

Chapter 14 - Relations With Other Federal and State Agencies

The Forest Service in the Southwestern Region, as is true elsewhere, interacts on a daily basis with literally thousands of people and special interests, representing Federal, State, and local governments, private businesses, interest groups, and individuals. The famous Tama Wilson letter to Gifford Pinchot of February 1, 1905, set the tone for the problems of conflict and the advantages of cooperation in the management of the forest reserves by the Forest Service under the direction of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Wilson was addressing all Forest Service personnel when he explained that in administering the forest reserves it must be clearly borne in mind *"that all land is to be devoted to its most productive use for the permanent good of the whole people and not for the temporary benefit of individuals or companies."*¹ That is not an easy charge. As the years have passed, competing demands for use of national forests and their resources have heightened.

Gifford Pinchot elaborated on this charge in instructing "Fritz" Olmstead, in the preparation of the *Use Book*, to emphasize that the forest reserves were accessible to all persons for all lawful purposes and that the national forests were not to be administered for the benefit of the government but for the benefit of the people. Forest officers, he said, are servants of the people. "They must obey instructions and enforce the regulations for the protection of the reserves without fear or favor, and must not allow personal or temporary interests to weigh against the permanent good of the reserves . . ." ²It is not easy to defer real or imagined current needs to anticipated requirements in the future.

Much more recently, D. Michael Harvey explained the crisis in Federal forest management as a product of intense competition for all the resources of the forests and the resulting disputes over their allocation. Each interest group believes that the forests should be immediately available to satisfy its particular requirements. The hunters want game, the wildlife conservation people want game preserves, and the timber interests want timber. Some conservationists want wilderness, Indian tribes want to reacquire public lands for their reservations, and cattle interests want grazing rights. State and local governments want to develop recreational facilities and to improve their economies, and different branches of the Federal Government have different rationales and approaches to management. The Forest Service must mediate all these competing interests and make it clear to these interests that "all alternatives have been objectively considered and that the ultimate decisions strike a balance among competing interests and uses."³

Before the organization of the Southwestern Region, competitors for the natural resources of the forest reserves often settled their disputes directly. Cattlemen disputed with each other and with sheepherders over grazing; mining interests were settled by filing claims that were then sometimes defended by force. Timber interests sometimes simply moved in and harvested timber; settlers, farmers, and hunters squatted or used the land as they desired. Nevertheless, the demands for the resources were usually local and, compared to later days, created by a very small number of people or interests. Officials of the Southwestern Region usually found that competing demands could be settled locally and often at the level of the smallest administrative unit, the ranger district.

Early on, rangers became arbitrators in disputes over the uses of the forest reserves and later the national forests. The ranger was often the negotiator, judge, and enforcement officer of forest use

regulations, until at least the close of World War II. The ranger's duty was to protect the forests, enforce the regulations, settle disputes between local persons and interests, and generally be a good neighbor. It was not an easy thing to do, but rangers in the region established their reputations as good neighbors and good citizens of the community.

As time passed, the competitors for the use of forest resources became more divergent, more broadly conceived, larger and better organized, and often national in their scope and purposes. These were interests that no single ranger or forest supervisor could effectively coordinate, manage, or arbitrate. Cooperation, coordination, and often conflict increasingly became the business of the regional office. To be sure, elements of cooperation and conflict were built into the system for managing the forest reserves. Federal forestry in the Southwest began with overlapping and confused jurisdiction and boundaries. The region has spent much time and effort since its creation in defining boundaries, exchanging land tracts, and negotiating questions of jurisdiction with other Federal and State agencies.

For example, when the Pecos River Forest Reserve was created in 1892, it was placed under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of the Interior, General Land Office. In 1905, management of the forest reserves was turned over to the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Forestry, but the Department of the Interior continued to rule on questions affecting easements, mining, and the disposal of lands, while the Department of Agriculture decided issues relating to temporary occupancy and use. Often the directives of the two agencies conflicted, and court action was sometimes needed to resolve issues of agency jurisdiction.⁴ Since the beginning of the Southwestern Region, the Forest Service has had to interact with the Department of the Interior, particularly three of its agencies: the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Interior and Agriculture

The Departments of the Interior and Agriculture have been zealous stewards of the Nation's landed resources. Conferences and discussions relating to the return of the forest reserves to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior began as soon as their transfer to the Department of Agriculture was complete. At a conference held at Yellowstone National Park in 1911, and attended by Chief Forester Henry S. Graves, a Department of the Interior spokesman said, "the difficulty in perfecting this work," that is, supervising the forests, derived from the fact that the bureaus involved were located in two different departments. The conclusion of the group was that "consolidation of all forestry questions in an enlarged and more efficient Forest Service must place that service in the Interior Department"⁵ Chief Graves judiciously made no response, but the argument has continued unabated from that time to the present.

In his book, *The Forest Service: A Study in Public Land Management*, Glen Robinson said that it would have been surprising, "considering all known laws of bureaucratic behavior," if the growth of the Forest Service had gone on unnoticed or unenvied by the Department of the Interior, "and, in fact, it did not"⁶ More recently, in 1985, a congressional study by Representative James V. Hansen of Utah examined the possibility of merging the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service with the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management. The report included a summary by Representative Hansen of previous attempts to merge the agencies.

The first serious merger effort was by President Herbert Hoover, who issued an Executive Order on December 9, 1932, to transfer the Forest Service to the Department of the Interior, but it could not be completed without the agreement of Congress. Subsequently, President Franklin D.

Roosevelt tried to transfer the Forest Service to the Department of the Interior. In 1949, the Hoover Commission recommended that Congress transfer all Federal land management to the Department of Agriculture, and in 1953 the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization recommended merging the Department of the Interior's Range Management Division with the Forest Service under the Department of Agriculture. From about 1964 through 1970, efforts were made to transfer the Forest Service from the Department of Agriculture into a reorganized Department of the Interior, to be called the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. In 1976, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act specified independent and cooperative activities for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Forest Service. President Jimmy Carter wanted to move the Forest Service into a new Department of Natural Resources during his administration (1977--81). Most recently, the problem of jurisdiction is being approached with the idea of interchanging public lands between the two agencies.⁷

The interchange proposal announced on January 30, 1985, would give some Forest Service land to the Bureau of Land Management and some of the Bureau's land to the Forest Service.⁸ Although the question of merger and reorganization rarely generated active public interest at the local or regional levels, where interagency cooperation is perhaps more necessary and real than it is in Washington, DC, the interchange proposal created a storm of public protest, particularly in the Southwestern Region. It centered around Prescott, AZ, where local citizens equated interchange with the loss of their forest supervisor's office, their national forests, and the long tradition of cooperation and accord between the Forest Service and the local government and residents.

