

A Proposed System of State Forests for California
to Help Solve Cutover Land and Future Unemployment Problems

Emanuel Fritz, University of California

At first glance my subject may appear to have no bearing on the war theme of this Conference. Yet, wars not only must be fought and won, but the problems they generate must be anticipated and provided for. Our victory will be an empty one if we have not placed ourselves in a position to enjoy its fruits. My subject therefore deals with post-war reconstruction.

President Roosevelt has already directed that federal bureaus give thought to and make plans for post-war public works; a committee of state governors almost a year ago pledged to him, among other things, to "Begin preparing programs of useful post-war public works."

I propose that the State of California create an extensive system of state forests by acquiring idle cutover lands and restoring, their productivity, so that once again they will produce timber and payrolls. The State Chamber of Commerce went on record some years ago as favoring the creation of State forests. No action is therefore necessary on your part, at present, but you should know of the present effort since it gives life to your proposal.

In the process of forest restoration we can at the same time substantially aid in relieving post-war unemployment distress. The two go together very nicely, with benefit to both; but acquisition of the lands must be gotten under way without delay so that adequate plans to meet both problems can be readied by the war's end.

This proposal is the latest in a long series but is probably the first one with concrete recommendations, and the first one to have been approved by the State Board of Forestry.

Importance of California Forests

California's forests are incomparable in beauty and in utility. They helped the pioneer to create and develop mines, farms, industries, railroads, shipping, and cities. They are an important factor in building up water supplies for domestic and industrial uses and for the farmer's irrigation. They provide sport for the hunter and fisherman, and wholesome recreation for the outdoor-minded citizen. Lumbering itself ranks as one of our greatest industries; its products have an annual value of about \$50,000,000 and its payrolls are about 15 per cent of the state's total. Our forests have given us all these benefits since the white man arrived; they are still doing it and they can continue to do so. Our timber species are valuable, our forest soil is highly productive and our climate is conducive to maximum possible yields.

Excluding parks, foothill woodlands and other lightly timbered areas, California is believed to have 13,655,000 acres of commercial timberland. Already about 5,000,000 acres have been cut over. The timber removed has served useful purposes, but in cutting it we have not always made due provision for regrowth, with the result that a large share of the cutover area is not now producing what it should and could produce. Of the 5,000,000 acres cut over, 1,935,000 acres, if U.S. Forest Service estimates are correct, is practically loafing. We have been profligate in our use of timber and neglectful of the future in our cutting practices. Superabundance of timber made us wasteful and thoughtless. To heap

abuse upon those who cut our forests with no provision for the future solves nothing. The loggers were no more guilty of deliberate abuse than the rest of the citizenry and their elected representatives. The State itself has done nothing to make better practices possible, and it has given cutover land reforestation no official attention. Instead of calling past forest treatment an abuse it were better to call it a mistake, though the results are the same. Young states, like young people, learn best from their errors.

Cutover lands are the inevitable result of forest utilization, just like a bare field results from the harvest of a farm crop, no matter who controls the operations. Cutover lands can be left in a variety of conditions as to their ability to produce another crop promptly, ranging from absolute denudation over large areas with no hope of natural regeneration for centuries to selective logging with the nucleus for a new crop already established. In all cases, unless the denudation is accompanied by excessive soil deterioration and repeated fires, man can help nature expedite the production of another crop cheaply.

Condition of California Cutover Lands

Some of our older cutover lands are already being logged a second time. This is because the earliest logging unconsciously followed a rough selective system--at least some seed trees were left.

With the growth of lumbering and the introduction of powerful steam donkey engines and cable systems of yarding, logging became very destructive. Actual utilization, itself, changed but little. What the early logger didn't want he left standing, but under the steam cable systems the unutilized trees were pulled down, thus obliterating the source of seed essential for reproduction.

Since the last war logging has undergone revolutionary changes in the pine region and more recently in the redwood region. The advent of the tractor made it possible to return to a selective system of logging, with immature trees left standing to continue their growth and to shed seed for reforesting the gaps. Protection against fire also has improved. More significant is the conscious thought increasingly being given to leaving the cutover lands in a productive condition.

Why State Forests?

