sidewalks of the city, to preparing various floats and other things for special events that they do in the city.

So, urban forestry is the adaptation of sound forestry principles to urban areas. It involves professional advice and assistance on problems relating to trees, education of the urban populace on the role of trees and their environment. We hear much about environment and ecology, and so we try to highlight the importance of trees to a community, to an area, town, city or State.

And, so, we find more interest and more concern about trees than ever before.

Everyone is interested in ecology and environment, and we find that this word "environment" means a lot of things, and we find that trees mean a lot of things to different groups.

If you are talking to a homeowner, you are talking about aesthetics and beauty and a home for birds, noise abatement, nature's air conditioner, water purifier, the play area, and the landscape of the community.

If you are talking to a hunter, you are talking about cover and its habitat for game, for food and cover.

To the fisherman, it is the basis for food in the streams and lakes. filter the water, reduce water temperature in the summer; and help maintain stream flow.

To a recreationist, it is a place to hike on scenic trails, to study plant life, bird life, animal life, a restful place to relax, shelter from the elements of wind and temperature, and a place to camp.

To the city dweller, it is a watershed, insuring a continuous supply of good water, the basic requirement for a park or playground area.

To a landowner and to the public, it is vital in preventing soil erosion, providing flood control, and an income from an investment.

To the forest landowner, it is a raw material to grow and sell to industry, hopefully for a profit.

I might say that in our State, and we are about the average of the United States, almost 60 percent of the forest land is in public ownership of less than 5,000 with an average of about 75 acres per owner, and they are cutting at the present time about two-thirds of the amount of

wood being cut and harvested in this country each year. And I think that is important.

Trees, to a wage earner afford a job to support himself and his family.

Trees, to the local and State government are the basis of tax revenue for government.

We like to say that the trees and the forests are big enough to meet all of these needs provided we have the knowledge and can share it with others who need to know about it.

So, we are trying to tell them about it in every way that we can.

Now, there are three great resources given to us by nature: air, water, and trees.

We sometimes forget the incredible part that trees play in contributing to the ecological balance over the other two. Most of our air pollution, water pollution problems are around the urban areas and cities, and once we get into the country it is a lot different. You see, in reverse to man, the trees breathe in man's pollutants of carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide and breathe out pure oxygen into the atmosphere. Along with the green vegetation, trees produce one-third of the climate's oxygen, and research indicates that just 1 acre of young, growing, well-managed trees releases 4 tons of oxygen into the air each year, enough to supply the needs of 12 humans.

So the forests are equally adapted to aiding man's water supply, in purifying, maintaining, and recirculating much of the moisture in our environment.

Too many subdivision, residential, and business developments are destroying, with bulldozers and other equipment, trees, shrubs, and other plants that make for a healthy environment. These barren areas contribute greatly to soil erosion and water pollution. We work with these subdivision developers.

City and county officials, with proper zoning and enforcement, can maintain small wooded areas for parks, historic sites, and shrines, playgrounds, nature trails, and other similar areas that will add to a more livable environment.

The products of the forests and the resource itself contribute much to the quality of the environment and the least to ecological pollution.

One important development in an urban program can be the planting of trees and ornamental plants in the various interchanges along the Interstate Highway System throughout the United States.

I would like to tell you about one of the interchanges in the suburbs of Atlanta, I-20 and I-285. It is adjacent to residential areas that consist of 134 acres. We have just completed this spring planting 60 acres of that interchange in trees. We planted pine and a number of hardwood species, along with borders of dogwood, crepe myrtle, crab apple, and red-bud flowering trees. These trees are going to be used as a noise barrier, and will have environmental and ecological values, aesthetics, will be homes for birds and other plant life.

In developing this, we utilized the ladies organizations, the garden and federated women's clubs. They, along with the commission, were able to obtain from the highway department the easements to plant

the trees. The trees were donated by the industry, in this particular case Sears Roebuck, through the hands program. They were planted by 4-H, Boy Scouts, FFA, and church groups under the direction of our foresters.

Now, I am attaching to the report the actual results that we have had of this program for the past 4 years. It has been funded by our General Assembly of Georgia. It is not something that we are coming to the Congress to ask you to buy in a blind poke, but we feel that this is a program Congress should share in. We feel that we must take the program—and the needs—to where the people are, and we have the forests to meet the people's needs.

We have over 5,000 products being harvested, manufactured from trees each year in this Nation. And so it is the recommendation of the National Association of State Foresters that H.R. 6086 be amended to include only the technical forestry advice and assistance through an established State agency. We do not think it is necessary to cost-share in trees, in shrubbery, and we do this on experience. We have found that if you have a need and if you will give the guidance, the assistance, the know-how, you will find somebody to supply the trees and the shrubs to go where they need to go, and then we have an involvement of the cities and areas that we should have in this type of program.

We are going to continue, whether this bill is adopted or not in our State. That is how important it is.

But I feel that we should have some assistance. So, our association hopes that you will see fit in the wisdom of the Congress to implement this program, to assist.

I have an attachment here of the results in 4 years' experience exactly who we work with and what the results of our efforts have been, and I submit it to you for your consideration. I would like to also make on addition, if I might. I have heard, since I have been here, in talking with some of my own Congressmen and others today, that there may be some talk about if we have revenue sharing with the States that this would interfere and nothing could be done.

Well, I believe that under the revenue-sharing proposal—I have just studied it—it does provide that any cooperative funds or funds coming for programs like this will go into the various programs that would be revenue shared, and so this would not prevent some revenue from being shared in this program should this particular thing be voted in the wisdom of the Congress.

Now, as to the bills on the forest fire protection and on management, I would like also to endorse on behalf of my State and the National Association of State Foresters our endorsement of these bills to increase the cooperative forest fire fund enabling act to \$40 million and the CFM from \$5 to \$15 million. And in our own States, we have a State forestry budget of \$9.7 million annually. Approximately, \$1 million of that comes from the Federal Government in the various types of assistance that we receive money for in our programs. Approximately, \$1 million from county governments in my State and approximately three-quarters of a million through earnings, and the rest is from State appropriations.

So, we do not come saying that the Congress should do something before the States do it, and I believe all of the States recognize the importance of forests, and I hope that you will see fit to honor us by recommending that these bills are enacted into law and more assistance can be given to the States. Thank you.

(The attachment referred to in Mr. Shirley's statement follows:)

*Georgia Forestry Commission, Summary of Metro Activities,
July 1967-January 1971*

Request answered:

Phone -----	5,726
Field -----	4,612
Office -----	636
Letter -----	887

Total request answered ----- 11,861

Forest management:

CFM cases -----	431
Number acres -----	43,161
Sawtimber marked (MBF) -----	937.2
Commercial harvest (acres) -----	1,991
Pulpwood marked (cords) -----	5,218

Forest education:

Radio ¹ -----	95
TV ¹ -----	141
News articles ¹ -----	491
Exhibits -----	85
Tours -----	54
Floats -----	47
Programs and demonstrations -----	1,119

Programs (breakdown into types):

Scout groups -----	337
Garden clubs -----	124
Urban forestry workshop -----	5
Church groups -----	56
School groups -----	300
Smokey presentations -----	117
Mr. Tree presentations -----	20
FFA groups -----	10
Men's clubs -----	3
Women's clubs -----	6
DAR groups -----	7
Colleges -----	7
USFS -----	11
4-H groups -----	28
Shade tree conference -----	17
Civic groups -----	32
SCS -----	2
Homemaker clubs -----	1
Cerebral Palsy groups -----	2
Chamber of commerce -----	2
Day care centers -----	1
Foreign foresters -----	1
Forestry association -----	1
Miscellaneous programs -----	29

Total ----- 1,119

¹ TV, radio, and news articles are not included in the total requests.

Summary of Metro activities, July 1969–June 1970

Request answered :	
Phone -----	1, 944
Field -----	1, 421
Office -----	129
Letter -----	151
Total request answered-----	3, 645
Forest management :	
CFM cases-----	109
Number acres-----	7, 492
Sawtimber marked (MBF)-----	81
Commercial harvest (acres)-----	194
Pulpwood marked (cords)-----	679. 9
CFM referrals-----	120
Forest education :	
Radio ¹ -----	57
TV ¹ -----	75
News articles ¹ -----	208
Exhibits -----	32
Tours -----	34
Floats -----	10
Programs and demonstrations-----	241

¹ TV, radio and news articles are not included in the total requests.

METRO FORESTERS IN ATLANTA AREA

1967, 5 Metro Foresters.

1968, 5 Metro Foresters.

1969, 6 Metro Foresters.

1970, 7 Metro Foresters.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Shirley. You have made a real contribution to our effort in trying to get this legislation out of the committee, and we certainly appreciate your taking time to come to Washington and giving us this information.

Mr. Kyl?

Mr. KYL. Yes, sir; do you think you have got your money's worth per dollar spent in your State's program in Georgia?

Mr. SHIRLEY. Mr. Kyl, I feel that this is the finest program that we have, our urban forestry program at this.

Mr. KYL. Why should the Federal Government help pay for it?

Mr. SHIRLEY. Because this is where the people are, and I feel, with the values that we are rendering there and the services that we are giving to all of the people, that it is in the public interest that all of the people know the true values of the forest. We are having many, many people today that think it is a crime to cut a tree, and if we ever get to the place where the majority of the people feel this way about it, through ignorance, through not knowing the actual facts about the value of a tree and the importance of trees to our economy and to our environment, then, we are going to have some of this type of legislation, and we are having a shift of people. If we had enough people living in the rural areas, this would not be a problem. They realize the value. But the people in the cities do not, you see, unless someone tells them.

We are having a lot of people telling them what is wrong with the environment and very few telling them what makes for a good environment, and I think this is absolutely needed.

Mr. KYL. It happens that I agree with what you say, but here we are going to have a program nationally and put this money in every State of the Union and I assume put it out on the basis of population. What difference does it make whether the Federal Government collects the tax and sends it back or the State collects the money to do the job?

Mr. SHIRLEY. Well, I do not think it makes too much difference as long as the program is carried on.

Mr. KYL. You have several levels of government, but you have only one level of taxpayer. He is going to pay for the job no matter who does it. I have a feeling you probably have a much better program in Atlanta and in Georgia because you did it yourself rather than having the Federal Government come along with some program.

Mr. SHIRLEY. Well, I feel that our program is very effective.

Mr. KYL. It is a wonderful program.

Mr. SHIRLEY. And we are going to continue it. But I feel that it is a program that does tax the State quite heavily, of course, to do all of these things.

Mr. KYL. Your State is going to pay the taxes for the program if the Federal Government gets into it, too.

Mr. SHIRLEY. That is right.

Mr. KYL. And I am not ready to say that somebody in Washington knows more about Atlanta, Ga., than the people down there.

Mr. SHIRLEY. Well, I would have to share with you, if everything was going to be on an equal basis, but, you see, the way some funds are being spent on some matching basis for certain programs, I think this one does deserve more than some of the others with Federal money, and if we were going to put all programs on the same basis and look at it like you were talking about, I would have to agree with you.

Mr. KYL. Of course, one of the problems we have had in forest management in so far as Federal lands are concerned is the fact that because of political facts, we have spent about the same amount of money on the poor forest lands as we have on the good forest lands, and that is a political consideration rather than a forester's consideration, and the same thing is going to be true in these other Federal-aid programs. The money is going to go where the wheel squeaks the loudest. I am trying to find good reason to support a program like this, because I happen to believe in the forests in cities and elsewhere, but I do not if this is the way to do it.

Did I infer, from your comments, that you agree with these other gentlemen who just testified that this money ought to be used for technical assistance rather than for planting of trees, and so forth?

Mr. SHIRLEY. Very definitely. I do not feel that any cost sharing should be for plants or shrubs.

Mr. KYL. Just for the sake of argument let me turn this around for a second and get back to a pet project in which I have been engaged for a period of about 20 years with very, very little success.

Almost in every community the United States owns property in the city limits or on the outskirts of the city limits. The county owns land. The city owns land. And this is true of the tiniest hamlet and the biggest cities that we have. And it is land that we should keep. A lot of it should be kept as open land.

Now, you know for \$50 you can buy several thousand seedlings. So, I have said to these communities:

Here, you have an acre of ground or you have ten acres of ground. Let's buy the seedlings. Get the chambers of commerce out there, the Boy Scouts, the Future Farmers, Vocational Ag.; now, have a tremendous program of community development, and you plant those trees, those little seedlings, and you cultivate them and water them whenever it is necessary, and in four or five years you have nursery stock sufficient to plant all of the public areas. If you cut the trees, transplant the trees wisely from this little area, you wind up with a tree park where you can put some picnic benches and a path, and you have got a little park developed where you have the trees, and you really do not have much money involved.

If you had a program like this, where the Extension Service or the conservation or the State forester would recommend what kind of trees you are going to have in each area and thereby give the technical assistance and also give the local groups that are going to do the cultivations, give them some advice on what to do with the seedlings and how to transplant and how to prune them, and so forth, you have actually given the technical assistance, but in the end you have got the trees there to transplant where you want to put them.

You know, the sad thing is, sir, that does not sell very well, because you do not have a tree to plant today. Whenever you have to look 5 years down the road, there is a corresponding decrease in the interest of all of the individuals involved.

Now, those communities that did this, they looked back and said, "Boy, what a great thing; we are glad to do it." But it is hard to get anybody to look 5 years ahead.

If you are talking about technical assistance, you are talking about a long-range program, too, or you should be or else it is not a very good program.

Do you think that maybe instead of furnishing some trees through the State Forester we ought to use all of the money for just plain technical assistance?

MR. SHIRLEY. Well, there could be different sections of the country where needs would be different.

It just so happens in our own particular State and area of the country, in the South, where we actually do plant permanently 1-year old tree planting stock; we do not transplant and have all of these 3 or 4 or 5 years to wait to get a sizable tree to transplant. On this basis, we find that if you get some ladies behind you, some federated women's clubs and some garden clubwomen who are interested in beautifying the town and city—and that is the backbone of our movement—they will get a little bit of money to buy this, and they will give you some assistance, and they will take part in it.

You know, to make anything grow, you have got to get somebody interested, and you have got to get a mass of people interested; not just sell a few. This is what we are attempting to do.

We attempt, for instance, in the city of Atlanta—we have a tree trail in one part of the city. What did we do? We went out to the Jaycees. They like to move around. They have got a lot of energy. We said, "Join us in a joint program." They did. They furnished a lot of elbow grease, and we furnished the know-how and the scientific and common names to put on the trees and how it ought to be laid out,

and laid it out, and in just a few days we had a tree trail in the city of Atlanta that was used by thousands every year.

Mr. KYL. I hope you will forgive me for leaving the subject for a moment with a bit of levity. In Oskaloosa, Iowa, the highway department was going to widen the street and cut out about a mile of elm trees on both sides of the road, and the ladies went out and formed a human chain and stopped the highway department from cutting the trees. But 3 years ago, the elm bark beetle came to town and the ladies could not form any chain, and now we have a treeless mile of highway, and we still have a narrow highway. The bugs got done what the highway commissioners could not get done.

I would like to ask your advice, and the other people's, because this approaches the problem from another direction. I flew into Washington again yesterday, flew down the Virginia side and around Mount Vernon and upstream, as you have done, and I looked over here in the Falls Church area, the edges of Arlington and Alexandria, and I saw a tremendous acreage of beautiful trees.

Here is a housing development, and the trees had been removed and what we have left is red clay, and because it had rained heavily last weekend, here is the red water in the river, and you can see it in the Potomac. It is green and blue down to this point, and then it is red because soil conservation is apparently something for the farm and not for the city.

Yet, when we talk about land-use law and start to interfere with a man's right to use his property the way he wants to, we get into some real philosophical battles. Obviously we would be better off if we build our new housing additions on land which is not forested and plant the trees rather than going into the nice wooded area and clearing out of the trees and then planting something in the front yard that takes its place. How would we do this without violating the individual rights of these people, and so on? How do we educate them in this regard?

I do not expect you to give me an answer now, but this is one with which the whole Congress is concerned right now, in both bodies, land-use managing.

What can a man do with his own private property, and what is it he cannot do? What is in the public interest, and what is not?

And it gets pretty binding. But there is no sense talking about building another Atlanta-type forest in Arlington, Va., if we cut down all the trees to make homesites. It just does not make much sense.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you very much.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. I just want to congratulate Mr. Shirley on his enthusiasm and evidence of great progress and initiative and imagination. I think you make a very impressive statement. Mr. Shirley.

Mr. SHIRLEY. Thank you.