Articles in the Prescott *Courier*, "serving the communities of Prescott, Prescott Valley, Chino Valley, Dewey, Mayer, and Humboldt, Arizona," reflected the rising irritation and then anger over the interchange proposal. On February 1, 1985, the *Courier* noted that the proposed land swap could affect the Prescott National Forest. On February 10, the paper stated that the swap would "swallow" the Prescott National Forest and that most people "can't stomach it." On February 22, 500 people attended a hearing in Prescott to "save the forest." On March 1, petitions were sent to Representative Robert Stump. The "Citizens for the Protection of the Prescott Area" was formed, and in March the children of the area wrote letters to their representative to save the forest. Representative Stump publicly objected to the impact of the interchange plans on his district, and retired Forest Service people in the region began to study the interchange from the perspective of professional foresters. Finally, the regional forester proposed to keep the forest, but consolidated the supervisor's office with that of another forest. A local group then threatened a lawsuit to stop such a move, others expressed "outrage," and forest workers "blasted" the proposal. Many more editorials, letters, and public protests led to a public hearing in Prescott in June, but the *Courier* stated on June 30 that the hearings had settled very little. On July 2, with no reference to the dispute over the Prescott National Forest or the land interchange, Regional Forester M.J. Hassell announced his retirement. Despite the fact that the issue was not firmly resolved in July 1985, the *Courier* expressed the belief that the system of public review and participation really did work.⁹

Controversy and cooperation over the interchange proposal will continue to occupy the agencies involved and the public affected by the proposal for quite some time. The public's involvement in the "Prescott affair" illustrates a number of important lessons and themes in the administration of the forests in the Southwestern Region. On one level, that is, Federal administrative agencies, the interchange is another incident in the continuing effort to resolve problems of jurisdictional overlapping and confusion between agencies involved in the administration of the public lands. On the regional and local levels, the public's reaction to the interchange proposal and its effects on the Prescott National Forest illustrates the vital and very real identification that the Southwestern Region has with State, local, and regional interests. This affiliation, which some

believe has developed in the Southwestern Region more so than in other regions of the National Forest System, is an excellent example of the development of "federalism" within the administrative units of the national government. That is, part of the administrative responsibility of an agency is to represent the policies of the Federal government, but another part is to administer those policies fairly and equitably within the region or the designated areas of responsibility.¹⁰ Thus, there is a tendency for administrative agencies of the national government to identify with the locale or interests they are designated to serve or regulate.

There is, perhaps, an even more important significance to the Prescott interchange activity. The public concern over the interchange and the loss of a local forest supervisor's office exhibits an unusually strong public support for and identification with the work of the Forest Service in the Southwest. Such concern is good evidence that the Forest Service in the Southwest is performing its mission in a satisfactory, if not outstanding manner.

Responsibilities of Federal Agencies In the Southwest

The major jurisdictional overlaps involving the Forest Service in the Southwest are with the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, all in the Department of the Interior.

Although it is difficult to obtain short policy statements from the various Federal agencies, three fairly succinct statements appeared in a 1981 publication, *Adjacent Lands Study, Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona*:

National Park Service

The National Park Service is guided in its land management policies by the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916 (39 Stat. 535). The act states that the National Park Service shall promote and regulate the use of parks to conform to the fundamental purpose of the parks, which is ... to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.¹¹

Bureau of Land Management

The Bureau of Land Management's public land policy is based on the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-579, October 23, 1976), which established guidelines for its administration: to provide for the management, protection, development, and enhancement of the public lands.

The Bureau's policy is based on the premise that any particular land area and its resources offer the potential for a variety of uses, some of them mutually exclusive. It is the objective of the Bureau to provide maximum public benefits through the best combination of uses of which an area is capable.¹²

Under the Bureau of Land Management multiple-use concept, several components were discussed: livestock grazing, fish and wildlife development, utilization and protection of endangered and threatened species, industrial development, mineral production, occupancy, outdoor recreation, timber protection, watershed protection, wilderness preservation, preservation

of public values, and cultural resources.¹³ These multiple-use objectives are similar to those of the Forest Service.

Forest Service

The Forest Service is charged with administration of the National Forest System. The National Forest System's policy is to manage all resources of these lands under the principle of multiple use and sustained yield so that the products and benefits therefrom will best serve local and national needs of the people.¹⁴

The Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, stated that it is the policy of Congress that the National Forest System be administered for "outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes," and it directed the Secretary of Agriculture to develop programs and policies to support multiple use and sustained yields. The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (RPA) directed that long-range plans be developed by the Forest Service to ensure future supplies of renewable resources. The legislation specified that the national forests should be managed in a manner that would protect "the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archeological values," and that certain lands should be preserved as habitat for fish and wildlife, that grazing for domestic animals should be maintained, and that provisions should be made for outdoor recreation and human occupancy.¹⁵ RPA was amended by the Forest Management Act of 1976, which liberalized the timber harvesting provisions of the 1897 act but added numerous restrictions.

Bureau of Indian Affairs. Today the Bureau of Indian Affairs is headed by the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior. This position was created in 1977 because of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of January 4, 1975 (P.L. 93-638). This legislation implemented the policy of self-determination advocated by President Johnson in 1968 and by President Nixon in 1970. It encouraged tribal control over reservation programs:

Today, some 50 million acres of Indian reservation lands are held in trust by the United States for Indian tribes and individuals. They are not properly public lands, because they must be managed for the benefit of the specific beneficiaries involved. Thus an additional decision-maker, the tribal government, is involved when resource development is to be considered on an Indian Reservation.¹⁶

In 1978, President Nixon "emphasized negotiation rather than litigation to resolve Indian water rights."¹⁷ Because Indian lands are now operated somewhat in the fashion of private lands, semi-autonomous in the hands of the individual tribes, they will not be discussed in this chapter other than from an historical standpoint.