If our cutover lands, in general, were in a more productive condition there would be no cause for concern for the future of California's forest industries, their payrolls, and the stability of the dependent communities. Most of the lands cut over in the earliest days, and the much larger area logged selectively in recent years are reproducing satisfactorily. But the lands logged in the clear-cutting days present a real problem. They are idle. Worse, they are liabilities. They cost money to protect without their yielding commensurate returns. They produce very little tree growth. Many of them are brushfields. The taxes paid on them are almost only nominal. The dependent counties derive very little revenue from them and they show none but a dubious or, at best, distant possibility of again furnishing saw logs and payrolls. They might as well not exist. But many of them have real possibilities. Originally they supported some of our best and most accessible timber. Being good growing sites they can be again made to produce timber, substantial in quantity, quality, and value. But they need the help of technically trained forest land managers. Nature, left alone, cannot do the job promptly. What is needed to get them back into production is well known to foresters who have studied the problem, and it is well within the realm of economic possibility for public agencies.

In recent years an old movement to convert cutover lands into stock ranches has gained momentum. This aggravates the problem of future timber production and the stability of the local forest communities. As a rule, these lands, both pine and redwood, have only a temporary utility for profitable stock raising. To make good and permanent grazing grounds of them requires costs in excess of their economic value. Usually they are merely burned frequently, but, being absolute forest lands,

brush, the forerunner of timber, takes possession. The result is a further degradation of the producing capacity of the lands for anything, of value and their removal, ultimately, from the feasibility of economical forest regeneration. This movement to convert absolute forest lands into stock ranges is dangerous to the future welfare of the forest communities.

Some owners are not in a position themselves to regenerate those lands mistakenly logged too close in the steam-logging days. The long wait to mature a crop makes it an unattractive venture for private capital; furthermore, many owners are not too optimistic of the future of business. The more optimistic owners, however, will prefer to continue to hold their cutover lands and wait out the changing times to decide what they themselves can do with them.

If the State undertakes forest restoration and thereby proves its interest and competence in taking leadership in forestry matters, it would present one of the surest ways of forestalling the energetic and persistent efforts of the federal forestry agency to encroach further upon state functions and arrogate control of all forest lands in California to itself. This is a State job. California is big enough to do it without federal pressure or help. If it is left undone, the State is not true to its traditions of independence and self help.

Private ownership would be preferable to public ownership. It could do the job more cheaply, but, unless the State makes reforestation attractive to private enterprise, the cutover lands will continue idle. Incidentally, lands held privately could not be used by the State for the employment of jobless men in an unemployment emergency and the relief money may have to be spent on less "durable" work. During the last emergency very few of the many CCC camps operated by the State Forester worked on state-owned land.

The State must share responsibility for the condition of our cutover lands, largely because of its past lack of interest. Now the job of regenerating old cutovers has become too big for private owners to handle on a wholesale scale.

Consequently, it appears that if reforestation on a large scale is an early necessity, the State must do it itself. By purchasing the critical lands it can also halt their conversion into doubtful stock ranges; and will have lands of its own for employing future jobless men. This latter feature will be referred to again later.

Why Cutover Land for State Forests?

It would seem to be more logical for Sate forests to start off as virgin timber so that cutting could proceed according to a conservative plan. However, the day for acquiring extensive areas of well-located virgin timber is past. It would be excessively costly, and we would still have the nonreproducing cutovers to bring back into productivity. Here and there some tracts, not now accessible, can be bought very cheaply, and such opportunities should be considered. Also, some virgin timber is likely to come into possession of the State through tax delinquencies, but it is so located that operations are not practicable for perhaps several decades and thus could not serve as demonstrations of cutting practices now, when they are most needed. It is interesting to note that relatively few cutover lands are delinquent as against virgin lands, largely because the cost of holding cutovers is light compared to holding standing timber reserves.

Cutover land presents California's most pressing forest problem. The problem of more conservative handling of virgin forest is rapidly correcting itself.

What Kinds of Lands to Buy?

Emphasis should be placed on inadequately reproducing but promising cutover lands in making purchases for state forests, but there are cases where remnants of the original growth are part and parcel of cutover tracts. Such remnants should be acquired along with the cutovers. Being remnants does not mean they are inferior, rather, they ordinarily are as good as what was cut and were left for a variety of other reasons. Where, as before stated, presently inaccessible tracts of virgin land are available cheaply, their purchase should be considered. But the present proposal concerns primarily cutover lands.

Some cutover lands present no reforestation problems, and are already producing good crops of second growth. However, to help balance the future State forests some of such reforested areas also should be acquired. Ordinarily they are integral parts of nonreproducing blocks of land and are necessary to build up manageable units. Acquisition of such lands would prevent their premature second logging, would give the State's foresters an excellent opportunity to work out desirable cutting practices for demonstration to owners who do not wish to sell, and should prove to be particularly good investments, since they can be bought cheaply and can be made to yield returns very early.