Mr. KYL. I hope you get to see the project sometime; it is tremendous.

Mr. McMILLAN. Do you have a question?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shirley, I am from Virginia, and this morning I had a communication by telephone from George Dean, our State division of

forestry head, with respect to these three bills, and he informed me that he was strongly in favor of the two that you have mentioned only in passing, but that with regard to the one on which you spent most of your time he had no real strong feelings.

Now, I would gather from this that in Virginia we probably have no beginning of a program such as you have in Georgia, and I am sure you can answer the question. Is this true?

Mr. SHIRLEY. Yes, sir, that is true. I will give you just a little brief background.

In the mid-1960's, we began this program. We had a meeting of the seven-group of State foresters. I told them of my plans, and we had been studying this and what we were going to do. And, without exception, they thought I was ready for the white coat, and they said "We could not grow trees in the town. We are still growing them where they are supposed to be, in the rural areas."

I said, "Well, you may be right, but let's see who is going to stay around here for a couple of years, because my people are moving to town, and I am going to follow them."

They have been having a lot of trouble in the State of Florida, because the city people are not supporting the forests right now in the legislature and in the bills. They are having a lot of forest fires, but they say "This is a rural problem and is not the city's."

And I think it is just the reverse. I think the people in the cities today are the people that really want to get out and use the forests. How are they going to use them, unless they really know something about them?

And so, today, I do not know of a single State forester that has not written or communicated with me, "What are your results?" "What do they want to do?" And how do they get into this program?

I believe Mr. Capps told you they had started a program in Missouri also, not as large as ours, but I can tell you now that George Dean and all the other State foresters are definitely interested in trying to get started.

You see, it is a little bit different type of forestry and showing off something that we had not got into, but we did not know any better than to do it in Georgia.

Mr. ROBINSON. This leads me into another question which is an extension of the area Mr. Kyl was developing. In the State of Virginia, where we have no such program, I am disturbed, frankly, if we go to a concept that is going to be or can be 75 percent federally financed, I am afraid we will destroy at the very outset the initiative that your program has developed, and certainly I congratulate you on it, I am concerned about this, and I wonder if you have any reaction to this 75 percent funding sharing?

Mr. SHIRLEY. I have always thought any sharing ought to be on an equal basis.

Mr. ROBINSON. Now, the other question that I have is with regard to the second page of the bill beginning on line 14 where it sets forth those to whom payments might be made under this bill, and it says: "On the certificate of the appropriate State or other appropriate public official."

Would it be your understanding in a State like Virginia when no such agency as you have in Georgia exists that this would be a man

like George Dean, the division of forestry, or would it be the man who heads up the department of forestry at our land-grant college, for example?

Mr. SHIRLEY. I think it would be the people that are really giving a service program, and in all the States I know the State Forestry Department is the agency through which a service program is being rendered.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Shirley. I am certainly appreciative of you taking your time to be with us this afternoon.

Mr. SHIRLEY. Thank you very much.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Joel Pickelner, legislative information specialist, National Wildlife Federation.

STATEMENT OF JOEL M. PICKELNER, LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SPECIALIST, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. McMILLAN. We are glad to have you here. You may proceed.

Mr. PICKELNER. Thank you, sir. Mr. Chairman, I am Joel M. Pickelner, legislative information specialist for the National Wildlife Federation.

Ours is a nongovernmental organization which has its national headquarters at 1412 16th Street, Northwest, here in Washington, D.C. The federation has independent affiliates in all 50 States and the Virgin Islands. In turn, these affiliates are made up of local groups and individuals who, when combined with associate members and other supporters of the federation, number an estimated 3 million persons.

Thank you for the invitation and opportunity to make these remarks.

Mr. Chairman, the National Wildlife Federation would like to endorse the principles contained in H.R. 6086 providing for an urban environmental forestry program.

This bill would launch a bold new program which would do a great deal toward correcting and improving the urban environment. The urban environment has already deteriorated greatly and is continuing to pay the high price exacted by rapid growth of the national economy and of the population. Ever-increasing demands for housing, shopping centers, parking space, highways, airports, and related needs have led to the deterioration of the out-of-doors urban environment. Trees and associated plants have declined and are generally being eliminated. This has uncovered massive ugliness; contributed to air pollution; permitted sound to reach harmful levels; resulted in loss of protection from sun and wind; and has led to further reduction of remnant populations of desirable birds and wildlife.

H.R. 6086 seeks to alleviate at least some of these severe environmental problems by maintaining open spaces, greenbelts, and natural woodlands in and near heavily populated areas. Trees and shrubs have significant environmental properties through their ability to renew the atmosphere, filter small particles from the air, muffle noise, reduce

wind, shade the soil, conserve moisture, and control erosion. This will not be a panacea to our urban environmental problems but it will help and it could easily be one of the first big steps taken toward restoring the urban environment. The main roadblock to the communities developing this program on their own is a lack of personnel with the technical skills necessary for the administration of such a program.

The program outlined in H.R. 6086 would provide technical assistance for protection, improvement or establishment of native trees and shrubs on private lands and public areas in urban and suburban areas. Administration would be by the States through cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agency designated by the Governor, usually the State forest service. Technical assistance would be made available to public and private agencies and to individuals in the areas of planning, coordination, guidance, technical service and training in urban environmental forestry. Forestry activities include the planting, growing, protection and maintenance of trees and associated plant communities singly, in rows, groups or forest stands.

Under the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950, the Forest Service provides technical assistance to private forest landowners in rural areas through the State forestry agencies. This program would build on the technical capabilities, experience, and institutional arrangements thus developed and provide the same or similar service for urban and suburban areas.

For these and other reasons, Mr. Chairman, the National Wildlife Federation strongly endorses the early enactment of legislation which would implement an urban environmental forestry program. Thank you for the opportunity of making these remarks.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Pickelner. We are glad to have your statement, and we appreciate you taking the time to come here and give us your opinion on these proposed bills.

Mr. KYL?

Mr. KYL. You are aware of the open space programs that we have under the Housing and Urban Affairs Department and also the outdoor recreation park programs under land and water conservation funds, and the areas which are started and developed under these programs that are normally planted. They make broad use of trees and shrubs as well as of the plants, and they do it rather wisely. I do not know of any case in which the job has not been done, really, with great wisdom.

Mr. PICKELNER. Right, sir.

Mr. KYL. Now, how would you use the Federal funds under this urban tree program differently from how you use the present funds in the existing programs?

Mr. PICKELNER. Well, the present funds are more or less still pointed to the nonurban areas, and I would think, and I think that the National Wildlife Federation would prefer, that the funds be used as the bill states, for technical assistance, rather than for the planting as such.

Mr. KYL. Those programs are all in cities.

Mr. PICKELNER. Well, the HUD program is not concerned with urban forests as such. More or less just developing existing open space.

Mr. KYL. Developed as improvements of the general environment esthetically as well as recreationally, and they do make a broad use of trees and large growing plants.

Mr. PICKELNER. Well, sir, the program is not complete enough, because there is not enough being done in the urban areas and suburban areas.

Mr. KYL. Is the need for more money to acquire land or is it for technical services?

Mr. PICKELNER. I think it is more for technical services. I think there are a number—well, even in this city here, you can see a number of vacant lots which are owned by the city which are just standing vacant, makeshift playgrounds, which could use development on the scale that you mentioned earlier of planting trees and letting them grow over a period of years.

Mr. KYL. Of course, here, we did it differently. Here, we transplant trees 6, 8, 10 inches in diameter. We do not wait for them to grow in most instances.

Mr. PICKELNER. Here you have the Federal Government doing the planning. That is the difference.

Mr. KYL. We have a little more money available, I suppose. But we do a pretty good job of forestry in the District of Columbia, don't we?

Mr. PICKELNER. I think so, sir. I do not think there is a more beautiful city in the world, and I have seen about half of it.

Mr. KYL. Isn't it because we have the money to keep the space open?

Mr. PICKELNER. I think that is very true, that the Federal Government, themselves, going back to the L'Enfant plan for the city, have followed it very well and have done a very good job of maintaining it, sticking close to the plan.

Mr. KYL. Right over here we just cut down about 50 ginkgo trees.

Mr. PICKELNER. Took away a parking lot, also.

Mr. KYL. Then, we will go to the nursery and get some 8-inch diameter trees and plant them outside the building when it is completed, improving the aesthetics.

Mr. PICKELNER. Actually, it would be very nice if the Federal Government went into this program in every city.

Mr. KYL. Here we are talking about \$5 million, 50 States, hundreds of cities.

Mr. PICKELNER. Sir, I see that more as seed money to get programs like the Atlantia program that Mr. Shirley was just testifying to started.

I think that as now most States are not willing to allocate or appropriate money for this. I think if they do find the money from the Federal Government, they will be willing to appropriate matching, or, as the bill says, 25-75 percent, to start programs in open areas.

There are a number of cities that I am sure you know as well as I do around this country that desperately need something like this.

Mr. KYL. A number of them do not have any money at all with which to match Federal funds. So, you are more or less forcing them with a carrot-and-stick approach to spend some money they do not have to match Federal money just because that is free.

Mr. PICKELNER. Sir, the thing is the money is so small. Five million is not an awful lot compared to the money you talk about up here.

Mr. KYL. You said, "seed."

Mr. PICKELNER. Right.

Mr. KYL. How much do you think they could use?

Mr. PICKELNER. Of the \$5 million?

Mr. KYL. No, above the 5. If this is "seed," how much do you think we will use ultimately?

Mr. PICKELNER. Sir, I can't estimate that.

Mr. KYL. If this bill provided for \$100 million, the Wildlife Federation would still be up here testifying in favor of it, wouldn't they?

Mr. PICKELNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KYL. At least as enthusiastically.

Mr. PICKELNER. Probably more so, sir.

Mr. KYL. That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Vigorito?

Mr. VIGORITO. No questions.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. No questions.

Mr. ROBINSON. No questions.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you very much; glad to have your statement.

Mr. PICKELNER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. Dr. John Muench, Jr., forest economist, National Forest Products Association.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN MUENCH, JR., FOREST ECONOMIST, NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. McMILLAN. Glad to have you here, sir. You may proceed.

Mr. MUENCH. Mr. Chairman, I believe you have before you copies of three statements, one for each of these three bills, and I will speak on the three bills in numerical order, sir.

I am Dr. John Muench, Jr., forest economist with the National Forest Products Association. I am testifying today in behalf of the Forest Industries Council, the resource coordinating committee of the forest products industry composed of the American Paper Institute, the American Forest Institute, the American Plywood Association, the American Pulpwood Association, and the National Forest Products Association.

The forest industries of the Nation urge that the authorization limit on the Federal funds authorized for technical assistance to private forest landowners under the cooperative forest management program be increased from \$5 million to \$15 million, as proposed in H.R. 6082. Such an increase would be responsive to current needs as recognized in the recommendations of the President's Task Force on Softwood Lumber and Plywood which made its report to President Nixon and the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy almost a year ago.

With 59 percent of the Nation's forest land in its ownership and including some of the most fertile forest land, the group known as the nonindustrial forest landowners provides a significant opportunity for meeting the Nation's expected long-range wood and wood fiber demands. This group has carried a disproportionate share of the burden

of supplying wood needs in the past but largely without the benefit of technically sound forest management practices. The results of past practices have left the nonindustrial private forest lands in poor condition when compared to the condition of the industry, State and Federal forest lands. The owners are in need of technical assistance if their lands are to contribute their share to meeting future consumer needs.

SOURCES OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical assistance is available from several sources. The cooperative forest management program is frequently a first point of contact between the landowner and the trained forester. Recognizing this, the forest industries support the proposed increase in fund authorization for the CFM program.

Other sources of on-the-ground assistance to the private forest landowners are industry foresters and private consulting foresters. Many industry companies make their foresters available to landowners within the company's wood procurement area. However, it is easily understandable that many landowners might like to have the assistance of a forester who is independent of the timber buyer. For this reason it is important to have CFM and consulting foresters available.

ENCOURAGE CONSULTING FORESTERS

Consistent with free enterprise objectives, the forest industry encourages the development of independent private-practicing consulting foresters. We feel it is sound public policy to encourage the establishment of private consultants so as to avoid the need for public programs insofar as possible. In the administration of the CFM program there have been some unfortunate instances of conflict between the CFM program and consulting foresters. We feel both kinds of foresters are desirable and that some guidelines from this committee might be useful in reducing conflict. We therefore suggest that the committee urge that in using Federal funds appropriated for cooperative forest management programs, each State forester should recognize the availability and capabilities of private consulting foresters in his State.

In the same vein, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Association of Consulting Foresters have a program underway wherein the TVA is underwriting the income of two new consulting foresters in the TVA area. The public funds will be used only if the consultant needs the income support during the establishment period. If successful, this idea should be applicable to other areas. For instance, a State forester could use public funds to establish consulting foresters in areas of a State where such a business seemed most viable. Once the consultant's business was great enough to promise him a reasonable level of living, the State funds would be free for other purposes.

This committee should recommend that State foresters consider using some of the Federal funds available under the CFM program as seed money to establish consulting foresters. The language in section 1 of the CF Act seems sufficient to accomplish the encouragement of more consultants but a brief statement on the committee report might emphasize the point.

URBAN FORESTRY PROGRAMS

Over the past 10 years there has been a significant change of ownership of forest land out of the hands of rural residents into the hands of urban residents. This shift has compounded the problems of establishing contact with the landowners so that improved forestry practices could be applied. Several states have begun urban forestry programs with State funds to extend technical assistance on share tree planting and care, greenbelts and other similar topics of forestry in the urban environment to municipalities and private urban property owners. In addition to the improved amenities which the program has brought to urban areas, it has provided a point of contact for State foresters with city residents of rural forest land and members of the State legislatures. Both of these contacts are valuable if technical assistance under the CFM program is to be kept available on private forest land. With this in mind, I offer the following suggested amendment to the CFM Act for your consideration (new language italic) :

SEC. 1. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to cooperate with State foresters or equivalent officials of the several States, Territories, and possessions for the purpose of encouraging the States, Territories and possessions to provide technical assistance services to private forest landowners and operators, *owners and administrators of private and publicly owned land in metropolitan areas*, and processors of primary forest products with respect to the management of forest lands: *shade trees, parks, greenbelts and barrier plantings* and the harvesting, marketing, and processing of forest products, and—
et cetera.

On H.R. 8064, I am also here today to speak in support of increasing the authorization level for cooperative forest fire protection funds from \$20 to \$40 million annually as proposed in H.R. 6084.

Without doubt, the most important factor in the improved condition of American forests over the past several decades has been the reduction of forest fires made possible by the Federal-State forest fire protection programs under the Clarke-McNary Act. Without adequate protection programs, all other efforts to improve the level of management on non-Federal forest lands are wasted.

You may recall that almost a year ago the Task Force on Softwood Lumber and Plywood appointed by President Nixon made its report to the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy. The task force was headed by Robert Mayo, who at that time was Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Among the recommendations of the task force was one that efforts to increase timber production on State and private forest lands were essential and that careful attention should be paid to cooperative forestry programs for increased production, technical assistance and financial assistance. The cooperative forest fire protection program conducted under the Clarke-McNary Act is one of these programs.

While the Clarke-McNary Act authorizes the Federal share of fire protection in a State to be as high as 50 percent of the costs, the Federal share has not increased as rapidly as the costs of manpower and equipment for fire protection. The Federal share has fallen to an average of about 15 percent of the total costs of fire protection on non-Federal lands nationwide. Under the original concept of the program, this diminishing share would have been desirable. The Federal funds

were to be used to prime the pump in the States. However, the public of late has taken a lot of interest in the environmental aspects of forest land management and, as a general rule, enjoys access to and recreation on the bulk of private forest lands. In addition, the general public, both urban and rural, enjoys the benefits of green spaces, wildlife habitat and watershed protection that forest cover brings. It, therefore, seems reasonable that the public should continue to assume a proportionate share of the costs of protecting those lands.

Increasing the authorization for cooperative forest fire protection programs is essential to both the Nation's environmental and timber productive objectives. The Nation's forest industries urge that you approve H.R. 6084.

Now, as to H.R. 6085. Over the past decade or so there has been a significant shift of ownership of nonindustrial forest land out of the hands of farmers and other rural owners into the hands of city dwellers. This shift has made it difficult for State foresters to maintain contact with such landowners. There is a feeling that opportunities to improve the level of management on forest lands are being lost for want of personal contact between landowners and foresters. Several States have initiated programs with State funds to make technical assistance available to owners and administrators of private property, parks and other areas within cities. This urban forestry program has given the State forester a foot in the door, so to speak, so that the city owner of rural forest land is made aware of the benefits of forest management. At the same time it has provided the State forester with increased opportunity to keep his programs before the State legislator, who increasingly is an urban dweller. If State funds for forestry programs are to be maintained, these urban forestry programs will become more important.