Federal Agency Cooperation with the Forest Service

Cooperative relations are a double-bitted axe. The Forest Service cooperates with other Federal agencies on projects beneficial to it, and the other agencies cooperate with the Forest Service for the same reason. Often the cooperation is initiated by the other agency, sometimes by the Forest Service; sometimes it is legislated by Congress or mandated by the Administration. In 1962, the Forest Service policy was to maintain "cooperative relations with representatives of interested agencies and organizations."¹⁸ These include the Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation

Service; the Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Park Service; as well as the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Education, Energy, Health and Human Services, Justice, Labor, State, and Treasury.¹⁹

USDI National Park Service Cooperative Activities

Cooperative relations in national park activities within the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service began early, before 1911 and before the National Park Service became a separate bureau.

Perhaps you do not know that the Forest Service, contrary to general understanding, is not a part of the Department of the Interior, but a part of the Department of Agriculture. The result of this is not always happy, although during my administration both the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service have shown every possible disposition to cooperate whenever the necessity for such cooperation was realized.²⁰

Since this statement by the Secretary of the Interior in 1911 followed soon after the Pinchot-Ballinger controversy, it meant that the way was still open for the two agencies to work together on common goals. For example, Arthur Ringland reported that in 1916 he represented the Department of Agriculture on a committee with the Department of the Interior to work out boundaries of the proposed Grand Canyon National Park by adjustment from three adjoining national forests.²¹ In a memorandum to the District Forester (Albuquerque) dated April 22, 1920, W.B. Greeley, new Chief of the Forest Service, stressed that in cooperative relations with the National Park Service, "I want to have the Forest Service do its full share, or more, in such forms of cooperation as those indicated above which may come up in current administration."²²

This desire by the Chief of the Forest Service to have Southwestern District (Region) officials cooperate with National Park Service personnel had apparently not taken full hold by 1929. In that year the Chief of the Forest Service sent a memorandum to all Regional Foresters urging them "... to find a way to resolve differences on what is best for the land and the public, and have our joint achievements instead of our differences."²³

The National Park Service engages in cooperative efforts with the Forest Service and others in several areas as enunciated in its 1975 publication *Management Policies*:

Joint agency planning may be undertaken when a park is adjoined by Indian reservations, other Federal lands, State lands, or lands subject to State, regional or local planning or regulations. Formal agreements to coordinate major planning efforts with planning agencies and other governmental agencies will be made where appropriate.²⁴

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires consultation with any other Federal Agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to the plan's environmental impacts. Formal written comments from these agencies will be solicited.²⁵

Of course, this cooperation between other Federal agencies and the Forest Service continues today, as does occasional conflict. There is, however, management merit in preserving competition between agencies. Competition and conflict can lead to constructive cooperation and eventual efficient management of the Nation's resources.

Bureau of Land Management Cooperative Activities

In 1906, cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior concerned the examination, location, and evaluation of agricultural lands within the forest reserves by the Department of Agriculture and the filing of such information with the Department of the Interior.²⁶ Other cooperative work with the Department of the Interior General Land Office and the Grazing Service and finally the Bureau of Land Management consisted of agreement on grazing fees and development of parallel land management activities. In recent years Congress and the Presidents have imposed certain laws and regulations on both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, by which they are now required to work cooperatively. Three of these include management of wild horses and burros, setting of grazing fees, and administration of mining of public lands.

A requirement of the Wild Horses and Burros Protection Act, passed in 1971, was to establish the National Advisory Board for Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros. Leadership is shared between the Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management and the Department of Agriculture Forest Service, the only agencies whose lands are affected.

According to Culhane in his book, *Public Land Politics*, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service have been forced into cooperative work in minerals management through the Federal Land Policy and Management Act in 1976:

Local land managers have minimal control over mining uses.... When the agencies have a chance to officially approve mining rights by patenting mining claims or issuing mineral leases, those decisions are the formal responsibility of BLM state offices, not local Forest Service or BLM administrators.... The agencies have evolved informal administrative practices for consulting with local land managers over mineral management decisions. BLM state offices forward lease applications to BLM district offices and Forest Service rangers for review and stipulation of conditions to protect surface resources during mining operations ... such procedures are a far cry from the formal control that local BLM and Forest Service officers have over other uses of lands under their jurisdiction.²⁷

Cooperative agreements between the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service in range improvement work were suspended November 22, 1976, because of pending implementation of the BLM Organic Act (P.L. 94-579). However, the prohibition of these cooperative efforts was lifted on February 17, 1977.²⁸

U.S. Army Cooperative Activities

From the early days, the Forest Service and the Department of the Army have cooperated with respect to forested portions of the military reservations in Arizona and New Mexico. The *Coronado Quarterly*, July 1911, reported on cooperative work between the Forest Service and Fort Huachuca resulting in the construction of a trail entirely on the reservation, to interconnect with Forest Service trails in the main divide of the Huachuca range.

A second example of cooperation at its best was with the U.S. Army during the time of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Walter Graves is quoted in Tucker and Fitzgerald's book as saying:

... the Army had the responsibility of organizing the camp and handling all of the logistics, and the complete operation of the camp itself. The involved agencies, land management agencies, were assigned the boys in the morning, took them out on the job, and were

responsible for them until they returned to camp in the evening, at which time the Army took them over and of course was responsible for them until the following morning.²⁹

Soil Conservation Service Cooperative Activities

The Forest Service and the USDA Soil Conservation Service have entered into numerous cooperative agreements in Arizona and New Mexico. The Land Utilization Program of the Federal Government during the 1930's-based on Title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195, 200)-resulted in later transfers of land from the Soil Conservation Service to the Forest Service. Seven Land Utilization projects in New Mexico were transferred from Soil Conservation Service jurisdiction (administration, protection, and management) to Forest Service jurisdiction in 1939. These were transferred by administrative order from Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture.