There are some cutover lands, which, because of repeated fires and other abuses, are too far gone for even the State to regenerate economically. These may have to be acquired to round out boundaries. Their purchase cost will be very low and they would serve as effective buffer areas to the reforestation areas; but no money, other than for minimum protection, should be spent upon them, at least for some decades.

Purposes and Concomitant Benefits

Obviously the primary purpose of a State forest should be the production of wood for ultimate harvesting and utilization. There are, however, certain incidental and concomitant benefits which should be given due attention though not at the expense of or infringement on the major purpose. These include water supply insurance for power, irrigation, and other uses; recreation, hunting and fishing. State forests are essential, too, to the training of the State's own forestry personnel to increase their competence as advisers to private owners, particularly small ones. Our State forestry staff is large and a growing number of the men have technical forestry training. Their work at present is almost wholly fire protection; they need opportunity for practical experience in actual forestry.

State forests should make useful and much needed demonstration areas of cutting practices for guiding private owners, and for promoting wiser use of forest resources and the development of forest potentialities.

Acquisition Policies

The primary purpose--the production of timber for ultimate harvesting--must guide the selection and purchase of forest lands, though with due regard to the incidental benefits. The suitability and desirability of the lands sought or offered for sale to accomplish the major purpose should be kept constantly in mind. Therefore, the following must be considered: the present condition of the cutover lands; their possibilities and probable response to management; the growing conditions or site factors; the cost of restoration; the possible returns as to time and amount; the importance of their rehabilitation to local industries and communities; their suitability for the incidental uses--hunting, fishing, recreation, water supplies, fur culture, and trapping; their area as influencing economical management units; and their suitability for employing a large number of jobless men on productive work in unemployment emergencies. In general, the lands must be "good buys" for state investment. To be "good buys" their first cost must be reasonable, their rehabilitation practically and financially feasible, and the returns early and substantial. In other words, good business practices should prevail so that there is ample assurance the taxpayer's money is recoverable with a profit.

Purchase Areas to be Set Up

To systematize purchases for State forests, a series of purchase areas should be set up. The exterior boundaries, as far as possible, should follow natural physiographic lines, and they should enclose all those lands considered suitable and desirable for stated State forest purposes. Once the State Board of Forestry has approved purchase areas and has set up a priority guide, all purchases should be confined to within the boundaries of the areas. Such action prevent control by sectional, interests and forestall the introduction before the Legislature of separate and unrelated bills for purchases of areas not considered of State forest timber-producing caliber. The present Board appointed Mr. Fred M. Dunow of the State Division of Forestry, Mr. C.R. Tillotson of the U.S. Forest Service, and the writer as chairman, to act as a technical committee to report, among other things, on possible purchase areas. Such a list is to be presented on December 28, 19420, at its final meeting before it goes out of office.

Exceptions may arise. Some desirable small areas may be offered for sale at very attractive prices, which would serve well as local demonstration areas. Care must be exercised, however, that the principal aim--timber production--is met. For this reason, State forests will have to be generally located in timbered counties. However, since the southern half of the State, though not a commercial timber-producing region, has problems of a forestry nature involving mainly afforestation and which need solution; a purchase area of limited extent may be found desirable there.

The board should take steps early to set up in the Division of Forestry an Office of State Forests for centralizing studies, surveys, purchases, and planning affecting prospective State forests.

Purchase areas should enclose from 50,000 acres up to about 150,000 acres. All lands within an area may not be desirable nor available, particularly since some open natural grasslands, now used for grazing, may be involved. Should virgin timber areas be included which the State cannot or does not desire to purchase, but which it would desire when the timber is removed, the State Forester should undertake to enter into precutting agreements with the owners, at the same time stipulating the price to be paid for the property when cut, to assure the lands being left in a desirable State forest condition.

Priorities of Purchases

Once a general plan is prepared, purchases should be made according to the relative suitability and desirability of the available lands for the stated State forest purposes. Essentially and logically that unit which is the "best buy" and best meets the specifications of a State forest, as just outlined, should be purchased first.

What Should be the Goal?