In addition to the benefits they can bestow indirectly on rural forest lands, urban forestry programs which render technical assistance to urban property owners and administrators are directly useful for the benefits they bring to city people.

The forest products industry has reviewed H.R. 6086 and has concluded that the bill does not offer the kind of assistance to city people which is needed. The emphasis is on cost-sharing for the planting of trees and shrubs. However, little mention is made in the bill of providing technical assistance. We understand that assistance in sharing the costs of tree planting in cities is available under programs in the Department of the Interior and in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In the light of need for technical assistance and face-to-face personal contact between foresters and property owners which could be provided by an urban forestry program, as compared to cost-sharing assistance, we suggest that the cause of urban forestry could be furthered if the Cooperative Forest Management Act were amended to permit State foresters to provide technical assistance to owners and administrators of public and private property in metropolitan areas, as I suggested earlier when speaking on H.R. 6082.

Mr. Chairman, that is all, except I would, with your permission, like to respond to a question Mr. Kyl posed to Mr. Shirley earlier.

Mr. McMILLAN. Without objection.

Mr. MUENCH. Mr. Kyle, as I understand your question, it was: Why should the Federal Government pick up the cost or share of the cost of these programs which can be carried on by the State? Is that approximately right?

I think we should realize that with the distribution of our population in States like Connecticut and Rhode Island and Massachusetts and New York, highly concentrated, the people are not where the trees are growing; they are not even in the States where trees are growing, and yet they consume forest products and they speak quite vociferously on the way forest lands in other States are managed.

Having demonstrated such an interest in the way forest lands are managed in other States, we think it is only reasonable that they pay some of the costs of protecting those lands and of providing technical assistance to the landowner so that the costs of the products the city dweller consumes can be kept down.

Mr. KYL. I would like to respond. You are not suggesting that we do not give any of this money to the States of Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and these other States?

Mr. MUENCH. Absolutely not. Especially, in the urban forestry program, having the personal contact between a trained forester and urban resident or administrator of a park or highway buffer strip in an urban area might be a very good way to help the city dweller keep his hand on the land, so to speak.

Mr. KYL. I think your suggestion here on the urban bill is the appropriate way to proceed on this. I think you have a very practical and a very salient suggestion. I still have the same problem. You point out the Federal Government is now sharing about 15 percent on these cooperative fire-fighting arrangements. The real problem is that we just do not have enough money for fighting fires.

It goes beyond that, of course. On public lands, we do not have the roads we need to get to the fires; we do not have the kinds of programs for harvesting mature timber, and a lot of other factors.

But, overall, what we really seek is a greater appropriation for fighting fires, and especially for preventing fires, and it bothers me considerably that what we are doing here is almost nit-picking again by making some gesture toward solving a problem which requires a whole lot more than these bills suggest is necessary. The same thing is true on cooperative management.

I would like to go a step further than you do and recommend that this cooperative management money, too, be made available primarily to the State forestry associations, and so on, rather than being dispensed helter-skelter by some bureau. I think we are pretty much in agreement.

Mr. MUENCH. As I understand, then, you are saying that these steps that these bills propose are really too feeble in light of the—

Mr. KYL. They are feeble.

Mr. MUENCH (continuing). In light of the magnitude of the problem, and I would agree, but nevertheless they are a step in the right direction. There are a number of movements afoot by industry, by the Federal agencies, by other interested groups to get better coordination of existing programs, to increase their magnitude, to take entirely new approaches to the problems which we face on our non-Federal lands.

Mr. KYL. The only thing that saves us is that we are concentrating here on non-Federal lands, and I am convinced that the only way we are ever going to get adequate funding for the public land forests is to have some entirely new means of collecting these fees for public land timber and of dispensing the fees to perhaps a quasi-governmental corporation to which the funds from timber lands will go so that we will know how much money we are going to have year after year on a 20-year or 30- or 50-year program.

As I say, the only thing that saves these bills in my own consideration is the fact that we are concerned primarily with private lands rather than public lands, but, again, I worry about this factor, too.

We do a little step in taking care of some problems on nonpublic lands and the public gets an idea, which has been suggested a number of times today, that we now have taken care of the forest needs, and this is as far as we have to go. And it is not.

When we report bills as they are, whereas amended, we are going to have to point out that this is just a scratching of the surface in this total timber program that we have to have nationally.

Mr. MUENCH. I thoroughly agree with you, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Vigorito?

Mr. VIGORITO. No questions.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Robinson?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, thank you.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. No, thank you.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you very much. Glad to have had you with us.

Mr. MUENCH. Thank you, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. You have given us a very good statement. Is there anyone else who has a statement they care to submit for the record?

Mr. Thomas L. Kimball submits statement on H.R. 6082 and H.R. 6084. Mr. Kimball is executive director of the National Wildlife Federation.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF THOMAS L. KIMBALL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL
WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. Chairman, I am Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director of the National Wildlife Federation.

Ours is a non-governmental organization which has its national headquarters at 1412 Sixteenth Street, N.W., here in Washington, D.C. The Federation has independent affiliates in all 50 States and the Virgin Islands. In turn, these affiliates are made up of local groups and individuals who, when combined with associate members and other supporters of the Federation, number an estimated three million persons.

Thank you for the invitation and opportunity to make these remarks.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr. Chairman, our purpose here today is to endorse the principles of H.R. 6082 which would authorize the annual appropriation of \$15 million for Cooperative Forest Management.

This bill would amend the Cooperative Forest Management Program, authorized by PL 729 in 1950, to make technical forest management assistance available to non-industry private owners. This group of private landowners owns an estimated 60% of the Nation's commercial forests which, in the future, must

supply more than half of our timber supplies and wood products. At the present time, it is our opinion that these properties are poorly managed. The owners do not have technical capability needed in proper management and lack proper incentives for long-range management plans. While some help is available through industry foresters, consultants and State extensionists, most technical advice must come from the Cooperative Forest Management Program.

We think it is in the public interest and benefit that technical assistance be provided these landowners for protection from insects, diseases, fire and other damaging agents, for improving timber stands, and for providing water, recreation and forage on these properties as well as for the preparation of multiple forest plans. All of these activities, of course, improve the environment. This is particularly true when technical assistance can help advise forest products manufacturers on how they can curtail air and water pollution.

Attached, Mr. Chairman, is a copy of a resolution adopted by our organization earlier this year in which we endorse the "Trees for People" program which relates to non-industrial private forests.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, the Federal appropriation for this activity in Fiscal 1971 is \$4,973,000, or virtually at the maximum authorization. As a consequence, we hope this can be increased to \$15 million as proposed in H.R. 6082.

Thank you for the opportunity of making these remarks.

Resolution No. 4

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, 35TH ANNUAL MEETING, PORTLAND, OREG.,
MARCH 4-7, 1971

"TREES FOR PEOPLE" PROGRAM

Whereas some four million private non-industrial woodland owners own or control 59% of all U.S. forest land; and

Whereas it is in the overall public interest to provide better protection and management for these non-industrial private forest lands; and

Whereas these areas provide many opportunities for the public to hunt, fish, or engage in other outdoor recreational pursuits; and

Whereas a coordinated effort is being made by conservation organizations and forestry groups through the "Trees for People" program in which the National Wildlife Federation is one of the cooperating organizations; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation, in annual convention assembled March 4, 1971, in Portland, Oregon, hereby calls attention of the American public to this program which will propose a cost-sharing incentive effort somewhat similar to many practices already being implemented within the U.S. Department of Agriculture with relation to forest protection from fire, disease, and insects and projects for tree planting, water-shed protection and improvement of wildlife habitat; including openings in forests; and Be it further

Resolved, That emphasis be directed toward allocating priority for meeting the above needs through Federal allocations of funds for fiscal year 1972 in these amounts; for cooperative forest fire protection, \$20 million; for insect research, \$5.8 million; and for disease research, \$3.8 million.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. Chairman, the National Wildlife Federation would like to express its support of the principle contained in H.R. 6084, authorizing the appropriation of additional funds for Cooperative Forest Fire Protection.

The National Wildlife Federation long has felt that the proper management of timber resources must include effective protection from destructive forest fires. As a consequence, throughout the existence of our organization, we have stood for wise management of forest resources including protection, where possible, from uncontrolled forest fires. We have worked quite closely throughout the years with State agencies and private groups and believe this Federal-State cooperative program is one of the finest in the field of resources management. All 50 States

are active participants in this program and Federal sharing up to 50% is authorized. This reduction in wild fires has a beneficial impact on the economy at all levels and results in improved timber and wood products, recreation, and wildlife. The expenditure of funds for fire protection is simply good business because it results in a vast savings in the resources bank. Attached is a copy of a resolution adopted by our organization in 1969 which relates to protection of uncontrolled fires.

Mr. Chairman, our organization is concerned that Federal appropriations have not kept pace with increases in program costs. In short, the Federal matching share have been far too small and it is our hope that this authorization can be increased from \$20 million to \$40 million per year, reflecting greater emphasis on the program as well as accelerated costs.

It is our understanding that additional Federal funding will extend fire protection to an additional 40 million acres of eligible lands presently unprotected as well as to increase protection on some 200,000,000 acres where protection is not now adequate.

Thank you for the opportunity to make these remarks.

Resolution No. 24

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, 33RD ANNUAL CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C.,
FEBRUARY 28-MARCH 2, 1969

WILDFIRES PROGRAM FOR PRIVATE LANDS

Whereas uncontrolled fires continue to be a major threat to wildland resources; and

Whereas accumulations of forest fuels on lands unburned for many years increase the possibilities of disaster type fires occurring under extreme conditions of drought, high winds and low humidities; and

Whereas, there is no national program for private lands dealing specifically with disaster wildfires and no reliable source of funds available to pay the costs of their suppression; and

Whereas there is need for training, research and coordination between all fire control agencies for dealing with wildfires of disaster proportions; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation, in annual convention assembled Feb. 28-March 2, 1969, in Washington, D.C., does endorse the work of the Task Force on a National Program for Wildfire Control and supports in principle a national program designed to prevent and combat disaster type fires on the wildlands of this nation.

Mr. McMILLAN. We will hold the record open for a week to receive any further statements that may be submitted. The committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:45 p.m., an adjournment was taken.)

(The following letters and statements were subsequently submitted to the subcommittee:)

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER S. BARING, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the need for the authorization enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into negotiated contracts for the protection from fires of lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, as stated in the intentions of the bill, H.R. 7387. If we are to be a concerned Congress aiming to preserve America's forests and lands in general, we must equip the proper agencies with the needed authority to make use of fire fighting devices.

As the bill states, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Forest Service, may by negotiated contract or otherwise provide for procurement and operation of air tanker facilities and services for the protection and management of the national forests, with authority to renew any contract for such

purpose annually, not more than four times, without additional requests for proposals.

Being a western state's Congressman, I am not unaware of the extreme difficulties encountered by our Federal, state, and local agencies in fighting forest and range fires. In my State of Nevada we have forested areas which are inaccessible by roads and some of these areas are national park sites. The only way to douse these fires is almost solely through the fire fighting air tanker planes which have the capability, as we all know, to get into this mountainous area fast with a load of fire fighting liquids. Therefore, I believe this measure will properly equip the Secretary of Agriculture and the forest agencies to maintain proper protection for the forest lands, and I urge approval of such legislation.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. Chairman, as a co-author of companion bills H.R. 6083, H.R. 6085 and H.R. 6087, I wish to commend our colleague Bob Sikes of Florida for his vision and leadership in bringing these important forestry proposals before this Committee.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Our forest resources play a very important role in the welfare of our people. They provide jobs, wood for homes, habitat for wildlife and places in which to recreate while their hills and valleys serve as catchments for vital supplies of water.

In this vast complex of the properties of some 4,000,000 private, non-industrial owners exert a major influence because they occupy nearly 60 percent of all the commercial forest land.

Therefore it is imperative that these private forests produce their share of the goods and services needed by the Nation as a whole.

Surveys in my State of New Hampshire and elsewhere show that private forest owners will improve their properties if shown how to do so. This educational effort is being carried on by the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, by public service foresters and by private consulting foresters. But their combined efforts fall far short of reaching more than a small fraction of the many landowners in our State. We need to strengthen this educational effort.

Therefore I strongly recommend enactment of H.R. 6082 and its companion bill H.R. 6083.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Similar efforts need to be exerted in protecting our forests from damage by fire. While we in New Hampshire have been blessed with an excellent protective organization for some years, other parts of the Nation have not been so fortunate. There still are 45,000,000 acres of commercial forests and non-forested watersheds that do not receive any protection at all. In addition, there are some 200,000,000 acres that are not protected adequately. These areas are being damaged severely in the present rash of Spring fires. The protective program needs to be improved.

Therefore, I urge passage of H.R. 6084 and its companion bill H.H. 6085.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

I am deeply interested in initiation of a program of urban environmental forestry. As you know, about three-fourths of the Nation's people live in cities. By the year 2000 the percentage of urban residents may increase to 85 percent according to present trends. These people need the benefit of the ameliorating effects of trees and shrubs upon their environment.

Let me point out a single example well known to all of you. Rock Creek Park, a long corridor of trees extending from the center to the outer limits of Washington, provides natural air drainage for a major portion of the city. In addition to offering a place for much needed recreation by thousands and thousands of people, the trees in the park recharge the atmosphere, filter dust particles from the air, control wind movements and deaden sound. It is of considerable importance that these trees be kept in a healthy growing condition.

Pioneering programs of urban forestry in some 30 communities in Georgia,

Missouri, Illinois, Mississippi and Arkansas during the past four years attest to the effectiveness of such an approach to improvement of the environment. Therefore I recommend that such a cooperative effort be made available to all communities by enactment of H.R. 6086 and H.R. 6087.

Some questions about urban forestry have been called to my attention. Inasmuch as the emphasis in the program is for education of the public to improve urban amenities, why is administration being assigned to the Forest Service? Why not assign it to the Extension Service or to the Department of Housing and Urban Development?

These and other Federal agencies probably could guide urban forestry satisfactorily. However, it would be necessary for each of them to set up additional administrative machinery for that purpose.

The Forest Service, on the other hand, already has a parallel program in progress in Cooperative Forest Management. It would not be necessary for either the Forest Service or related State Forestry Departments to organize new administrative procedures. As a matter of fact, urban forestry could be initiated by a suitable amendment to the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950. I would be agreeable to such an amendment.

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD F. COLLIER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE
STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. Chairman, I think most of us are aware that certain aspects of forestry management and operations are under heavy criticism. The critics have centered their attack upon the practice of clearcutting, the lag in reforestation, lack of concern for environmental quality, and indifference to public opinion. To whatever extent these charges are justified, I hope these hearing will point up solutions as entailed by the legislation under discussion.

Although I am opposed to the principle of automatically providing funds for any program without reasonable justification, I believe that Congress must make every effort to improve our forestry programs by increasing necessary funding and reviewing the expenditures with more frequency. Correspondence from H. F. Siemart, an Illinois state forester, and subsequent research have convinced me that states alone can not adequately carry on extensive new programs of forestry. Solutions can best be found in the legislation before us today.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

One of the bills is an amendment to beef up the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950. This bill would triple (raise from \$5 million to \$15 million) the Federal share of the Cooperative Forest Management program, which provides technical assistance to small woodland owners and processors of primary forest products.

In my state of Illinois this is an important program. Most of our timber harvest comes from small privately owned woodlands. Only 11 percent of the State is forested, but what we lack in timber, we make up for in people. In terms of population, Illinois now ranks fourth in the Nation, and these people are vitally concerned about what happens in our National Forests and other timberlands. Part of this concern is drawn from the fact that Illinois is 47th in per capita park and recreation space so her citizens must search elsewhere to enjoy a vacation of camping or hunting in the woods.

Unfortunately, many farms in southern and central Illinois would be ideal for growing hardwood trees used in manufacturing fine furniture. Many areas have proven adequate for the growing of certain families of softwoods. I believe that the only ingredient lacking is more funding for education of landowners to prove to them that trees can be a profitable crop. I urge that this bill be reported favorably by the Committee and passed by the Congress.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Next, I would like to speak about the bill to amend the Clarke-McNary Act, because this bill is once again important and would add funding to a vital area. It would authorize Federal funding for cooperative forest fire control under the Clarke-McNary Act to be raised from \$20 million to \$40 million.