Jurisdiction over certain activities was derived through the relationships of agencies, often in Washington. These jurisdictions then filtered down into the forest regions. Once such filtering was the outcome of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act of May 18, 1937. Quincy Randles, assistant regional forester, division of timber management, in a memorandum to the supervisor of the Apache National Forest in 1940, reaffirmed the responsibilities of the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service:

The Soil Conservation Service is charged with the responsibility in administering all forest farming, i.e., forestry on farms deriving their income principally from farm products, and the Forest Service handles the work on all farm forestry projects. Farm forestry is defined as forest practices on farms or ranches which derive the major portion of their income from forest products.³⁰

Fish and Wildlife Service

This agency was formerly known as the Bureau of Biological Survey. The Biological Survey assisted materially in getting the deer of the Kaibab National Forest under effective management control. The Forest Service and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, a division of the Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service, cooperate generally in studies concerning the management of game and fish on the national forests. Several cooperative agreements between the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Forest Service occurred in the Southwest during the 1960's.³¹ More recently, the cooperation has taken the form of assistance in the handling of wildlife and birds in game management areas on national forests and in co-sponsorship of seminars or workshops. Typical of these was a seminar held in 1977, "Improving Fish and Wildlife Benefits in Range Management," with speakers from most Federal agencies managing lands with wildlife and fisheries resources. The seminar was jointly sponsored by the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, and the Soil Conservation Service. A speaker from the Forest Service was on the program.³²

Cooperation In Specific Situations

Managing the Kaibab Deer Herd. The conflicts between Federal and State jurisdiction were brought to a head in the Southwest with the Kaibab deer herd:

On the basis of several court decisions, the States have claimed full jurisdiction over all game animals within their boundaries whether on public or on private land, not excepting national forests, however, the Forest Service, while directly responsible for forest administration, is powerless to take such action in connection with game management...³³

In 1919 about one-fourth of the Kaibab National Forest was placed in the Grand Canyon National Park Killing game in the Park was prohibited by law. By 1926, the herd in the park numbered from 35,000 to 40,000, about 20,000 too many to sustain the habitat³⁴ In 1929, the U.S. Supreme Court "enjoined the Governor and other state officials of Arizona from interfering with the killing of deer by government hunters on the Grand Canyon Game Preserve where such killing is needed to protect forest lands included in the Kaibab National Forest"³⁵

The Forest Service decided to hire hunters to reduce the deer herd by killing. Two reports of the affair indicated polarized positions about the event. One report emphasized slaughter, and the other preservation of the deer herds and wildlife conservation.³⁶ General misunderstanding about the proper management of the Kaibab deer herd continued. In 1931, the Chief of the Department of Agriculture Forest Service appointed a committee, representing 12 organizations, to visit the Kaibab National Forest. Representatives of the National Association of Audubon Societies, American Game Association, American Forestry Association, Camp Fire Club of America, Izaak Walton League of America, Society of Mammalogists, Arizona Game and Fish Commission, American National Livestock Association, University of Arizona, Arizona Game Protective Association, and U.S. Bureau of Biological Survey visited the forest, accompanied by personnel from the Forest Service, National Park Service, National Woolgrowers' Association, and local cattlemen. The committee approved cooperative plans like those in effect between the Forest Service and the State of Arizona, and urged more coordination and cooperation among Federal bureaus, including more manpower to regulate the deer herd.³⁷

In 1947, the Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Forest Service undertook a cooperative study "to determine the competition between cattle and deer for the available forage." As of 1964, the work was still being done, with rehabilitation of the range and management of herd numbers to stay within the area's carrying capacity being the principal deer and deer range management activities. To make this work required the cooperation of livestock interests and the Forest Service in managing livestock numbers and livestock concentrations.³⁸

Cooperation in Fire Suppression. Forest and range fire is no respecter of land ownership. Because of the mixed nature of land ownership in the Southwest, fire control is an activity needing cooperative work between Federal, State, and private interests. A wildfire starting on one type of ownership can burn into another type of ownership, if the conditions for fire spread--fuel, topography, and wind --are suitable to move it.

Numerous cooperative fire control agreements were consummated by the Forest Service in the Southwestern Region. Let us examine a few of these. As an early example of State Federal cooperation, a 1923 agreement between the Forest Service and the State Land Commissioner of New Mexico provided fire control by the Forest Service on State holdings in the Carson National Forest, primarily in the Taos District.³⁹ Later, in the spring of 1941, Regional Forester Pooler apprised forest supervisors in New Mexico that the State Guard was available for fire fighting on national forests and private land in emergency situations. The Forest Service was to provide the Guard with two days' training in fire fighting.⁴⁰ Federal agencies, such as the Department of the Interior, also cooperated in the control of fire on the national forests and national forest rangelands.

In 1943, Lee Muck of the Office of Land Utilization, Department of the Interior, in a memorandum to the Director of the Department of the Interior Grazing Service, authorized "cooperative action in the protection of the Nation's forests and range resources from loss and damage by fire."⁴¹ The Grazing Service and the General Land Office were combined in 1948 to form the Bureau of Land Management. In 1952, the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service entered into a memorandum of understanding on fire suppression covering lands in Arizona within or adjacent to national forests. A memorandum of understanding on fire detection outlined how to report fires and prorate costs based on acres burned under each jurisdiction. Another Forest Service-Soil Conservation Service understanding was signed in 1955.⁴² Private enterprises also entered into cooperative agreements with the Southwestern Region.

During fiscal year 1969, the Southwestern Region signed a cooperative agreement with the New Mexico Timber Co., Inc., for mutual assistance on fires on the San Diego Grant. Each would share fire protection costs. And, of course, timber management was of mutual interest to Government and private agencies.

Cooperation in Timber Management. The Forest Service has had a strong cadre of personnel and a long history of sound management of timber resources. The agency has managed lands of others under cooperative agreements and has entered into cooperative activities with Federal agencies, States, and forest industry firms. An early example of a cooperative management agreement was on January 22, 1906, when "the Office of Indian Affairs made a cooperative agreement by which the Forest Service was to undertake for the Indian Service the supervision of logging, the sale of timber, the protection of forests, and a detailed study of forest problems."⁴³ Some work was performed, but the work was improperly funded. The agreement was abrogated after a period of slightly less than 18 months. At least two versions of why the arrangement did not work were reported in hearings before the House Committee on Indian Affairs, in 1919, by the Office of Indian Affairs, and by Gifford Pinchot.⁴⁴

In 1914 a special cooperative agreement between the Arizona State Land Commission and the Department of Agriculture allowed the Forest Service to handle State land with forests in the same manner as timbered land in national forests. In 1926 the New Mexico State Enabling Act of 1910 was amended to permit the State to enter into land-for land exchanges with the United States for either public domain or national forest land or timber. Exchanges of land and stumpage-for-land continued in both Arizona and New Mexico, and in 1933 an extensive exchange of land with the State of New Mexico was begun. A cooperative agreement had been entered into by the Forest Service and the New Mexico Game and Fish Commission on the Cimarron Canyon Project. This was for a timber cruise and appraisal for possible state acquisition, and since the work had been completed, the agreement was terminated in 1949.⁴⁵