When the Clarke-McNary Act was passed in 1924, it was conceived as a 50-50 sharing program, but by 1970 the States were paying 85.5 percent. The Federal Government is paying only 14.5 percent. The proposed legislation would raise the Federal share to 29 percent of the \$138 million estimated program cost for all 50 states.

The bill would also authorize the re-study of tax laws and how they might be improved to encourage the conservation and growing of timber. It would also authorize the investigation and promotion of practical methods of insuring standing timber on growing forests from losses by fire.

Why is the control of forest fire so critical? One need only study the fire statistics for last year on our National Forests. According to a USDA release dated February 10, 1971, this is what happened:

The 1970 fire season in the National Forests of the United States was one of the most disastrous—and certainly the costliest—in history.

Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, reported today that 555,831 acres of Forest Service-protected lands burned. Seven lives were lost fighting the fires and untold millions of dollars of damage were suffered by natural resources.

The annual report revealed the acreage burned was the highest in 36 years, going back to 1934, when a total of 706,500 acres was charred. The 15,000 fires were the most since 1961 when 15,160 were recorded.

Contributing most to these fire disaster figures were some of the worst forest "blowups" in the annals of the States of Washington and California. In late August and September in the Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests of Northern Washington, lightning and continued dryness combined to set off fires which scoured more than 100,000 acres of timberland. One fire alone spread out over 55,000 acres before it was controlled.

Four National Forests—the Angeles, Los Padres, Cleveland and San Bernardino—figured in some of the worst brush fires ever in Southern California. In these National Forests alone, more than 207,000 acres were burned, including a record 185,000 acre blaze which roared across National Forest land and onto other land ownerships almost to the Mexican border. On State, private and Federal lands in Southern California, more than half a million acres burned killing eight people and destroying 1,000 buildings.

Chief Cliff said that statistics for all the forest lands of the United States are now being compiled and will be reported later in the year. This will include all forest lands in Federal, State and private ownership.

The Clarke-McNary funds, of course, are not used on National Forests, but the problems of fire control on State and private forest lands are similar to those on Federal lands. The need for more funds is obvious. As a co-sponsor of these two bills, I recommend their enactment without delay.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. Chairman, I want first to thank you for the courtesy extended me in this opportunity to present my views to your Committee on these three measures, H.R. 6082, 6084, and 6086, of which I am a sponsor.

For the sake of brevity and convenience, Mr. Chairman, I will discuss these measures jointly to the extent practicable.

Taken as a whole, these measures will go a long way toward aiding our citizens, at the State and local level, help themselves preserve, beautify, and enjoy that most valuable natural resource, our forests.

H.R. 6082 and 6084 are measures which propose additional funds for presently established, very worthwhile, but financially limited programs. They are both programs which emphasize the self-help aspects of dealing with their respective problems. H.R. 6082 would give additional funds to the Cooperative Forest Management Program and H.R. 6084 would do the same for the Cooperative Forest Fire Protection Program.

These programs present a most economical solution to the problem of maintaining, preserving, and protecting our forests. They give support, through financial and technical means, to State and local government agencies and personnel.

H.R. 6086, proposing the Urban Environmental Forestry Program, is an attempt to establish a workable and rational approach toward the preservation of our many urban forested areas as well as provide a stimulus for the reforestation where it is needed. Such areas include green strips along highways, community parks, and urban forest areas as well as other environmental assets. These areas can provide noise abatement, reduce air pollution, enhance wildlife habitation and provide a place for men to retreat from the pressures of this fast moving, complex world.

All of these measures have in common the benefit, Mr. Chairman, of working to improve the environment and maintain that which needs no improvement. I respectfully urge this committee to approve the requests which would allow these plans continued success in these areas of vital concern to so many of our citizens.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES A. HALEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE
STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, as one who for many years has supported conservation programs in the Congress, I would like to express my support for three bills before your Subcommittee which would significantly enhance the continued cultivation and preservation of one of this or any other nation's great natural resources—its forests.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

The bill, H.R. 6082, would increase the authorization for Cooperative Forest Management from \$5 to \$15 million. This program has done much to assist in the battle to preserve our environment through providing technical forest management assistance to the thousands of private forest landowners. When you consider the timberland holdings of this group of people constitute approximately 60 percent of the nation's commercial forests, it is readily apparent how significant this type of assistance has become. If we are to be able in the future to rely on these sources of timber, there will need to be a substantial increase in assistance to these private landowners.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

The bill, H.R. 6084, would increase the authorization for forest fire protection from \$20 to \$40 million. The losses which this nation suffers through forest fires annually is tragic, especially when the bulk of the destruction of the timber stands could have been either prevented or at least diminished by prompt and sufficient action. But because fire fighting forces are spread so thinly, fire fighters have simply had to let much timber go up in smoke. There is a clear need for additional Federal participation in the joint State-Federal effort to fight such forest fires.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

The bill, H.R. 6086, would institute a new program for urban and environmental forestry to insure that in the decades to come there is an adequate healthy blend of forests and green areas to complement our ever-expanding urban and suburban society.

In my estimation, these three pieces of legislation are sound investments for the future in terms of the products to be yielded as well as the quality of the environment to be protected and enhanced; and I respectfully urge your favorable consideration of them.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr. Chairman, if this Nation's woodlands are to provide larger timber harvests that are essential to meet the needs for forestry products as the population increases, forest management must be expanded and improved. Not only is it paramount to meet commercial needs, but to protect and enhance the environment and provide outdoor recreation.

The Cooperative Forest Management program has been of great benefit in improving management of private forest lands and the harvesting, marketing, and processing of forest products.

Yet the present authorization for the program is not sufficient to provide this technical assistance for a substantial portion of landowners who need forest management know-how.

Back in the 20's and 30's little attention was given to the propagation, conservation, and management of our forest resources. Today these practices are of great concern in assuring production of larger and sustained harvest yields.

I have cosponsored the legislation before you today to increase the authorization for the program to \$15 million annually. These additional funds are a small investment to make in assuring an adequate timber source and to preserve our woodlands for future generations.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, I have cosponsored and strongly support this legislation to provide authority for increased Federal participation in the cooperative forest fire control program.

Though the Clarke-McNary Act authorized that the Federal share in this cooperative effort with the States would be up to 50 percent of the total cost, the States now provide about 85.5 percent of the cost. The present \$20 million authorization provided by the Congress in 1949 still stands regardless of today's prices while State expenditures have increased to about \$97 million.

Long ago Congress recognized the national interest in the millions of acres of forest and nonforested watershed land under State and private ownership. In fact the cooperative forest fire control program is a basic environmental program. Millions of acres are lost to fires each year and we can ill afford such destruction of these vital resources.

Arkansas has 18,206,700 acres of forest land, with ownership divided among farm woodlots, forest industry holdings, other commercial lands, and the State and Federal Governments. Forestry resources provide 65 percent of our industrial payroll and is our largest industry. In addition, these forest land acres provide a dependable water supply, home for wildlife, plus scenic beauty and forest recreation for citizens of Arkansas and the entire Nation.

The States cannot provide an adequate level of fire protection for these lands and I urge that the Federal authorization be increased to \$40 million annually.

STATEMENT OF HON. PETER N. KYROS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MAINE

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

The recent death of two bald eagles in the "Pine Tree State" was recently recorded in the newspapers of our Nation's Capital. The report says the State has fewer than 50 of these birds. I doubt if on an given day we publish the State's toll in human life in the Nation's newspapers. Why was this an important event? It's important because it tells us we are endangering something in our heritage that is dear to us, something we want to preserve for future generations. And, of course, the reorder cost of the bald eagle may be exorbitant.

Maine, with over 17 million acres of non-Federal forest land (that's over 86 percent of its total land area), is in far better position regarding its forest resource. We want to keep it that way.

Over three-fourths of the State's commercial forest land should be treated with one or more conservation practices to protect and enhance its productivity. These are forests that have been historically important since Colonial days, forests that are still famous—nationally and world-wide.

Yet, Maine, with over 12 million forested acres requiring conservation treatment, had to settle in 1970 for less than 55 thousand acres treated with funding available under the Cooperative Forest Management Program—\$88,900 Federal and \$162,723 State. Yes, over 1,800 individual owners of small tracts of forest land were assisted. But what of the other untold thousands who wondered: Why are my trees worth? How should I manage my woodland? Should I grow some

Christmas trees? How can I have more game and birds in my woodlot? Why are my pine needles turning brown—can I do anything about it?

We should never lose sight of the fact that the Cooperative Forest Management Program protects the individual forest landowner's right to decide how he wants to use his land. We like that in Maine. Equally important, I feel, is the fact that this individual can get the best professional advice available concerning multiple-use possibilities for his particular piece of land.

While meeting the needs of the individual landowner, we will also be providing for goods and services from the Nation's private forest resource that are in great demand today. One of these demands is from timber industries and home-builders who recognize that private forest lands must bear an increasing share of the timber supply for the Nation. We must look to these lands to fill the gap between supply and demand. Yet there has been little effort to accelerate public assistance to help the private owner meet the demands.

Other demands on private forest land are also increasing. These come from conservationists, recreationists—hunters who look to these same private forest lands for their needs. State employed foresters can assist landowners in providing these services. Multiple-use management is essential to meet growing demands for all goods and services that these lands can provide.

I visualize a three-way payoff from H.R. 6082—

(1) Fewer individuals will have unanswered questions or situations concerning their real estate;

(2) The general public will have available more of the goods and services inherent in well-managed forest land; and

(3) We will make a start—NOW—to take some of the crunching pressure off public lands upon which demands have obviously proliferated and multiplied.

Yes—I heartily endorse the increased Federal cost sharing with States provided for in H.R. 6082 to encourage more technical assistance to private forest landowners and operators.

We need this \$15 million impetus—NOW.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

The State of Maine was one of the first states to participate in the Federal-State Cooperative Forest Fire Control program. It began in 1911 under the Weeks Law and since its enactment has participated under provisions of the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924.

All 50 States participate at present and the program's primary objective is to hold fire damage, on the more than 500 million acres protected, below the level at which serious adverse effects on the yield of timber products, environmental quality and other public benefits from these lands would result. Protection of these lands from wildfire produces a favorable impact on the local state and total national economy.

The vast areas of valuable forest land in my State motivate me to place a high value on the development and maintenance of a strong fire control organization. Over 17 million acres are receiving protection from fire in the Clarke-McNary program in Maine. Our economy and general well being has been favorably affected as a result of this protection. Reduction in the acreage burned has been accompanied by a corresponding reduction in resource losses including timber, water recreation, wildlife, and forage.

Adequate fire protection cannot be provided without ample funds. There is a need for supplemental funds to extend fire protection to an estimated 46 million acres of unprotected eligible lands and for intensifying protection on nearly 200 million acres where it is not considered to be adequate.

The Clarke-McNary Act authorizes Federal sharing up to 50% of total program expenditures. However, we have failed to carry out part of the financial load. For instance, in F.Y. 1948 total program expenditures were nearly \$24 million, of which \$9 million or 37.7% was Federal. In F.Y. 1970 the total had risen to over \$113 million, of which \$16.4 million or 14.5% was Federal. Surely we need to do more.

Normal increases in the cost of doing business and a growing public demand for a higher level of protection continue to cause program costs to soar. Much of this results from the fact that large numbers of people are building homes in rural areas formerly considered remote. Resource and improvement values have risen rapidly along with increased recreation and other use of the land.

These factors emphasize the need for a more intensive job of fire prevention. Smokey the Bear and other prevention efforts have done a good job but additional help is needed.

To successfully cope with the large, potentially disastrous, fires specialized fire control training and new and more adequate equipment will be required. These large fires (over 300 acres) accounted for one-half of one percent of the wild-fires on State and privately owned protected land in 1970, yet they accounted for over 36 percent of the acres burned.

Periodically, Maine experiences fires of a disastrous nature and we are especially conscious of the need for a capability to control these situations.

We still think back to the fall of 1947 when the famed "Bar Harbor" fire occurred. Approximately 220,000 acres of forests, hay fields, and pastures were burned with an estimated total property loss of \$30 million. In the tragic wake of this destruction 16 persons lost their lives, 2,500 were made homeless, 9 communities were leveled or practically wiped out, and 4 other communities suffered extensive damage.

More recently in September 1965 the "Centerville" fire destroyed two small hunting camps and burned over 12,000 acres of valuable timber and watershed lands.

Periodic studies are made to update estimated financial needs for providing adequate fire protection to eligible Clarke-McNary lands.

In 1949, the annual cost was determined to be about \$40 million. Congress passed legislation that same year for the present Clarke-McNary \$20 million authorization. This appeared to endorse the principle of Federal sharing up to 50% of the estimated need. The most recent estimate for accomplishing the fire protection job was made in 1965 and revealed an annual need of \$123 million. Based on today's prices this estimate would be raised to at least \$138 million.

A study made in 1958 by the Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio, indicated that the Federal share of the Cooperative Fire Control program cost should range from 40 to 59 percent of the total. A more recent study by the Southern Forest Resource Analysis Committee (The South's Third Forest) in 1969 estimated the Federal share should be 29 percent in that area. If this recent factor is applied to the estimated total need of \$138 million, the Federal share is indicated to be \$40 million.

H.R. 6084 proposes to increase the appropriation authorization to the \$40 million level. I believe this is the minimum amount we should approve to provide an acceptable level of fire protection for the Nation's State and privately owned forest and nonforested watershed lands. As a result of this protection they can be expected to make their maximum contribution to the needs of the Nation.

I urge each of you to join me in supporting this needed legislation.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

The State of Maine has long been noted for its concern for environmental and forestry programs. At present the State boasts over 87 percent of her land area in forests; her nickname, the "Pine Tree State"; her flower, the "Pine Cone and Tassel"; her tree, the "Eastern White Pine"; and her State bird, the forest-associated "Chickadee".

Her concern over the environment is reflected in the establishment of the Baxter State Park, an area of over 200,000 acres to be "forever wild" and the recent \$7,000,000 bond issue voted by her citizens for acquisition of lands in the now "Allagash Wilderness Waterway" to preserve a vestige of "primitive America."

After having accomplished the preservation of these God-given entities for all time she now turns her energies to combat the deterioration of the cities, towns and hamlets that provide the living environment of her citizens by recommending to Congress the bill now before us (H.R. 6086).

The State of Maine is fortunate indeed that the deterioration of her cities and towns has not been as great or as rapid as some of her sister States. Yet the increased demands of population and economic growth have made inroads into the cityscape. The elm-shaded byways and green environment of trees, shrubs and other plants have yielded to shopping centers, office and apartment buildings, industrial sites, housing developments, parking lots and highways. These entities constitute long-term and sometimes irreversible commitment of urban resources.

The citizens of Maine recognize the need and value for an urban environmental

forestry program and the interdependence that exists between man and his environment. Each year many thousands of vacationers seek out the peace and solitude offered by the forest environment and the rustic atmosphere of the towns and hamlets.

Trees, shrubs and other plants can reduce the harshness of city noise, air temperature and pollution. They can help reduce erosion and rapid runoff and affect the presence of wildlife.

There is a need for cooperative federal-state-local action to combat these problems. The federal government has much to share through the programs and responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture. This department is concerned with the various related land resources and has been instrumental in increasing the capacity of the land for goods and services to provide for our expanding population. Throughout its history it has provided information and education relative to growing trees and plants for shade and beauty. The Forest Service has conducted research and provided technical assistance to States and rural communities on problems related to urban forestry. The scientific knowledge applicable to forest management and soil and water conservation are directly applicable to urban environmental problems. The Forest Service through its varied programs, skills and experience can provide the coordination, leadership and technical assistance necessary to fulfill the need.

Under the envisioned program the Department of Agriculture would become the locus of Federal activity relating to urban and environmental forestry. This would provide a central point for the dissemination and application of new and established guides and principles and administration of urban forestry programs. Training opportunities and a range of technical services would be available to those requesting services.

Through its present institutional arrangements the Department would encourage program emphasis and dissemination of information.

Application of the urban forestry program would be through the State and local agencies. Thus local entities would share in the accomplishments.

The benefits of the urban environmental forestry program are far reaching. Not only will the tide of environmental deterioration be reversed for our generation but for generations to come. As urban renewal has lifted older cities out of the decay of neglect, environmental renewal will provide them with a new spirit of life. Developing communities would also be able to better plan for the establishment and protection of greenbelts, forest parks and improved living conditions for man.

To provide for the common good and the establishment of an urban environmental forestry program, I, along with citizens of Maine, recommend the enactment of this bill.

STATEMENT OF HON. SPEEDY O. LONG, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to appear before you today to offer my support to the several bills now being considered by you having to do with forests. I appear as a co-sponsor of the bills H.R. 6888, H.R. 6889, and H.R. 6890 and I am pleased to note the many other co-sponsors of this legislation.

My remarks will be brief as I am sure you realize the importance which forestry and the timber industry has meant to my State of Louisiana. Our great State has been blessed over the years with an abundant acreage of forests and we all know that as time passes, the supply and size of this natural resource becomes less and the need greater and greater for its protection and most efficient utilization.

This legislation enjoys the support of the Louisiana Forestry Commission, which is our State agency charged with the responsibility of executing state laws relating to forestry and in coordinating the efforts of the State of Louisiana with the Federal government in this field. I am advised by our State Forester that this legislation is of great importance to Louisiana's forestry program and is consistent with the objectives of the Administration in improving our rural areas.

I hope this Committee will see fit to report this legislation favorably. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. Chairman, as cosponsor of legislation similar to H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084 and H.R. 6086, I ask the Subcommittee to report favorably on this legislation. By increasing the authorization for the Cooperative Forest Management program from five to fifteen million dollars, raising the authorization ceiling on Cooperative Forest Fire Protection to forty million dollars, and launching an urban environmental forestry program, we would sow an abundance of environmental benefits for future generations to reap. These proposals are an investment in the air, land, water and people of America. I urge the Subcommittee to support this bill.

Respectfully, I suggest that the Committee consider merging these three bills into one for more expeditious consideration.

STATEMENT OF HON. B. F. SISK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr. Chairman, the Federal-State Cooperative Forest Management program provides the technical assistance available to the more than four million owners of some 300 million acres of non-industrial private forest land in this country.

These holdings represent 59 percent of the total commercial forest, which must produce more than half of the nation's future timber requirements. They also make important contributions to the environment, water supplies, wildlife refuges, livestock forage and recreation.

Benefits of the program also include a better income for owners and users of these lands and increased recreational uses for residents of nearby communities, a stable resource base for forest industries and a healthy and pleasant natural environment.

The management of forests for timber requires a high degree of technical skill and capability. The management of forest for additional values, including protection and enhancement of the environment requires substantially more expertise. This is not commonly found among non-industry private owners. In order to deal with this complex problem, technical assistance to these owners must be increased several times above its present level.

The present authorized limit of federal appropriation is \$5 million. This should be increased to \$15 million.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

The Federal Government has a good record of bringing additional acreages of state and privately owned forest under cooperative forest fire control. We do not have the same kind of record in providing the funds for fire fighting activities.

As of December 1969, more than 511 million acres of land were being protected under the Clarke-McNary Act, which provides for cooperative state-federal forest fire protection. This was an increase of 25 million acres in 1968 and 32 million acres in 1967.

While federal levels of expenditures have increased from \$360,000 in 1924, the year of enactment of the Clarke-McNary Act, to \$16.5 million in 1970, state expenditures have increased from \$1.9 million to \$97 million.

Federal participation in cooperative forest fire control under the Clarke-McNary Act is authorized up to 50 percent. But we find that the federal share in fiscal year 1970 was 14.5 per cent and the state share 85.5 per cent.

Experience has shown that increased federal appropriations mean an increase in state expenditures. The present authorized limit on federal expenditures is out of date. The states cannot be expected to increase their appropriations without a more equitable contribution from the federal government.

I support authorizing the increase of federal funds from \$20 million to \$40 million to help us plan soundly for a long and effective fire control program.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

The new program for an urban environmental forestry program meets a need only recently recognized. In cities throughout the country the problem is the same. People are jammed together, surrounded by concrete, steel and glass. They are assaulted by sound, dirt, odors and smog.

This unfortunately has become the face of modern America that the urban dweller too often sees, hears and feels.

The urban and environmental forestry program would provide technical assistance for the protection, improvement, and establishment of native trees and shrubs on private lands and public areas in urban and suburban areas.

Much like man-designed artifacts which can completely control the environment inside a closed room; trees, shrubs and other vegetation can help control the natural environment. They provide shade and protection from the elements. They soften harsh contours, enhancing the view. They clean the air and deaden the sound. And they provide beauty and serenity.

Few communities have the resources, personnel and technical skill to administer an urban environmental program. This program would help supply these needed elements.

Administration of the program would be by the states through cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and the state agency designated by the Governor, usually the state forest service. The services of qualified experts could be applied as needed.

It is estimated that by the year 2000 some 85 per cent of the people of the country will be living in metropolitan areas. This will create environmental problems which can be solved by careful management of woodlands and vegetated areas, open spaces and other areas for which there is now no overall program.

For this program, I support the proposed authorization of \$5 million.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. AL ULLMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE
STATE OF OREGON

I would like to testify today on behalf of H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084 and 6086 and related bills. I have co-sponsored identical measures, H.R. 6497, H.R. 6598 and 6499.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

This Subcommittee is to be complimented for the efforts every year to assist in the problems faced by our nation's forests.

We are entering a critical stage in our economy with the need to respond to the desperate housing shortage now facing the country. With the demand that exists, it is clear that the federal forest reserves will not be adequate to meet the challenge. It is critical that we assist in bringing non-federal forest reserves into maximum production within a short period of time.

One of the most meaningful types of assistance that can be made is in the Cooperative Forest Management Service Program. Through this service private timber holdings have access to research, planning and technical guidance in developing this resource. Unless we make the investment now, there is a real question whether or not our forest capability will be adequate in the future.

I would request that the Subcommittee increase the authorization for federal cost sharing of this important activity. An authorization level of \$15,000,000 would allow accelerated development to begin, and this will greatly assist our capacity to respond to the future forest product needs of our country.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

While we are concerned about the proper management of our non-federal forests, the problem does not stop there. With an increased authorization for assistance in managing this resource, much is possible. However, a serious forest fire could destroy in hours all of the investment that has been made. For this reason, I am today urging that the Subcommittee authorize a funding level of \$40 million to increase cooperative forest fire protection.

Since enactment of the Clarke-McNary Act in 1924, this program has been of great value to the nation. However, the intent of this act was a true cost sharing of such protection. At the present time, the federal government is paying only about 15% of this cost instead of the 50% that was envisioned. While it would be difficult to immediately reach the 50% level, this Subcommittee's favorable decision to increase the authorization will be of great assistance. Again, I urge that you would authorize a new level of \$40 million as described in this bill.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

Urbanization has become a fact of American life. Many of the demands placed upon our forest resources are as a result of population concentration. We have responded to the need for forest products to serve our urban population. However, we have given little attention to the problem of trees in the cities. As a country, we are beginning to realize that our urban environment needs green spaces and trees to assist the physical and mental well-being of people who live there. However, we have done little to encourage research and investment in promulgation and management of trees in our cities. The bill you are considering would achieve this.

There is some evidence to believe that properly managed grooves of trees within cities may help our fight against air pollution. There is reason to believe that properly managed forest resources can assist psychological adjustment in the cities. There is reason to believe that the cities simply may be made more beautiful with properly managed stands of trees. However, funds are required to pursue these and other potentially beneficial uses of trees within the urban environment.

I would urge the Committee to favorably consider this bill, either as an amendment to the cooperative forestry bill, or as separate legislation. The authorization of \$15 million will be of great assistance in meeting this challenge.

Thank you for the opportunity to present my views on these important measures.

STATEMENT OF EDGAR H. FALKNER, FOTOFORE CONSULTING, BRENTWOOD, MD.

I have recently become aware that a Congressional Hearing by the House Sub-committee on Forestry to consider H.R. 6082. It is my understanding that if this becomes effective the Cooperative Forest Management program would treble. If the intent of this legislative proposal is to provide progressively increasing no-cost public assistance to landowners, I am compelled to express a dissenting opinion.

Let me take a few moments to present the background for such an opinion. For a number of years I have been building a technical capacity to offer capable forestry consulting. In addition to a B.S. (Forestry) degree I have attended continuing education workshops at six universities as well as numerous adult education classes at several local high schools. Practical experience includes five years in multiple-use forestry with a Federal agency, two years in forest inventory (during this period I was also involved in the CFM program), and eleven years in aerial surveys with private companies. About a year or so ago I began offering forestry assistance. During this time, in order to support my family, there has been an economic necessity to maintain full-time employment in aerial surveys, while also attempting to develop contacts for consulting projects. It should be emphasized that this consulting has not been of "moonlighting" nature as evidenced by an excessive dispensation of personal funds.

As I see it, there is a need for Cooperative Forest Management and Extension Service programs in dealing with those cases where individual citizens should not expect to realize a profit from no-cost services. This is not to say, though, that a landowner is entitled to receiver forestry services without charge, then sever the timber with the advantage of receiving as a personal profit that amount which was not paid for the services rendered by a government agency.

In these days of national economical recession and depressed lumber market, there are sufficient stumbling blocks in the path of the private consulting forester. Added to these problems, a portion of his tax dollar is being directly utilized in inequitable government competition; inequitable in the sense that CFM services are offered at no cost, while the private consultant must be recompensed at some figure above zero dollars in order to maintain a sufficient livelihood.

Were you to examine the background of the average private consulting forester, I would predict a solid technological preparation. Under our system of free enterprise the qualified private consulting forester is entitled to the right to expect the same bargaining position for the available market as small businessmen in any other endeavor.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH F. KAYLOR, JEKYLL ISLAND, GA.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, My name is Joseph F. Kaylor, Jekyll Island, Georgia, I wish to speak in support of H.R. 6082—6085—6086 which will increase financial assistance to states and other public agencies or organizations in forestry and related works. H.R. 6082 as introduced would amend Sec. 2 of the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 by authorizing an appropriation of \$15,000,000 annually to aid small landowners in solving their problems in managing forest lands. These small forest tracts (generally under 500 acres) are capable of producing far more timber products than they do now. Most of the millions of owners are farmers, business and professional men who though not knowledgeable, in forestry practices, are willing to follow the advice of technical foresters if they can be provided by the cooperating State Forestry Departments. Here in the south we need to plant millions of idle acres to pine or other species to fill the increasing needs for pulp, lumber and other wood products. I have learned from over 50 years experience that giving technical assistance to these folks will aid in increasing and improving our nations wood pile. Amending Sec. 3 of the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 by increasing the annual Federal Authorization to \$40,000,000 is long past due. It will provide additional funding for Sec's. 1, 2 and 3 of the C-M Act. Fires in the woods respect no ownership lines and as one drives over our major highways here in the southland we are often never out of sight of a burning or smoldering forest fire.

Charlie Flory (of your state) and others like him have provided an excellent basis for organized forest fire protection but modernization costs have pyramided and must be met. Recently in one southern state our cooperating neighbor to assist in controlling a bad fire situation. We in the states need a regional pool of dollars in wood fiber which means jobs for our people and an increase in the of such special, but expensive equipment to prevent the annual loss of millions the north Canada flew highly specialized equipment several thousand miles to local economy. The growing need for advice and guidance to property owners are developing rural communities where citizens have moved to escape the with tree problems will be met by enactment of H.R. 6068. All of the 50 states inner city problems. Millions of homes in these urban settings have created new problems for state forestry agencies in intensive management of tree growth, which we all know is essential for purifying the air surrounding these homes. Appropriating \$5,000,000 annually to furnish matching funds for states to provide technical assistance through the Urban Environmental Forestry Act will supply a basic program to improve surroundings in many communities.

In closing Gentlemen, let me add that every dollar appropriated and spent under authorization of these three important and essential national forestry programs will multiply many times in benefits to your constituents and to our local state and industrial economy.

STATEMENT OF HENRY L. DIAMOND, COMMISSIONER, NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

The Subcommittee on Forestry of the House Committee on Agriculture, is considering three important and much needed bills which are designed to improve the management and protection of the Nation's forest resources and to establish a new Urban Environmental Forestry Program. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation favors these bills and urges their passage.

Fifty-six percent of New York's land area is covered by forests and thus its forest resource is important to all of the people in the State and in other states as well.

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

H.R. 6082 increases the Federal Authorization of the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 (CFM) from \$5 million to \$15 million. Eighty-five percent of the commercial forest land in New York, comprising 12 million acres, is owned by about 250,000 private individuals. If the Nation's demands for forest products

is to be met in the future, private forest land throughout the United States must be brought into peak production. In order to improve the forest management practices and production on these lands, a number of incentives will be necessary. One of these is increased technical assistance to the private woodland owners. The CFM Program provides for 50-50 cost-sharing for this purpose, but in New York the Federal share has only amounted to about 26 percent. With increased cost-sharing available, it is apparent that the states would be in a better position to meet their technical assistance needs.

COOPERATIVE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

H.R. 6084 increases the Federal Authorization for forest fire control from \$20 million to \$40 million. The value of the forest resources is tremendous and must be protected for the welfare of all people. The value of the forest products should not be considered as the only criteria. The many other intrinsic values of the forest resources must be considered as well, including watershed protection, recreation, aesthetics, environmental and ecological values, wildlife, values and related economic values. Section 2 of the Clarke-McNary Act provides for 50-50 cost-sharing. Appropriations, however, have only provided the states with about 15 percent Federal cost-sharing. Even with the increase, the Federal share will only be raised to about 30 percent. Such an addition will be most helpful to the states in meeting their forest fire control responsibilities and, thereby, reducing the great annual timber losses from fire.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

H.R. 6086 authorizes \$5 million for a new program of environmental forestry. We know there is a very strong need for this type of a program in our urban areas. Most of our Mayors and many citizens of cities and villages have strongly supported the concept of such a program. Thousands of graceful American Elms, which were planted along our streets and highways years ago, are rapidly dying out because of the Dutch Elm disease. The dead and dying are being removed at considerable cost. Pollution and population pressures have added to the disappearance of many of the village greens. Replacements are needed as are mini-parks, green belts and trees and shrubs in open spaces. H.R. 6086 is the beginning of a program which will receive national support and will contribute to the solution of one of our urban problems.

We, therefore, respectfully urge your favorable consideration of these bills.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD STUART, JR., PRESIDENT, EASTERN FORESTRY, INC.,
WAKE, VA.

I am a graduate forester who has practiced forestry for the past 34 years. For the last 25 years I have been a private, self-employed forester providing technical services to the general public. I am a member of the Society of American Foresters and the Association of Consulting Foresters, as well as being a former National President of the A.C.F. I feel qualified to speak on the CFM program, as my field of services has been with the small private timberland owner whose holdings fall in the 1 to 500 acre size class. I strongly oppose any increase in CFM funds because:

1. The way to improve small private timberland holdings is *not* by increasing technical assistance. Today any land owner has a multitude of sources from which to obtain forestry assistance, most of it free. He can turn to his State Forestry Service, the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, industrial foresters, and the hundreds of private consulting forestry firms. Increasing CFM activities will merely duplicate services already available, and will be a waste of public funds that could be used more effectively in another program.
2. Scattered throughout the United States are hundreds of private forestry firms offering professional services to the general public at no cost to the taxpayer. These firms range in size from a single forester to those of 50 or more professionals. In addition, consulting firms provide employment for thousands of non-technical personnel. CFM foresters, by providing free technical services, are competing unfairly with the private forester, causing many hardship cases.

A three-fold increase in CFM activities will cause many consulting firms to go out of business, including myself. Private enterprise cannot compete with federally financed competition.

3. It has been proven time and time again that private foresters can do the job much more efficiently than CFM foresters. I would like to illustrate this by citing the results of a survey comparing the effectiveness of consulting foresters versus CFM foresters. This comparison is based on figures provided by Robert Raish of the U.S.F.S. and a survey conducted by the Association of Consulting Foresters.

In one year consulting foresters professionally supervised the harvesting of \$65,000,000 worth of timber, at a cost to the land owners of \$4,600,000, or 7% of the gross receipts. CFM foresters, in the same one year period, supervised the harvesting of \$23,264,542 worth of timber at the cost to the tax payers of \$8,900,000, or 38% of the gross receipts.

Again, in one year, consulting foresters had under continuing management 40,000,000 acres of timberland, while CFM foresters placed only 7,774,941 acres under management.

These comparisons alone should convince this committee that good forestry practice does not require an increase in the CFM funds.