Cooperation Since World War II. Numerous references to existing and needed cooperative work with a variety of different entities are mentioned in the inspection reports of the decades of the 1940's and 1950's. Several references to the need for cooperation between the Forest Service and others were made in excerpts of the Loveridge-Cliff General Integrating Inspection of the Southwestern Region made in 1945. In wildlife management, two items were considered important--the need to strengthen the working relationships with the State Game Commissions to protect national forest interests, and "continued close cooperation with the States in fish planting and other stream and lake management work." In watershed management the inspectors suggested "collaboration in the development of programs of other agencies in so far as national-forest interests are concerned or national-forest conditions affect their programs," and better relations with water users.⁴⁶

Cooperative efforts were also mentioned in the McCutchen-McDuff General Integrating Inspection Report of the Santa Fe National Forest in 1948. Cooperative work in fire protection was noted in an arrangement with the Indian Service, and a three-way agreement between the Forest Service, the Atomic Energy Commission at Los Alamos, and the Bandelier National Monument. There were arrangements with local leaders for securing men for large fires, and placing 210,000 acres under cooperative fire agreements with 59 different cooperators. Information on cooperative work in timber management was limited to the statement that Knutson-Vandenberg Act Cooperative funds for tree planting after harvest were being collected from only two sales, and a recommendation for the Forest Service to handle sales made on Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service management areas where their management personnel were inexperienced in timber sales work. The report mentioned the cooperation of the Forest Service with 10 local livestock associations on the forest, and good cooperation with the New Mexico State Game Department and four game protective associations. In recreation, it was noted that a Guest Ranchers' Association had been formed on the forest. The inspectors mentioned numerous direct contributions to the local areas by Forest Service personnel on the national forest, including active participation in associations noted above and with the Santa Fe Winter Sports Club, a civic club, and the Santa Fe Chamber of Commerce, and good liaison with State officials, especially the strong relationship with the State Game Warden, Elliott Barker.⁴⁷

The report of a 1953 inspection of the Kaibab National Forest made similar comments. Knutson-Vandenberg Act deposits were taken from all of the larger sales and special mention was made of the "very high level" and "cooperative relationships with employees of the Arizona Game and Fish Department" and the pressure that the Forest Service and women's clubs were putting to bear to clean up litter on road rights-of-way.⁴⁸

In the Federal Records Center, Denver, for the period January 1, 1958, to June 1, 1959, the following folders were filed under "G - COOPERATION" in the Southwestern Region files: American Society for Range Management, Arizona Cattle Growers Association, Arizona Game Protective Association, Arizona Permittees Group, Arizona Wool Growers Association, Livestock Associations, National Wool Growers Association, New Mexico Association of Soil Conservation Districts, New Mexico Cattle Growers Association, New Mexico Permittees Group, New Mexico Wool Growers Association, Southwestern Lumber Company, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Department of Agricultural Research Service (relating to brucellosis), Utah Cattlemen's Association, and Yavapai Cattle Growers.⁴⁹

Cooperative efforts conducted by the Southwestern Region cover a gamut of items with a wide range of agencies, associations, and private entities. For instance, cooperative work in fiscal year 1971, each group housed in a separate file at the Fort Worth Federal Records Center, is presented below in sample form to illustrate the diversity of these efforts.⁵⁰

- *Albuquerque Wildlife and Conservation Association.* Highway and right-of-way problems.
- *Arizona Game and Fish Department.* Cooperative agreement on game range studies. Joint field trip. Study of lions in Sycamore Canyon.
- *Arizona Wildlife Federation.* Show-me trip with representative of the Tonto National Forest. Regional Forester Hurst spoke at its 1971 convention. Published a brochure, "Southwest National Forests are Unique." Invitation to the AWF to tour the North Kaibab.
- *U.S. Department of the Interior.* Cooperative agreement on interagency browse analysis between New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service. BLM manuals on wildlife habitat management sent to the regional office.

- *U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.* Meeting of parties interested in management of Tule elk. Report on Indian Camp Reservoir.
- *Isaac Walton League.* Their newspaper sent to the Regional Office.
- *National Wildlife Federation.* Requested information on channelizing the Salt River.
- *New Mexico Game and Fish Department.* Letter from Regional Forester Hurst to its Director, May 4, 1971, trying to keep small problems small. *New Mexico Game and Fish News* sent to the Regional Office. Letter to a Congressman wanting more dollars for wildlife in BLM and FS. Interagency meeting between the Department and Apache/Gila National Forest personnel, March 9, 1971. Invitation to Regional Forester William D. Hurst to attend the State Game Commission Meeting.
- *New Mexico/Arizona Section, The Wildlife Society.* Forest Service person was program chairman of the Section Meeting, February 5-6, 1971.
- *Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners.* Annual meeting agendas.
- *Arizona Lake Program.* Joint meeting with Arizona Game and Fish Department.
- *Phelps Dodge Corporatio.* Blue Ridge Reservoir file, relative to fishing in stream below the dam.
- *Red Rock Canyon [dam].* Publication of USDA Forest Service, Southwestern Region, *Hydrological Survey & Analyses, Water & Related Land Resources, Red Rock Canyon, Patagonia Ranger District, Coronado National Forest.* Engineering plans for the dam.
- *Arizona Game and Fish Department.* Proposed Canyon Creek Fish Hatchery.
- *Arizona Game and Fish Department.* A file of grazing allotments--sample is "Wildlife Habitat Management Plan, Chevelon Canyon Allotment, Sitgreaves National Forest."

Observations made during an interview of retired Southwestern Region officials are that during the past 20 years relations with the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management have been good. When William Hurst was the Regional Forester there were one or two joint meetings per year with BLM and NPS personnel. Good relations existed with state land, game and forestry departments.