It is not the lack of professional assistance that has kept many millions of acres of private woodland from being in good forest productivity. It is the lack of financial incentive that makes the small timberland owner apathetic. Guarantee the land owner a fair return on his investment by keeping reforestation costs down, assure him a good market for his product, and relieve his fear that his timber may be legislated out of his ownership without just compensation. Then you will get good forestry on private land.

For a more positive approach to stimulate the small land owner, I would like to suggest a program that would cost the government absolutely nothing. This would be to allow any land owner under 500 acres to expense his reforestation costs on his tax return, rather than require him to capitalize his cost as he does now. Of course the government would lose some tax dollars the year of reforestation, but this sum would be recovered by the government when the land or timber was sold. Working with small owners these past 25 years, I find that this expenditure, without being able to write it off, is the greatest obstacle to reforestation.

I ask you to continue to give private enterprise the chance to do the job. It has been proven that it can do it efficiently without the use of public funds.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES P. THOMPSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN LANDOWNERS ASSOCIATION

The American Landowners Association is a national alliance of land and homeowners organizations. Many of our members own small tracts of timberland. The Association favors enactment of H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084 and H.R. 6086. We should like to present our reasons.

H.R. 6082: In fiscal 1970 the federal appropriation for cooperative forest management was \$4.13 million. For fiscal 1971 the appropriation is \$4.97. When supplemental funding for pay increases is added the current limit of \$5 million will have been reached. This needs to be raised to \$15 million. Such an increase may be considered an investment in the future and should be looked upon more favorably by the Congress than might be the request for increased funding of the purchase of depreciating goods.

H.R. 6084: We feel certain that the Congress will see the wisdom in giving a greater level of protection to our forestry resources, interrelated as they are with so many of our other natural resources. Not only should the ceiling be raised, but federal participation should be counting for a larger share and should at least keep pace with increases in total program costs.

H.R. 6086: We are pleased to see this excellent legislation. We can foresee that the expertise gained during implementation of the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 with its rural emphasis will now be applied to urban areas.

The American Landowners Association is pleased to align itself with other groups in the Trees for People Task Force in support of these three excellent measures and hopes that the committee and, indeed the entire Congress will hasten to approve them.

SOIL CONSERVATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
Ankeny, Iowa, May 3, 1971.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Forestry, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Soil Conservation Society of America is an organization of 14,200 members whose objectives are to develop and advance the art of good land use and management, and to promote sound conservation practices for soil, water, and related natural resources.

I understand your committee is now considering a Bill (HR 6084) introduced into the 92nd Congress by Mr. Sikes. The Bill would authorize increased appropriations for cooperative forest fire protection. The increased emphasis on environmental protection, wise resource use, and an expanding population—which makes an increasing demand on our forest land and its resources—demands that we foster all reasonable efforts to protect our forests.

The additional funds sought under this Act would promulgate specialized fire control training, and provide more suitable equipment to successfully prevent and cope with disaster, or potentially disastrous fires. If the fires we have already experienced during the spring of 1971 in parts of the United States portend the summer fire season, 1971 is likely to be a busy, fiery one.

I know that I speak for most members of our Society when I indicate they favor this legislation. I am confident that increased fire protection, by the use of modern methods, and a speedup in reforestation can materially aid the entire forestry program.

Sincerely yours,

H. WAYNE PRITCHARD, *Director.*

MISSISSIPPI FORESTRY COMMISSION,
Jackson, Miss., May 7, 1971.

File: 670.0

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Forestry, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: We wish to take this opportunity to add our support to the forestry proposals scheduled for the hearing to be held on May 17-18. We would like to suggest that H.R. 6082 and H.R. 6086 be combined since both bills are closely related. Most state organizations will combine the work of these programs, if they are not worked together there will be an overlap in program responsibility.

H.R. 6084 to increase the authorization of the cooperative forest fire protection, would bring the financing more in line with the intent of the Clarke-McNary Act of 50-50 financial basis. This financial aid can be a giant step in the preservation of our environment.

It is imperative that the cooperative programs receive adequate funding if we hope to keep up with the ever increasing demands for forest products that will be needed for the future. We appreciate the opportunity to add our voice in support of these proposed measures.

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL D. LACK,
State Forester.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SERVICE, INC.,
May 10, 1971.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN McMILLAN: It has just come to my attention that the House Sub-Committee on Forestry will hold a Congressional Hearing on May 17 in regards to HR 6082 to increase the funding for Cooperative Forest Management (CFM) from \$5,000,000 to \$15,000,000 annually. This possibility is held as a very serious step back from individual responsibility and the encouragement of a proven, more effective means of establishing the needed continuity of long-term, sound forest management practices on small forest holdings.

Our views, if permitted, are those of a large forestry consulting firm which presently has but a small percentage of its practices from among the forest ownership tenure largely affected or serviced by the CFM program, and thereby little affected by changes or increases to the program. Yet we are much concerned in principle as to an increased entrenchment of a well-intended policy which consistently comes off "second best" as to the best and most efficacious means of establishing and implementing sound forestry practices on the smaller woodlots of America and seriously diminishes the possibility of the success of this much more effective program without public tax support cost due to its direct competition should the CFM program be greatly increased. A few explanatory comments are requested.

As initially envisioned, the primary purpose of the CFM program when initiated was to be educational and demonstrational and not intended to "permanently relieve" the private landowner (owning a valuable asset with an attractive profit potential if soundly managed), of his responsibility of holding and managing these assets in a reasonable and businesslike manner in a free enterprise economy which requires, or should require, a personal investment in management and development expenses to increase the owner's overall, long-term yield. A principal problem, and one of the understandable means for the origin and value of the initial CFM program, was to demonstrate or educate the small and medium size landowners as to the benefit that sample forest management practices (such as selective marking and/or an inventory of the timber to be sold, reforestation practices, etc.), could produce for the landowner. The program was never intended, by its preamble and our understanding, to become a continuous and permanent subsidized direct field service for "private capitalists" such as to relieve them of the expenses of their own proper management cost.

Essentially, the acknowledged rationale for the initiation of the program was to primarily fill a partial void as to the lack of a sufficient number of private practitioners available in the market place to serve these private landowners in need of services for timber estimation, selective marking, skillful marketing, reforestation, etc., etc., which lack of adequate number of private practitioners in all woodland economies could not be denied because the lack of a sufficient number was in turn caused by the "chicken and egg" type of conundrum. As Congressional Committee Members have the opportunity to well know, most federal programs, once reaching administrative maturity, have their own tendency of entrenchment and enlargement with a usual diminishing ratio of economic and social benefits, even if sometimes a negative increment. We urge your Committee to examine this request carefully, from the standpoint of this possible syndrome.

As an alternative, we would also ask that you look at a bit of enlightened, refreshing thinking stirring in the land which originated. I am very proud to state, with a quasi-independent Federal agency which has had an unusual opportunity to observe needs, pressures, motivation and realities of conservation and the CFM program in particular. This agency is the TVA and more specifically its Division of Forestry, Fisheries, and Wildlife Development.

The TVA, based upon several of its own surveys, discovered that those private land ownerships which used and employed private consulting foresters tended to have a significantly higher level of forest management practices, and continuity of same, than all other ownerships and approaches used as to implementing forest management practices. Based upon this awareness, the TVA is to be congratulated as to having both proposed and funded a type of pilot project to test the feasibility and effectiveness of helping to more broadly establish private practitioners (consultants) within a selected locality to test the advantage of this approach as compared to the far more expensive and, personally held, far less effective alternatives.

If successful, as the earlier signs of this pilot program indicates, the cost to the government and, principally the taxpayer, will be less than 5% of the cost of the "CFM approach" and due to great motivating advantages, will confidently prove to be far more effective. The overall basic difference between the two concepts is one of total funding of a program as compared to simply providing limited "seed monies" for a more effective, realistic program which knows and acknowledges elements of human nature.

Reduced photocopies of two relevant supporting accounts and descriptions of this "better alternative" is attached for your interest, along with a one-page letter explanation by the TVA Director of the Division of Forestry, Fisheries,

and Wildlife Development, Mr. Thomas H. Ripley. As an important point of clarification, it is not my, our firm, and I am certain the interest or position of the TVA to in any way diminish the *present role or funding* of the CFM program, but it is my personal conviction that there is a much better alternative than the proposed increase to the present CFM budget and program available to Congress that will seriously compete with and reduce the number of and opportunities for new forest consulting practices in need of all the encouragement possible as herein suggested by this letter and attached material. If there should be any desire for further amplification, it would be my privilege and pleasure to do so.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. BRADLEY, Jr.,

President.

HARRY E. MURPHY,

Vice President.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,

Norris, Tenn., January 12, 1971.

Mr. GEORGE D. KESSLER,
Glenn Forest Trailer Park No. 3,
Athens, Georgia.

DEAR MR. KESSLER: Thanks for your inquiry concerning the arrangement between the Association of Consulting Foresters and TVA to demonstrate how a public agency can assist new consulting foresters become established in the Tennessee Valley. The enclosed copies of agreements between the Association and TVA and the Association and a consulting forester will give the details.

The idea resulted from a forest landowner survey made by this Division in 1968 (copy enclosed). During this survey, we found that landowners were not only interested in applying more intensive management to their forest holdings but that they were willing to pay for such assistance. Therefore, we felt the consulting forester was a natural to provide this service.

Realizing the financial difficulty many consultants have during the first two years of practice, TVA and the Association designed this project to demonstrate how public and private agencies can work together to encourage young foresters to enter the consulting field and thereby promote better forest resource management.

To date, the Association has one forester under contract at Asheville, North Carolina, and another at Huntsville, Alabama. While it is still too early to report on the success of this arrangement, all parties are enthused by its potential. We do not plan further sponsorship at this time.

We appreciate your interest in this arrangement, and should you wish more information, please write us.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. RIPLEY.

Director, Division of Forestry,
Fisheries, and Wildlife Development.

SELECTION OF TWO NEWLY ESTABLISHED CONSULTANTS UNDER PILOT PROJECT OF TVA/ACF AGREEMENT

In the prior August, 1970 issues of *Forest Farmers* there appeared the article "Helping Consulting Foresters to Help Private Landowners" which announced a newly conceived program to be structured and supported by an agreement between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Association of Consulting Foresters. The objective of this agreement was to increase the production of timber products and services on millions of acres of private timberland within the greater Tennessee Valley. Since date of this announcement, approximately four months was spent in the careful screening of an unusually fine and well qualified group of candidates who submitted themselves for favorable consideration, with eight eventually appearing before a specially created Committee known as the "TVA/ACF Committee" which the writer chaired.

In early November this Committee made its final selection among the eight "finalists" who had been encouraged to appear for interviews. The two final selectees are now established in their new consulting practices in two geographical sites selected by this Committee, being Asheville, North Carolina and Huntsville, Alabama.

As of December 1, 1970 the newly established consultant at Asheville, North Carolina is a Mr. Cleavy Allen Hathaway, born on 1/4/42 at Manheim, West Virginia and educated in various West Virginia school systems that concluded with a BS in forest management and a minor in wildlife at the University of West Virginia in February, 1964. Between date of graduation and the present Mr. Hathaway had a considerably varied and valued range of experience as an employee for the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources where he held the position of a CMF forester at both Romney and Milton, West Virginia both before and after serving almost three years with the United States Army between January, 1966 and October, 1968. In the latter capacity he became commissioned as a Second Lt. with the Special Forces, serving with distinction as an Executive Officer in Vietnam combat duty, receiving impressive recognitions of which the Parachute Badge; VN Jump Wings; RVN Commendation w/dev 60; Purple Heart; Air Medal; RVN Cross of Gallantry; and the Silver Star were seven of twelve awarded.

Following his second position as CFM forester with West Virginia following military duties he held a position as an outlet Manager for Lumber Distributors, Inc. at Cannonsburg, Pennsylvania and was just seeking to become established as a consulting forester at Bristol, Virginia at the time of his selection after an exposure to the world of consulting forestry practice with brief associations with Tillinghast and Neely of Danville, West Virginia and Leon Willson and Associates of Petersburg West Virginia. Cleavy is married, the father of one child and presently resides at 139 Spears Avenue, Asheville, North Carolina 28801.

Colin Bagwell was born on 1/13/41 in Knoxville, Tennessee and educated in various schools of this locality, receiving his first BS Degree in Biology in June, 1963 at Tennessee Wesleyan College at Athens, Tennessee and a second BS Degree in Forest Management at North Carolina State University in January, 1966. Following graduation he served as a CFM Forester for the State of Kentucky later to become a district management assistant supervising three CFM foresters out of Elizabethtown, Kentucky before accepting his present selection as a newly located consulting forester at Huntsville, Alabama. Colin is married and the father of one child, presently residing at 4423 McClain Lane, Huntsville, Alabama 35810.

The idea behind this Pilot Project resulted from several forest landowner surveys made by TVA which seemed to divulge two interesting facts. The earlier survey revealed that the best level of consistent forest management practices, giving greatest promise of continuity of practices so necessary to forest management, were found among those private holdings being managed by consulting foresters for private landowners and the second survey identified a trend among landowners as being not only interested in applying more intensive forest management to their holdings but a willingness to pay for such assistance. This in turn led TVA to the belief that consulting foresters would prove a natural to provide this service.

Realizing the financial difficulty many consultants have during the first two years of practice, TVA and the ACF designed this project to demonstrate how public and private agencies can work together to encourage young foresters to enter the consulting field and thereby promote better forest resource management.

This Pilot Project is a radical departure from prior approaches to the universal problem of improving the generally poor level of forest management practices on the smaller size private timberland holdings of 5,000 acres and less, particularly of 500 acres and less, as per examples of the long established Extension, CFM and ACP forestry assistance type programs of public agencies which have required 100% continuing annual funding on the part of the sponsoring agency. This more novel program requires only a limited degree of seed capital, and is structured to incorporate and take advantage of the following principal premises or features:

1. Optimum motivation and pride of the self-employed independent practitioner when building his own practice and security solely on the basis of value and dependability of services rendered, as scaled against their cost, which in turn both demands and rewards extra effort and maximum productivity and efficiency seldom duplicated for the non-independent practitioner;

2. Ability to be a complete advocate for his client (and without potential for conflicting interest) in contrast to the necessary restrictions usually imposed upon a public (or even industry) "service forester;"

3. The rationale and equity of the recipient and beneficiary of the service's direct economic benefits paying for its costs rather than being funded by the public tax rolls;

4. Producing the result that a beneficiary (landowner) is consistently far more likely to protect (value, use and continue) a personal investment as compared to being a recipient of a service or recommendation without the feature of a personal investment.

Within the premise that the greater Tennessee Valley could theoretically effectively absorb the productive services of 100 public service foresters well distributed throughout the Valley in assisting private timberland owners over the following three decades and comparing the approximation that their minimal direct salary, administrative and equipment cost would require an annual budget of at least \$1,500,000, at 6% this would require a capitalized value of \$20,650,000 to fund for thirty years at this assured fixed annual cost. In an over simplified comparison, prematurely presuming an entirely satisfactory test of this alternative concept, the same 100 foresters if even required (assuming the same level of productivity) could be fielded under a (one time) capital budget commitment that could not exceed \$1,000,000 and *could* require significantly less, dependent upon the rapidity by which any of the 100 established consultants (or less) under this concept reached the specified "cut-off" level of assistance during the first 24 months commitment.

When having a potential leverage of 20 times or better less requirement for tax-supported capital outlays in accomplishing an agreed desirable performance goal between the comparative benefits of 100 public foresters and 100 independent, self-supporting private practitioners, the opportunity and magnitude of the importance of this pilot project can be best evaluated. Noting that broad inquiries have already been received from many different geographical sections of the country, it will be certain that the outcome and success of this Pilot Project will be watched with intense interest by many as much promise for not only the wisest husbandry and stewardship of the nation's major renewable resource, an important segment of its economy and even a new and enlarged stature of the forestry profession could hang in the balance as to its outcome.

An even more important social value gained could be that in attempting to find the best solution to meet a pressing social need and responsibility between two concepts, one would help encourage greater individual involvements while practicing and nurturing the means of finding and maintaining solution under *optimum concepts of individual liberty and free enterprise that makes for a more responsible and concerned citizenry.*

HARDWOOD RESEARCH COUNCIL,
Statesville, N.C., May 10, 1971.

HOB. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Forestry, House Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Estimates indicate that by the year 2000, we will need about twice as much wood as we are now using. With our shrinking land base and exploding population in this country, it is therefore mandatory that every acre presently in forests be managed for the fullest production of goods and services possible.