Cooperative Relations with Arizona. In Arizona the relationship of administration of the forest the State and the USDI/USDA was set forth early by the act creating the reserves, and the Weeks Act of 1911, assisting the organization of State Forestry departments. Under these laws all persons employed in the Forest Service had the authority to make arrests for the violations of the laws and regulations relating to the national forests, including the use of stock, the prevention and extinguishing of forest fires, and for the protection of fish and game.⁵¹

In 1913, the Forest Service and the State Game Warden of Arizona signed a plan to cooperate in game protection (Forest Service officers to be game wardens) and fire protection.⁵² Cooperation by the Forest Service and State of Arizona was reaffirmed ". . . in the act of May 22, 1928, where cooperation with the States and Territories, and with private agencies interested in conservation was provided for." Other legislation also provided for cooperation between the Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Forest Service, Southwestern Region, in setting game kills on the national forests. Another benefit to Arizona, as to other States, through cooperation with the Forest Service was the granting of monies from the sale of timber and other goods from the national forests in "sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 in each township of a State for the use of schools." These monies were prorated from the total amount received by the Forest Service from the forests within the State in a year.⁵³

The Arizona Game and Fish Department became more and more active and in 1947 began a cooperative project with the Forest Service under Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration (Pittman-Robertson Act) specifications. A biologist was assigned to an identified area by the Forest Service to obtain information on range use and condition.⁵⁴ In 1951 the renewal of a cooperative agreement between the Arizona Game and Fish Commission and the Forest Service centered around an amendment requiring the Commission to get approval of the regional forester before a wildlife refuge could be placed on a national forest. In 1958 the two agencies cooperated in a research-demonstration-management effort on the Tonto National Forest.⁵⁵

Cooperative relations with State game and fish departments in the Southwest continue. For instance, a memorandum on needed joint action with the Arizona Game and Fish Department was sent by William Hurst, regional forester, on May 22, 1972, to assistant regional foresters and forest supervisors of the Apache, Coconino, Kaibab, and Sitgreaves National Forests. The memorandum covered a list of cooperative needs that the Game and Fish Department and the Forest Service could accomplish on these National Forests.⁵⁶

Arizona is also concerned with the management of its water resources. The Forest Service cooperates with several Federal and State agencies. The Forest Service has recognized the necessity of taking positive steps to slow down and ultimately reverse the erosive trends on Arizona's watersheds.⁵⁷ In Arizona and in New Mexico, the management of wildlife and watersheds is a regional problem requiring the cooperation of many State and Federal agencies and local authorities.

Cooperative Relations with New Mexico. In New Mexico early cooperation between the territory/State and the Forest Service led to harmonious relations in several areas, notably with respect to the wildlife resource and fire control activities. In the January 14, 1914, issue of the Carson Pine Cone, the New Mexico State Game Warden reminded forest officers of their responsibilities as deputy state game wardens. Game wardens, in turn, were urged to promptly report forest fires and to assist in preventing them. The State of New Mexico put \$10,000 into helping construct the Taos-Cimarron Road, 18 miles in length, in 1917. On April 18, 1920, Supervisor Loveridge of the Carson National Forest attended the meeting of the State Game and Fish Protective Association as a delegate from the Taos Association.⁵⁸

Game regulations impinging upon the national forests were slower coming in New Mexico than in Arizona. The Arizona State Game Commission "provided for two long two-deer seasons on the Kaibab in 1929 and 1930, in which a total of nearly 9,000 deer were killed, most of them by out-of-state hunters." In 1930 the New Mexico legislature finally enacted a bill that transferred authority over seasons and bag limits to the State game commission.⁵⁹

In 1961, the Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, and the Department of Agriculture Agricultural Conservation Program entered into a cooperative agreement with the New Mexico Department of State Forestry. The agreement specified each agency's responsibilities regarding forestry on privately owned lands in the State.⁶⁰

Cooperative Relations with Other Public and Private Entities. The Forest Service cooperates with State agricultural experiment stations, usually in research rather than in operations. Hence, there are few records of cooperative relationships between the Southwestern Region and experiment stations. Such relationships are typified by a watershed management project funded by the Arizona State Land Department in cooperation with the Agricultural Experiment Station and the Salt River Valley Water User's Association.⁶¹

Local public entities have often cooperated with the Forest Service. For instance, Gila County, Arizona, maintained a campground within a national forest as early as 1921. Between 1947 and 1972 the Pima County, Arizona, Parks and Recreation Department supplemented recreation funds of the Forest Service by from \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year to rehabilitate recreation facilities on the Coronado National Forest.⁶²

Instances of cooperation between the Forest Service and the private interests are common in the records of the Southwestern Region. The *Carson Pine Cone* reported numerous instances of Forest Service personnel who were active in the activities of local private organizations. For example, Ranger C.R. Dwire was elected vice-president of the Taos Game Association in 1920. Forest Supervisor Loveridge was elected president of the Taos Commercial Club in 1920, and Ranger Wang, with help from homesteaders around Servilleta, poisoned prairie dogs. The Forest Service enjoyed excellent cooperative relations with the various stockmen's and sheepmen's associations, particularly in the suppression of fire.⁶³

Two instances of cooperation by private individuals and organizations during 1920 are reported in the *Carson Pine Cone*. The citizens of El Rito deposited \$200 to be used in work on the El Rito-Canjilon road, and the Molybdenum Mines Company helped build the Questa-Elizabethen Road. The Tucson Natural History Society was instrumental in getting a tract of 4,464 acres in the Coronado National Forest set aside for preservation as a "natural area" in 1927.⁶⁴ In 1956 Southwest Lumber Mills, Inc., and the Southwestern Region entered into a cooperative agreement to cover several areas of activity on Aztec Land and Timber Company tracts, including permits to graze, for forest and range fire protection, for marking, scaling and accounting on timber sales and for slash disposal. In fiscal year 1969, the Southwestern Region entered into a cooperative agreement with American Airlines, Inc., to search for downed aircraft on national forest lands.⁶⁵

A Special Type of Cooperation: The Forester as a Community Leader. The forester in the Forest Service of yesterday had stronger ties to local communities than he or she does today. This is the lament heard when you talk to foresters who have been retired for more than ten years.

I one time heard it said that the Forest Ranger and the County Extension Agent were the most respected and valuable citizens in the community. More recently, the Mayor and City Council members actually shed tears in my office when the decision was made to dose down a Ranger District Office in a small New Mexico community. In hundreds of small towns, and some not so small, throughout the United States, the reason Forest Officers are valued so highly as citizens is because they are involved in community activities. They are smart, well-educated people who for the most part play an active role in community affairs, church, Boy Scouts, Fish and Game Clubs, schools, civic clubs, Chamber of Commerce, and numerous other community organizations. In the earlier years of the Forest Service, a good Supervisor saw to it that the Forest Service was represented in every important organization within his zone of influence.⁶⁶

Herbert Kaufman, in his book *The Forest Ranger*, observes that there was potential conflict between the role of the forest ranger as a valuable member of the local community as well as the official local representative of the decentralized Forest Service. The ranger was ordinarily invited to join local civic and community organizations and was encouraged to do so by the Forest Service," partly because his position as manager of large properties automatically makes him a person of some standing in most localities, partly because the Forest Service is always 'represented' in such associations . . ."⁶⁷