Since so much of our commercial forest land is in small ownerships with comparatively little forest management being actually applied on the ground, the Hardwood Research Council, representing a good cross-section of the hardwood industry, wishes to go on record with your committee as endorsing bills H.R. 6082 and H.R. 6084 to help the situation.

It is our understanding that H.R. 6082 proposes an increase in authorization for Cooperative Forest Management (CFM) from \$5,000,000 to \$15,000,000 and that H.R. 6084 proposes an increase for Cooperative Forest Fire Protection from \$20,000,000 to \$40,000,000. By encouraging better forest management and forest fire protection on the small ownerships we will have a much better chance of meeting our future wood needs than we now have. Without such help there is serious doubt.

We also endorse H.R. 6086 which authorizes \$5,000,000 for a new program of urban environmental forestry. By establishing, improving and protecting trees and shrubs in open places, greenbelts, roadside screens, and community parks, we feel that the environment for our urban dwellings will be improved as well as beautified. Each time a tree is planted an individual oxygen factory is established to help produce cleaner air and beauty for our use and enjoyment.

We respectfully request the favorable consideration of these vital bills by you and your committee.

Sincerely,

JOHNNY CARSWELL, *President.*

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1971.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Forestry, Committee on Agriculture, House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: During your Subcommittee's deliberations about the three pieces of legislation which comprise the forestry package—H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084, and H.R. 6086—we, the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, would very much appreciate your consideration of our support.

We have studied the legislation and, though we are not able to state what is or is not adequate appropriation for carrying out the purposes of the bills, we do trust that your Subcommittee will authorize a sufficient amount.

We are all aware that trees are one of our most valuable resources, and as our population and our needs increase, it is vital that plans be carried out now so that our timber demands in the future can be met without depriving us of the esthetic and environmental requirements which trees provide.

It does not seem necessary for us now to go into the specifics of each of these bills. We hope it will be sufficient to say that we do urge your most careful consideration of them and that they will have your support as they do have ours. If possible, we would be grateful if you would permit this letter to become a part of the record of the hearings.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MRS. EARL A. BROWN, *President.*

HUNTSVILLE, ALA., May 11, 1971.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, House Sub-Committee on Forestry,
The House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: Regarding the hearing on H.R. 6082 on the Cooperative Forest Management appropriation increase:

My qualifications to speak are: (1) Five years as CFM forester for the State of Kentucky; (2) Five months as private consulting forester.

My feelings are as follows:

(1) CFM is a good program. While a CFM forester I have landowners much needed assistance when the expense of a consulting forester could not have been justified.

(2) As a consulting forester, I see definite dangers in the program. The CFM forester is often in direct competition with the consultant.

The following examples are taken from my experience as CFM forester. They should prove the point.

(A) I gave one man a 100% cruise of some timber which was to be flooded by a new dam. I justified my action by pointing to timber on the farm which I planned to selectively mark. I also looked at the increased accomplishment which could be reported.

(B) I "selectively" marked another man's timber more heavily than good silviculture would permit because he needed the money.

(C) Another man needed \$3,000 for interest on a note. I *didn't* mark his timber but did give him a *rough* estimate of its value.

(D) I know one CFM forester who worked on a timber damage appraisal.

(E) During my entire time as a CFM forester, there was pressure for increased numbers of cooperators and more timber marked. These pressures came from the U.S. Forest Service through the State Forester. To increase accomplishments I even looked at sick shade trees in the city and counted these as cases serviced. One landowner received a report on each of five sections in his timberland (a total of 500 acres). This, of course, was counted as five cases "received and serviced."

(F) There is one portion of my CFM work of which I am very proud. For about a year I wrote news articles describing good forest practices and building up interest in proper forest management. The articles were frowned upon from "above" because they were not cases "received and serviced".

(G) As a matter of policy, we did not participate in or put on demonstrations. This was the job of the Extension Service.

These are but a few examples. To my knowledge there are only three consulting foresters in Kentucky with about 11 million acres of timber. Alabama has about 27 consultants with over 21 million acres of timber. The Alabama Forestry Commission doesn't compete with the private consultant. There are many reasons

for Kentucky's lack of consultants, but the main one, in my opinion, is the activity of the Division of Forestry. The Division's work is free, given very liberally to all who ask and there is very little effort to cull out the jobs which should be done by the consultant.

My recommendations are:

- (1) Continue and strengthen the CFM program.
 - (2) Devise a method to encourage private consultants to set up practice. The TVA Forestry Department and the Association of Consulting Foresters is trying one approach.
 - (3) Review the types of CFM work being done and restrict that work which is in competition with the consultant.
 - (4) Cut the pressure for quantity and increase pressure for quality.
 - (5) Encourage the State forestry organizations to do more educational work.
- Please consider these observations and suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN BAGWELL, R.F.

CONNECTICUT FOREST AND PARK ASSOCIATION INC.,
East Hartford, Conn., May 12, 1971.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Forestry, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE McMILLAN: This letter and enclosed information is submitted for the record of the hearing for H.R. 6086 which will fund an Urban Environmental Forestry Program designed to make technical assistance available to public and private agencies and to individuals in the areas of planning, coordination, guidance, technical service and training in urban environmental forestry.

Throughout much of its 76-year history the Connecticut Forest and Park Association, Inc. has been interested in the proper care and maintenance of trees by communities throughout the state of Connecticut. As a citizen conservation organization we have sponsored over 15 shade tree conferences in the state to focus attention on this subject and we have been relatively successful in this area. We do, however, recognize the need for an Urban Environmental Forestry Program as a means of providing technical information to communities, public and private agencies on forestry matters.

On a limited basis the Forestry Division of the State Park and Forest Commission has been involved in this type of activity. The limitation has been in the area of funding of personnel to carry this objective forward on a more intensive basis. Communities are acquiring forest land for conservation and recreation purposes and now are looking for technical assistance in the management of these areas. The programs proposed would do much to maintain and improve environmental values of forests in and near urban areas.

I am enclosing a copy of the "Report of Forestry Committee". The report was adopted by the Officers and Directors of this Association in 1966. This report and a similar enclosure, "Adapting Forestry to Megalopolitan Southern New England"¹ focuses attention to the issue of urban and suburban forestry.

I am appreciative of the opportunity to submit this information to your subcommittee.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HIBBARD,
Secretary-Forester.

REPORT OF FORESTRY COMMITTEE

Connecticut is and must plan on being a city-studded forest. While it is the fourth most densely populated state in the Union it is almost two-thirds forested; the only states that are substantially more heavily covered with trees are New Hampshire and Maine. From the 1950 census to that of 1960 the population of Connecticut increased 25 per cent yet the area covered by forest actually increased slightly. Every planning agency which has considered the matter predicts that the growth of population will take place mainly where it is already most heavily concentrated—along the coast, in the Central Lowland from New Haven through Hartford toward Springfield, and in a few of the major river valleys of western and eastern Connecticut.

¹ May be found in the files of the committee.

This means that strenuous measures must be taken to protect the environment of the urban strips from corruption and disfigurement. It also means that both public agencies and private interests must act on the premise that most of the existing forests of the interior hills are a permanent fixture and not temporarily undeveloped land soon to be overrun with suburban residences.

Past Use

During three centuries these forests were used as hard as any on the continent, yet their usefulness will not end; it will only increase and change. The forest itself will change; it has changed immensely even since 1920, mostly from youth to middle age, and will be downright old by the year 1999. The farm woodlot, an indispensable source of fuel not too long ago, has become the forgotten forty acres of the rural resident who now busily commutes to town or of the non-resident proud of ownership but vague as to boundaries and purpose. What this forest becomes by 1999 and how much it contributes to the economy and well-being of Nutmeggers depends on what they do together through public action and what the private land-holder does individually.

Ownership

About a tenth of the forest area is now owned by the state, municipalities, water companies, and other quasi-public corporate owners. It is reasonable to anticipate that these owners will see that their lands are used in the public interest; however, they will never be free of controversy over which conflicting public interests should command priority and where they should do so. The amount of forest land in public ownership should and will increase, but only to a modest extent. By far the greatest share of Connecticut's extensive future forests will doubtless remain in thousands of private ownerships, mostly not more than a few dozen acres in size. The future of Connecticut forests rests mainly on what happens on tracts of this kind.

Objectives of Ownership

These owners are drawn from all walks of life and all ages. In fact, some of the forestry problems of Connecticut could be dealt with more effectively if there were systematic records of who these owners were, what they owned and where it was. Their objectives vary widely. Many are undoubtedly speculating, with varying prospect of success, on rising values for conversion to residential use. Many have no intention of selling their forest land but are holding for purposes which are often non-financial and sometimes quite vague.

Conscious timber production is one of several important ways in which continued ownership may bring financial returns. However, there are very few owners for whom timber production is the primary goal: for some it is secondary; for many it is latent or not yet in view; for those who wish to let nature take its course undisturbed, it is an anathema. To many the primary objective is encouragement of wildlife either for sport or for the sheer joy of seeing the members of the animal world or merely knowing that they are thriving.

Assistance to Landowners

The vast majority of these owners do not know what to do to accomplish their objectives and would lack the physical means of doing the work if they knew what to do. Free advice and limited assistance are available from a small force of five state service foresters and the Extension Forester at the University of Connecticut. Paid advice and unrestricted contract services for the care of forests are available from two individuals and one firm engaged in professional forestry services. These public and private services more often supplement each other than they collide. Both kinds of services should be considerably expanded because they are essential to solution of the problem. Each would be swamped by a small increase in the use of their services.

These services need to be available because there is, with one exception, no objective of forest ownership that cannot be gained more surely and effectively through the wise tending and careful modification of the forest. The only exceptional objective exists in those places where it is desired that the forest be left to develop purely as natural processes dictate. Otherwise, there is no benefit of the forest that cannot be enhanced by treatment of the vegetation.

Management Tools

Cool fishing waters can be made cooler by development of shade over small streams and watersheds. Most game animals require not only the cover of tall

timber but also the food available to them in adjacent very young forests which can be created only by periodic cutting operations. The bird populations characteristic of shrubby abandoned fields can probably not be maintained without the drastic treatments necessary to prevent the rapid and inexorable march of forest trees into such fields. The surest way to control destructive and disagreeable forest insects is to alter the composition of the forest, through cutting, so that resistant species of trees are increased. Beauty is measured by the eye of the beholder: once it is determined what constitutes beauty in the forest the condition can be arrived at most quickly if the vegetation is molded by people who know how it will change after treatment. Finally, the growing of high-quality trees for commercial use requires what is perhaps the most skillful long-term treatment of all.

Purposeful forest management for most objectives requires financially strong and stable ownership. The pursuit of these objectives is rendered most efficient if individual ownerships do not become unduly small. The unsatisfactory condition of small forest holdings in Connecticut owes in large measure to instability of tenure, lack of definition of purpose, financial pressures, and fragmentation of ownership. While there are distinct limits on what public action can do to affect the private use of land, certain steps will aid in the accomplishment of sound objectives.

Planning Activities

Public land-planning activities represent fully as much the prediction of land use as they do its guidance and control. Most town and regional planning agencies have so far viewed forest land as (1) temporarily undeveloped for intensive use, (2) unlikely to be developed, or (3) undevelopable, without distinguishing between the three kinds. Efforts at such prediction would help bring real purpose to the management of large areas of land likely to remain forested and also curb ill-advised speculation in such land.

The greatest single source of present-day fractionation of forest ownership is probably the large-lot residential zoning practiced by some towns in attempts to curb population growth and local school budgets. This squandering of the land resource is often done in the name of preserving rural character or permitting safe combinations of individual water-supply and sewage-disposal systems on individual lots. By the time all the compromises have been hammered out between town officials and real-estate interests and the houses have been built, it is too often found that not all the noble objectives have been attained.

Home Owner and Cluster Development

The home owner frequently finds he has more land than he knows how to use. Worse than that and even with two cars, his family is miles from work, playground, stores, church, friends, and all of the amenities of civilization. Neuroses flourish as they seldom did in the community of family interest which existed on the even more isolated farm of bygone days. The pseudo-rural setting does not abolish aspiration for modern municipal services and providing these for areas of low population density can make town officials and taxpayers as neurotic as the householders.

As a result of these problems, the idea of cluster zoning and the building of more densely populated developments provided with all services is rapidly gaining acceptance. These will have the incidental effect of reserving more "open space," often in the form of forests, between the clusters, although it leaves unsettled the question of ownership, use, and management of such open space.

These areas may require public ownership, revival of the ancient proprietorship of common and undivided lands, or new instrumentalities of ownership as yet devised.

Taxation and Easements

Forest land has chronically been taxed out of proportion to its earning capacity or the public services that it requires.

In 1963 Connecticut took an important step toward rectifying this problem through passage of Public Act 490. This provides that forest, farm, and other open space land may, upon application from the owner and approval of various public officials, be taxed on the basis of its value for the use to which it is put rather than presumed market value. While this act may need some perfection it provides important financial backing for the view that it is in the public interest that some land remain in farm or forest.

It is probable that this kind of encouragement of less intensive land uses will suffice only as long as values for other uses remain modest. However, there are

already places where values have risen so high that neither zoning nor tax incentive will suffice to prevent conversion to residential or industrial use. If it is in the public interest to prevent such conversion on specific tracts, public acquisition either of full title or of easements surrendering the right of conversion will provide the only solution. Connecticut law does not as yet authorize the state, towns, or cities to purchase the kind of easement by which an owner may sell to the public all land values other than the right to continue "open-space" uses. Such legislation is now being used in order urbanized states and should be enacted here.

Fire, Insects, and Disease

One minor but important item in the planning of use of forest land is the necessity of preserving access for fire control and other public protection activities. Much residential development follows existing highways and large areas of forest can become difficult of emergency access if the highways are solidly lined with residential lots.

It is a well-recognized tenet of forest policy that control of fires and other contagious sources of forest damage is best handled as a public responsibility. Public forest fire control is the one aspect of forestry in which Connecticut has achieved real success and needs only to maintain present high standards. However, public protection against forest insects and diseases has virtually collapsed as a result of agitation over "Silent Spring," gypsy moths, and DDT. The first main fruit of reduced protection has been heavy mortality among oaks, especially in western Connecticut, as a result of the combined effects of insect defoliation, drought, and shoestring fungus or borers operating in sequence.

Even the surveying activities have been curtailed to the point where it is not possible to estimate whether the damage is in millions or hundreds of thousands of dollars of damage.

Two decades of over-reliance on DDT resulted in inadequate investigation of alternative means of control, especially the non-chemical ones. The gypsy moth is far from being the only serious pest; it is merely the most spectacular and not necessarily the most harmful. Little is known of the oak leaf-tier and not enough of the red pine scale, which is an exceedingly virulent insect still limited to southwestern Connecticut and the New York metropolitan area. More serious than the shortage of knowledge is the fact that almost all public control agencies were abolished in 1963. It is, therefore, recommended that forest pest research at the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station be reintensified and that an adequately financed survey and control organization be established in the Park and Forest Commission. Through these means it may be possible for Connecticut to take greater advantage of the fact that the federal Forest Insect and Disease Laboratory for the entire Northeast is located within the state.

Forest Industry

The future of any substantial timber industry is uncertain. However, this is because of uncertainty about the policies of a myriad of owners and not because of any natural limitations. The productive capacity, acre for acre, of Connecticut forests compares favorably with other areas of the nation. Potential markets are very close at hand and the entire forest area is highly accessible.

Forest industry is currently at a low ebb simply because the very heavy cuttings of the 19th Century destroyed the resource base. Most of the million acres of land left in forest at the agricultural peak in 1850 were clearcut repeatedly for fuelwood and charcoal. Often nothing bigger around than a baseball bat was left and even that was usually killed back by the fires which burned far and wide. Since 1850 a million acres of agricultural land have reverted to forest. Much of this reverted to pure stands of whitepine the main share of which was clearcut between 1890 and 1930 during the heyday of the pine box industry. At the time of World War I, the chestnut blight eliminated the species which had responded most vigorously to the rough treatment that the forests had received. Connecticut forests were in their depleted condition early in the 20th Century and have been recovering steadily since. What little timber industry as remains has been eking out a barren existence and is too poorly equipped to supply more than the merest fraction of the state's demand for finished wood products.

The heavy usage of the past has not killed the forest but has instead merely rejuvenated it. So many things happened at once that most of the stands are now roughly 60 years old. Stands older than 100 years are so few as to be treasured museum pieces. Stands younger than 40 years are really not very common; even

those which sprang up anew after the 1938 hurricane are nearly 30 years old already.