According to Kaufman, community involvement also opens the door to the possibility of "capture" by the community. He explains: "Rangers are encouraged to take as active a part as they can in community service, social, and fraternal organizations. Slowly, they absorb the point of view of their friends and neighbors. One, for example, reported that he found himself tending to "look the other way" and to delay investigation as long as he reasonably could when he had reason to believe the chamber of commerce of the town in which he lived, and to whose executive committee he belonged, was operating a resort area without the rather expensive liability insurance required by the terms of its special-use permit . . ." ⁶⁸ As a result, local interests are in a better position to bring pressure to bear on foresters. ⁶⁹

The experience of forest rangers in the Southwest tends to refute Kaufman's contention, at least during the early years of the Southwestern District. There is an advantage for the district ranger, especially, to be active in the local community. In this way, confrontation can be headed off by discussing the issues early and attempting to produce a resolution before small problems become large. Confrontation occurred when the Forest Service first intervened in the free use of public land and implemented controlled use. But the wounds inflicted by confrontation were at least, in part, removed by cooperation. Since so many different products and services emanate from the national forests in Arizona and New Mexico, cooperation with those who would use them is imperative. The Forest Service in the Southwest has a good record in cooperative efforts with its sister agencies, with the two States and with citizen groups.

Reference Notes

¹ James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, letter to "The Forester, Forest Service," February 1, 1905, p. 4, cited in Gifford Pinchot, *Breaking New Ground* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1947), pp. 261-262.

² *Ibid.*, and p. 266.

³ D. Michael Harvey, "Solutions to Problems Associated with Use and Management of Federal Forest Lands," in *Crisis in Federal Forest Land Management* (Washington, DC: Society of American Foresters, 1977), p. 95.

⁴ Arthur C. Ringland, *Conserving Human and Natural Resources*, an interview conducted by Amelia R. Fry, Edith Mezirow, Fern Ingersoll, and Thelma Dreis (Berkeley, CA: Resources for the Future, 1970), p. 113 (reported in "Mr. Ringland's Success," *Albuquerque Evening Herald*, April 28, 1916); Mary E. Lauver, "A History of the Use and Management of the Forested Lands of Arizona, 1862-1936," M.A. thesis, University of Arizona, 1938, pp. 60-61, 65; Jenks Cameron, *The Development of Governmental Forest Control in the United States* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1928), p. 239.

⁵ Walter L. Fisher, Secretary of the Interior, in *Proceedings, National Park Conference, Yellowstone National Park, September 11 and 12, 1911* (Washington, DC: USDI, 1912), pp. 65, 70.

⁶ Glen C. Robinson, *The Forest Service. A Study in Public Land Management* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, for Resources for the Future, Inc., 1975), p. 13.

⁷ James V. Hansen, "Analysis of Merging the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management," *Congressional Record-House* (July 22, 1985), H6003H6007.

⁸ *Ibid.*, H6006.

⁹ Prescott, AZ, *The Courier* (February 1, 10, 22; March 1, 3, 17, 18, 21, 31; April 18, 19; May 12; June 6, 10, 13, 14, 18, 21, 23, 24, 30; July 2, 17, 21, 22, 1985).

¹⁰ Congressman Hansen's last sentence in the *Congressional Record* entry is: "Finally, it is questionable whether changes in the current structure are needed, since many observers would argue that the current system is working well." Senator John Melcher of Montana, writing in the September 1985 issue of *American Forests*, recognized the effort more as a power grab than a tool of more efficient management of public lands. Furthermore, he stated, "but it is going to take the public's involvement, and we must work under the public's terms and conditions after it has had a chance to see what directions it wants to

- give Congress." From: "The Great Land Swap," *American Forests*, 91(9) (September 1985): pp. 11, 76-78.
- ¹¹ *Adjacent Lands Study, Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona* (San Francisco: USDI National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, USDA Forest Service, 1981), pp. 7, 8, 49, A-1.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, pp. A-4.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. A-4-5
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. A-6-7.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁶ *BIA Profile* (Washington, DC: USDI Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1981), p. 5; George Cameron Coggins and Charles F. Wilkinson, *Federal Public Land and Resources Law* (Mineola, NY: The Foundation Press, Inc., 1981), p. 42.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- ¹⁸ Clare Hendee, *Organization and Management in the Forest Service* (Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service, 1962), p. 23.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- ²⁰ Fisher, *Proceedings of the National Park Conference*, p. 65.
- ²¹ Ringland, *Conserving Human and Natural Resources*, p. 85.
- ²² W.B. Greeley, Memorandum to District Forester, Albuquerque, NM, April 22, 1920, "D, Cooperation, National Park Service, F, Supervision" 4 pp., Federal Records Center, Denver, 095-60A0056.
- ²³ F.A. Silcox, Letter to Regional Foresters, All Regions, March 29, 1929, "C, Cooperation, Interior Department," p.1, Federal Records Center, Denver, 09560A0056.
- ²⁴ USDI National Park Service, *Management Policies* (Washington, DC, 1975), p. II-6.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, II-9.
- ²⁶ Lauver, "A History of the Use and Management of the Forested Lands of Arizona," p. 70.
- ²⁷ Paul J. Culhane, *Public Lands Politics: Interest Group Influence on the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, for Resources for the Future, Inc., 1981), pp. 122-123.
- ²⁸ John McGuire, memorandum to regional foresters, "Implementation of BLM Organic Act (P.L. 94-579)" (Washington, DC), February 17, 1977, 1 p., Federal Records Center, Ft. Worth, 095-820047.
- ²⁹ Edwin A. Tucker and George Fitzpatrick, *Men Who Matched the Mountains: The Forest Service in the Southwest* (Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service, 1972), p. 169.
- ³⁰ Quincy Randles, Assistant Regional Forester, Division of Timber Management, "memorandum for forest supervisor, Apache" (Albuquerque, NM), December 26, 1940, "F, Programs, Farm Forestry," 1 p., Federal Records Center, Denver, 095-59A0040.
- ³¹ Federal Records Center, Ft. Worth, 095-74B1639.
- ³² USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, *Improving Fish and Wildlife Benefits in Range Management*, FSW/OBS88/01 (Washington, DC: 1977), 118 pp.
- ³³ Will C. Barnes, "Attempt to Solve a National Forest Game Problem," *The Forest Worker* 2(3) (September 1926): p. 23.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.
- ³⁵ "Supreme Court Decree Permits Reduction of Kaibab Deer Herd," *The Forest Worker* 5(1) (January 1929): p.11.
- ³⁶ John P. Russo, *The Kaibab North Deer Herd-Its History, Problems and Management* (Phoenix: Arizona Game and Fish Department, Wildlife Bulletin No. 7, 1964), pp. 48-49; Walter G. Mann, "The Kaibab Deer: A Brief History and the Present Plan of Management," n.p., 1931, amended 1936 and 1941, p. 21, (filed at the Kaibab National Forest, Williams, AZ, 1685).
- ³⁷ C.E. Rachford, "Kaibab Investigation Leads to Confirmation of Forest Service Policy," *The Forest Worker* 7(4) (July 1931): pp. 13-15.
- ³⁸ Russo, *The Kaibab North Deer Herd-- Its History, Problems and Management*, pp. 15,159.
- ³⁹ *Carson Pine Cone* (June 23, 1923), p.1.
- ⁴⁰ Frank C.W. Pooler, Regional Forester, Memorandum to Forest Supervisors, Carson, Cibola, Gila, Lincoln, Santa Fe (Albuquerque, NM), April 25, 1941, "ND, Cooperation, General," 2 p., Federal Records Center, Denver, 095-60A0056.

- ⁴¹ Lee Muck, Assistant to the Secretary in Charge of Land Utilization, Department of the Interior, Memorandum to the Director, Grazing Service (same memorandum to Director, National Park Service, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Commissioner, Office of Indian Affairs, and Commissioner, General Land Office) (Washington, DC), March 15, 1943, 2 p., Federal Records Center, Denver, 095-60A0056.
- ⁴² "Fire Suppression Memorandum of Understanding Between Soil Conservation Service, Southwest Region and Forest Service Southwestern Region, Department of Agriculture, Covering Lands Within the State of Arizona" (Albuquerque, NM), May 29, 1952, 2 p. + covering letter, Federal Records Center, Ft. Worth, 095-274536; "Fire Detection Memorandum of Understanding Between Soil Conservation Service, Southwest Region, and Forest Service" (Albuquerque, NM), August 26, 1953, 2 p. + covering letter, Federal Records Center, Ft. Worth, 095-274536; "Fire Suppression Memorandum of Understanding Between Soil Conservation Service, Southwest Region, and Forest Service, Southwestern Region, Department of Agriculture, Covering Lands Within the State of Arizona," (Albuquerque, NM), March 2, 1955, 2 p. + covering letter, Federal Records Center, Ft. Worth, 095-274536.
- ⁴³ U.S. 66th Congress, First Session, House, Committee on Indian Affairs, Indians of the United States, Hearings, p. 311.
- ⁴⁴ Laurence F. Schmeckebier, *The Office of Indian Affairs: Its History, Activities and Organization* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1927), pp. 186-188.
- ⁴⁵ Duncan J. Lang, letter to Elliott S. Barker, State Game Warden, State of New Mexico, October 26, 1949, "P, Cooperation, State of New Mexico," 1 p., Federal Records Center, Denver, 095-59A0048.
- ⁴⁶ "Excerpts from the 1945 Loveridge-Cliff G.I.I. Report-Region Three-and Chief Watts' Letter of Transmittal." [1946], pp. 17-18, Federal Records Center, Denver, 095-62A0252.
- ⁴⁷ A.A. McCutchen and C.E. McDuff, "General Integrating Inspection Report, Santa Fe National Forest, June 1-24, 1948," 1948, pp. FC-2, FC-4, TM-4, TM-6, RM8, WLM-1, R-4, I&E-1, 2; Federal Records Center, Denver, 095-74A044.
- ⁴⁸ A. Allen McCutchen and Lewis W. Darby, "General Integrating Inspection Report, Kaibab National Forest, June 8-24, 1953," 1953, pp. S-7, W-6, U-3; Federal Records Center, Denver, 095-62A0421.
- ⁴⁹ Federal Records Center, Denver, 095-62A0421.
- ⁵⁰ Federal Records Center, Ft. Worth, 095-74A1639.
- ⁵¹ Lauer, "A History of the Use and Management of the Forested Lands of Arizona," pp. 66-67.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 68, 84--85; Dean E. Mann, *The Politics of Water in Arizona* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1963), p.156; and see 35 *Stat.* 260, and 36 *Stat.* 963.
- ⁵⁴ Russo, *The Kaibab North Deer Herd*, p. 6.
- ⁵⁵ Federal Records Center, Ft. Worth, 0959674B1639.
- ⁵⁶ William D. Hurst, "Joint Action Needed Between Forest Service and Arizona Game and Fish Department on Mogollon Rim Developments," Memorandum (Albuquerque, NM), May 22, 1972, 2 p.; Dale A. Jones, Memorandum to Division Chief, Range and Wildlife Management (Albuquerque, NM), May 16, 1972, 5 p., Federal Records Center, Ft. Worth, 095-741395.
- ⁵⁷ Mann, *The Politics of Water in Arizona*, p.156.
- ⁵⁸ *Carson Pine Cone* (May 3, 1920), p.1.
- ⁵⁹ Susan L. Hader, *Thinking Like a Mountain: Aldo Leopold and the Evolution of an Ecological Attitude Toward Deer, Wolves, and Forests* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1974), p.105.
- ⁶⁰ Ray L. Bell, State Forester, New Mexico Department of State Forestry (SFD), Robert A. Young, State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service (SCS), and Fred H. Kennedy, Regional Forester Forest Service (FS), "Cooperation - SFS, SCS, and FS in Forestry," n.p., June 1961, 3 p., Federal Records Center, Ft. Worth, 095-274536.
- ⁶¹ Mann, *The Politics of Water in Arizona*, pp. 157-161.
- ⁶² Harrison, "The Santa Catalinas, A Description and History," p. 111.
- ⁶³ *Carson Pine Cone* (January 10, 1920, June 10, 1920, April 27, 1923), and see *Carson Pine Cone* for January 10, 1920; March 1, 1921; March 15, 1921; February 20, 1925; January 27, 1928.
- ⁶⁴ "Natural Area Dedicated," *The Forest Worker* 4 (4) (July 1928):13-14.
- ⁶⁵ "American Airlines," Federal Records Center, Ft. Worth, 095-721694.
- ⁶⁶ William D. Hurst, "Traditional Forest Service Values," n.p., 1984, p. 4. Sent to author by William D. Hurst.

⁶⁷ Herbert Kaufman, *The Forest Ranger. A Study in Administrative Behavior* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, for Resources for the Future, Inc, 1960), p.194.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 77.