While a forest may not seem to change from year to year it does change profoundly during the passage of decades. The wildlife population of the state has probably changed more than we know because the brushy young forest of 1920 has become the middle-aged stand of 1966. If this large and remarkably even-aged forest is simply left alone it will during the 21st Century take on many of the attributes of an old-growth forest.

Future Timber Value

Timber industries are not likely to ignore the substantial volumes of merchantable timber that will begin to materialize in Connecticut forests late in the present century. The Affluent Society has a materialistic base and the economic forces that once over-used Connecticut forests have not been repealed. Modern Connecticut forests have hardwoods of increasing size and quality; there is no timber commodity in shorter supply than high-quality hardwood or in as increasing demand. The current status of timber industry in state gives no indication of the situation after 1980. The march of Suburbia will seal only a fraction of this forest off into house lots before then. We are sitting on a forest timebomb set to go off when stands now 60 years old pass the 80-year mark.

Action of Landowners

The actions of the thousands of forest owners will largely determine whether this potentially beneficial development is dealt with in orderly fashion or becomes a fast-moving disaster. It is not too early for stagesetting. Owners must be made aware of the opportunities and choices that lie ahead. Steps may still be taken to have improved timber ready when the markets open. Technological problems of harvesting and utilization will doubtless develop and there is already little time for the research necessary to solve them.

Connecticut is too small a stage on which to settle many of these forestry problems individually. This is especially true when any future timber industry is considered. It is, for example, probable that much of the high-quality timber destined to materialize in Connecticut forests will be moved to established manufacturing facilities farther north over the new interstate highways. It does not seem logical that Connecticut should attempt to solve all of its forestry problems independently of the other four states of Central and Southern New England. Opportunities for mutually advantageous cooperation in research, exchange of information, and sharing of major facilities should be pursued in both public and private activities.

The Committee also recommends that the University of Connecticut, the University of Massachusetts and the University of Rhode Island consider a co-operative venture in the publication of Extension Bulletins and Pamphlets on Forestry and Conservation.

Dr. DAVID M. SMITH,
Chairman, Forestry Committee.

CONNECTICUT FOREST AND PARK ASSOCIATION, INC.,
East Hartford, Conn., May 12, 1971.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Forestry, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McMILLAN: This letter is submitted for the record of the hearing for H.R. 6084 to increase the authorization for cooperative fire control from \$20,000,000 to \$40,000,000 yearly.

The Connecticut Forest and Park Association, Inc. a private citizen-conservation organization has throughout its history been interested in providing adequate fire protection to public and private forest lands throughout the nation. The Association recognizes that while a great deal has been accomplished there are areas that are inadequately protected. The Association also recognizes the increased costs for fire control which have resulted from increased costs of personnel, equipment, and other items included in the fire control situation.

Fire control and other matters which are of concern to us in Connecticut are listed in the "Report of Forestry Committee"² of this Association. The report was adopted by the Officers and Directors in 1966.

² See p. 130.

In closing I would like to indicate that the Connecticut Forest and Park Association, Inc., recognizes the necessity of adequate funding for traditional fire control activities; the need to bring protection to unprotected lands; and to bring adequate protection to areas which are not adequately protected at this time.

I am appreciative of the opportunity to submit this information to your Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HIBBARD,
Secretary-Forester.

TOMAHAWK, Wis., May 13, 1971.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Forestry,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: I am writing to you at this time with regard to the hearing to be held on HR 6082 on May 17th, 1971.

My son and I would like to go on record as being very much opposed to the bill that would increase the Cooperative Forest Management funds threefold.

I was a state employee in Wisconsin for 9½ years with the Cooperative Forestry Division, and left them in 1957 to begin my consulting firm. For the past 14 years I have had to make my way through heavy competition from state personnel who basically provide free forestry service for anybody that owns forest land. My son and I believe in the principal of free enterprise, but increasing the moneys available to state CFM programs just makes it that much more difficult to stay in business.

If we are ever going to get out of the spiralling cost of providing help to private owners of forest land it should be in the direction that will reduce our federal expenditures rather than increase them. Encourage more private forest consultants that make land owners pay for service rather than accept a handout, even when many are wealthy land owners. We would like to see some guidelines put into such a bill that would restrict CFM foresters time to 2 or 3 days per year, and make them charge for timber marking.

Our state presently has two consulting firms actively working with private land owners. It could stand 25 such firms. However, our state CFM personnel suppress this direction with their liberal help. Why not turn this around by reducing their appropriation, thereby making them revise their program to turn over more of the small forest land owner management to consultants. Let free enterprise step in and fulfill the needs, and our federal budget need not be increased by ten million. There are a lot of eager, qualified foresters that would like to get into the consultant business, but the present state set ups in the CFM make this almost impossible. By having a specialty in forest photogrammetry I have been able to stay in business. My son and I would like to do more work with more small forest land owners, but we cannot compete with free advise and service.

We urge you to refuse this appropriation and take action to change the bill so more private consultants can be employed and reduce the area of state control through their free services.

Sincerely,

EDWARD STEIGERWALDT AND SON.

DENVER, COLO.,
MAY 14, 1971.

THE HONORABLE JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Forestry, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS: The Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs supports the proposed forestry bills: H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084 and H.R. 6086.

We are aware that more wood is needed, that trees are one of our nation's most valuable natural resources, but in short supply. Fortunately, new forests can be grown and present stands of timber can be managed better. Additional funds are needed for implementation of the Cooperative Forest Management law of 1950. We are very much concerned that technical assistance be provided for protecting the nonindustry private forests in relation to the environment. Therefore we urge passage of H.R. 6082.

One of the strongest arguments at a public hearing in Colorado, by one of the largest lumber companies was that industry owned timber could be better protected from insects, diseases and other damaging agents than public lands—because of more funds and know-how.

The bill, H.R. 6084, which authorizes appropriation of additional funds for cooperative fire protection, will benefit people everywhere because damage to forest, wildlife and watershed affects both the environment and the national economy.

We strongly support H.R. 6086. The decline of and actual elimination of trees and shrubbery from our cities and suburbs has reached a critical point. We see ugliness in too many towns and metropolitan areas. Trees contribute beauty and serenity. Trees and greenery cool city heat, muffle traffic noise, help to purify the air, conserve moisture and reduce erosion.

Forestry know-how and assistance must be expanded. Through H.R. 6086 the *Urban Environmental Forestry Program*, technical assistance will be made available to public and private agencies, and to individuals. We would hope for further research, too.

We support and urge that H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084 and H.R. 6086 be made into laws.

May this letter be made a part of the hearings May 17, 18, and 19?

Very sincerely,

MRS. MARY H. HUNTINGTON,
*Chairman, Conservation Department,
Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs.*

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMEN, INC.,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1971.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Forests,
House Committee on Agriculture, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter carries with it the American Association of Nurserymen's support of the concept contained in HR 6086. We believe that there is a need to assist urban areas to create or improve environmental forestry programs. Attention has now been successfully focused on the need to maintain as much greengrowing plant material in urban areas as possible, and we believe that as this need becomes more widely recognized, there will be a tremendous increase in request for assistance from qualified foresters.

As an industry we are seriously opposed to creation of facilities for the production of plant material by any level of government. We believe that the production of plants and their installation in private and public areas is a legitimate function of our industry. We have proved over the years that the industry is large and efficient enough to handle that function without assistance from public agencies. We are pleased to see that the production of forest-seedling nurseries is no longer being expanded and we hope that one day soon we will see the abandonment of such facilities in favor of private production.

In order that there will be assurance that this needed program will not compete with private industry, we strongly urge that it be placed under the proven successful Cooperative Forest Management Act. That Act, which has been in existence for over twenty years, clearly states that all activities conducted under it will be advisory and carried out so as to encourage the utilization of private agencies and individuals when it comes to the actual furnishing of services. We, therefore, strongly urge that the Cooperative Forest Management Act of August 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 473), as amended by the Act of September 25, 1962 (76 Stat. 569; 16 U.S.C. 586C, 658d), be amended by the addition of a new section authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to expand activities under the Act to include offering assistance to urban areas for the production, improvement, and establishment of trees and shrubs in all of their uses.

We also recommend that funds available under the Cooperative Forest Management Act be increased to cover needs both under the Act as it exists and with the amendment recommended above.

We very much appreciate your courtesy in considering the contents of this letter and request that it be made part of the permanent record of hearings on this subject before your Committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

ROBERT F. LEDERER,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
May 14, 1971.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Forestry, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McMILLAN: I would appreciate it very much if you would have the record of hearings of your Subcommittee on Forestry, indicate the support of National Farmers Union for bills as follows:

H.R. 6082 to increase the authorization for cooperative Forest Management (CFM) from \$5,000,000 to \$15,000,000.

H.R. 6084 to increase the authorization for Cooperative Forest Fire Protection from \$20,000,000 to \$40,000,000.

H.R. 6086 to authorize \$5,000,000 for a new program of urban environmental forestry to provide for establishment, improvement and protection of trees and shrubs in open spaces, greenbelts, roadside screens, and community parks with Federal cost-sharing, State administration and contractual services such as planting and maintenance by private sources.

Sincerely,

REUBEN L. JOHNSON,
Director of Legislative Services.

COLORADO FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
May 15, 1971.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Forestry, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: Three bills scheduled for hearings on May 17, 18, and 19 in the House Committee on Agriculture are of primary concern to the members of the Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs.

We have been centering our work on environmental problems. To us, H.R. 6082 leading to good forest husbandry, H.R. 6084 authorizing funds for fire protection, and H.R. 6086 bringing forestry assistance to urban communities are just good sense. While we are trying to cut down on use of paper products, and are working on ways to recycle paper to conserve trees, we feel that proper forest planning can assure citizens the freedom to enjoy the many conveniences of paper products without endangering our nation's supply.

For that reason, the 6,620 members of the Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs urge your support of these three bills. We should be pleased to have this letter included in the record of the hearings.

Respectfully,

MRS. WARREN H. LEONARD, *President.*

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1971.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Forests Subcommittee, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National Grange believes the growing population pressures, steady advances in technological development, and the continuing congregation of our people in and around urban areas are combining to place ever-larger demands on America's limited supply of natural resources, including our forest lands. In the years directly ahead, the actions we take to preserve, improve and use wisely our soil, water, timber and wildlife resources will constitute a significant measure of our wisdom and maturity as a nation.

We further recommend that government on all levels—Federal, State, County, City and community—make available and/or avail themselves of the resources, technical knowledge and manpower of the Forest Service and other governmental agencies to establish natural resource use criteria and evaluate the domain of the country and direct the use of our natural resources to those purposes for which they are best suited and in the interest of our national welfare.

This rather broad policy statement by the Delegate Body of the National Grange includes preservation of our forest lands, as outlined in H.R. 6084 and related bills to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for cooperative forest fire protection. Forest fires in 1969 destroyed 2,576,987 acres of for-

est resources. We believe it is clear that this nation cannot afford such devastation of our natural resources, States alone cannot continue to shoulder the ever-increasing cost of fire prevention. We therefore respectfully request that this subcommittee report favorably on H.R. 6084.

The National Grange also is in support of H.R. 6082 and related bills to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for cooperative forest management. If the emphasis on environmental improvement is to have any true meaning we must provide the funds for better forest management through State forestry organizations that serve hundreds and thousands of non-industry private forest owners.

As we look down the road 10, 20 or 30 years from now, we must realize that forest resources must be replaced now, if we are to meet the lumber and other forest product needs of our expanding population. What better way to plan for our future forest product needs than through a Federal-State cooperative program to provide adequate forest management services to the 4 million people who own the 300 million acres of non-industrial private forest lands.

Under their present relatively low level of management, they are producing less than half their productive potential. Far greater use must be made of these forests and at substantially higher levels of management.

In addition, the redirected ACP program, now referred to as REAP (Rural Environmental Assistance Program) places renewed emphasis on tree planting. The main objective of the program is to encourage farmers to enter into reforestation projects on their own farms. Farmers who elect to engage in tree farming will need the technical assistance of the State forestry organizations to manage their forest lands so as to provide the greatest benefit to society.

We therefore are in strong support of increasing the authorization for the cooperative forest management program from the present \$5 million annually.

The Grange is a farm community-oriented organization and as such we have a vital interest in community service and community improvement programs. We therefore support H.R. 6086 and related bills to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and furnish financial and other assistance to States and other public bodies and organizations in providing an urban environmental forestry program.

It is our understanding that the bill would provide technical assistance for protection, improvement, or establishment of native trees and shrubs on private lands and public areas in urban and suburban areas. The services of landscape architects, foresters, horticulturists, nurserymen, and other qualified experts could be used as needed.

A growing population that will be crowded into 12 to 15 major metropolitan areas by the year 2000 will present numerous environmental problems—problems that can be partially answered by maintaining open spaces, greenbelts, and woodlands in and near heavily populated areas, for which there is now no overall program. The shortsightedness of the past should not be the eyes used for the future.

The environmental properties of trees and shrubs do not have to be pointed out to this Committee. However, we can't emphasize too greatly the ability of live plants, including trees and shrubs, to renew the atmosphere, filter small particles from the air, muffle noise, reduce wind, shade the soil, conserve moisture by reducing water runoff and thereby control erosion.

Few, if any, communities have the personnel or the know-how to administer such a program. The program outlined in H.R. 6086 would provide such assistance.

In the interest of forest preservation, development of future forest resources and truly urban renewal, the Grange respectfully requests that this subcommittee take the leadership by approving the bills now pending and use your influence to see the bills are passed by Congress.

Thank you for allowing the Grange to make known its views on H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084 and H.R. 6086. We would appreciate this letter being made a part of the hearing record on the respective bills.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. SCOTT,

Master.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., May 19, 1971.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
*Chairman, House Subcommittee on Forestry,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

Reference is made to hearings the House Subcommittee on Forestry is conducting May 17-19 on H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084, and H.R. 6086. For Southern Forest Products Association, a trade association representing manufacturers of Southern Pine and allied interest throughout fourteen Southern States, we have carefully reviewed the bills in question. We find H.R. 6082 and H.R. 6084 satisfactory as written. We endorse enactment of these two bills.

Concerning H.R. 6086 however, we feel the bill does not achieve the purpose of establishing a technical assistance urban forestry program. We, therefore, respectfully suggest that a new bill be drafted, or that H.R. 6082 be amended to provide a technical assistance urban forestry program.

Enactment of H.R. 6082, H.R. 6084 and drafting or amendment of a bill to provide a technical assistance urban forestry program all would greatly aid environmental improvement and would help provide housing, recreational, and other needs for the citizens of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

W. R. GANSER, JR.,
SOUTHERN FOREST PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION.

ELKINS, W. VA., May 20, 1971.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Forests,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: I understand that H.R. 6082 is a proposal to increase funds for Cooperative Forest Management from \$5 million to \$15 million dollars and that a hearing was held May 17.

I would like to endorse this increased funding because it is badly needed to place our private forest lands in better growing condition.

It would be appreciated if this letter could be made a part of the official record of the hearing.

Very truly yours,

F. HENRY SIPE.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 10, 1937.

HON. JOHN L. MOHRHEAD,

Chairman, House Subcommittee on Forestry,
U. S. House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Reference is made to hearing the House Subcommittee on Forestry is conducting May 11-12 on H.R. 6022, H.R. 6023, and H.R. 6024, For National Forest Lands, Association of timber-plantation representing manufacturers of Southern Pine and allied interest throughout Southern National Forests. We have carefully reviewed the bills in question. We find H.R. 6022 and H.R. 6023 satisfactory as written. H. Committee on Forestry of these two bills.

Concerning H.R. 6024 however, we feel the bill does not achieve the purpose of establishing a technical assistance program for forest lands. We therefore suggest that a new bill be drafted, or that H.R. 6022 be amended to provide for technical assistance in such forestry projects as would greatly aid the management of H.R. 6022, H.R. 6023, and H.R. 6024, and would greatly aid in the management of forest lands. We would greatly aid in the management of forest lands and would help provide technical, recreational, and other needs for the citizens of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

W. H. WALKER, JR.

Southern Forest Products Association.

Enclosed, W. H. WALKER, JR.

HON. JOHN L. MOHRHEAD,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Forestry,

U. S. House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter from the Southern Forest Products Association to the U. S. House of Representatives, dated May 11, 1937, in which the Association has expressed its interest in the management of forest lands. The letter is being forwarded to you for your information and for your consideration. It is felt that the letter would be of interest to you and to the U. S. House of Representatives.

Very truly yours,

W. H. WALKER, JR.

W. H. WALKER, JR.