The State should not be ambitious to acquire all cutover lands if a State forest acquisition program is undertaken. But there should be a good representation of them, and the probable future of the lands, if not bought, should receive consideration. Some owners will not wish to sell; some lands will not make suitable State forests; as much as possible should be left for private enterprise for the time when conditions make it attractive; some cutovers may have a higher use, ultimately, than for timber growing; and a large total in small holdings is too scattered for economical administration and management.

For the present the State should set as its Goal a total of 1,000,000 acres, to be acquired over a period of, say, ten years.

Attitude of Owners and County Officials

As already indicated some owners are not in a position to reforest the cutovers themselves, or they are

prevented from investing in the venture by their distrust of the anti-industry attitude of some branches of our federal government; some, too, are not too sure that wood has a future. Such owners will entertain offers for purchases. Others look forward to remaining permanently in the business of converting trees into lumber, plywood, chemicals, plastics, or other products, and will not wish to sell. A number of owners have kept their properties intact, taxes have been paid regularly, and the lands have been given at least the minimum requirements of protection. This is fortunate for the proposed acquisition program.

County officials naturally look askance at taking taxable property off the assessment rolls. In the main, their opposition in the past has been directed toward the removal of virgin timberland or heavy potential revenue-producing property. Toward idle cutover lands, however, their attitude has been found to be different. They appreciate the importance to their communities of returning these lands to an income-producing status, and that the direct loss in taxes would be inconsequential. To paraphrase the comment of several assessors on State forests, "It is the best thing that could happen to the old cutovers. We could forego the small revenues now derived for the greater benefits to accrue in the future."

Even should all the available lands included in the suggested purchase areas be acquired, the loss to any one county, except one, would not exceed several thousand dollars annually.

No important opposition is anticipated from the county officials, but, in fairness to the counties the State, in taking over the lands, should make some provision for reimbursing the county treasuries either by paying the current annual taxes, or to guarantee a specified percentage of the gross returns when rehabilitation is completed and yields are possible.

The attitude of the general public, if experience in other states is a good criterion, should be favorable. In general, it has a high regard for forests, wants to see useless lands made productive and approves conservative cutting that assures continuity of growth.

The Future of Wood

A skeptic may question the wisdom of investing money in cutover lands for growing more timber when wood must compete, nowadays, with a large number of other and new materials and that per capita consumption has decreased. The future of wood is secure, although drastic changes may be expected. It is definitely not an outmoded material. Even before World War II started this was clearly evident. Germany's might, for example, is predicated as much on forests as on mines. Germans call wood their Universalrohstoff--the universal raw material. Hitler certainly did not make Goering chief forester to gratify the latter's penchant for additional uniforms. It was to mobilize the forest completely. From timber the Germans are getting a great variety of products essential to war--alcohol, cellulose products, airplane stock, and wood gas to run autos--to name only a few. Lumber, wood pulp, plywood, piling, poles, crossties, are the standard products, of course, and as long as they continue to be easy to they will retain their eminence. Wood has one overpowering advantage over minerals--it can be reproduced. The importance of wood in war is evidenced by the government's declaring it a critical material and freezing workers to their jobs. We dare not gamble that the present war is our last. Shall the next one find us without an abundance of wood? If not, the best of cutover lands must be put to work at once, because it takes decades to mature a crop.

What Will the Program Cost?

Cutover lands have sold in the past for from \$1.00 to more than \$10.00 per acre according to the condition, location and value to the buyer. Large blocks have sold for \$2.50 per acre in recent years, and others can yet be bought for that. Some owners, recognizing the value of second growth and the

imminence of returns therefrom will ask considerably more for lands already well stocked. For purchase alone, a program of 1,000,000 acres of cutover land, including some young forest growth and remnants of old growth, will cost about \$5,500,000. To this should be added costs of examinations, surveys, appraisals, title searches, and like procedures affecting transfer of land.

Cutover lands are cheap now. They will never be cheaper. Purchases made now can be made at prices making the State forests sound investments.

For the first biennium, the appropriation for purchases should be \$1,000,000, and it should be made available until expended. A wise purchase policy demands thoroughgoing examinations, surveys and appraisal to determine the suitability and desirability of lands for State forest purposes. These take so much time that the data may not be available for all tracts by the end of the fiscal biennium. There should be an additional appropriation of \$50,000 for making the preliminary studies and surveys.

First costs should be regarded as investments for future returns. Eventually the State forests should be self-supporting with a profit to the public on its investment in the project. In fact, at present prices, the purchase program should be self-liquidating.

Cost of Administration and Management

Actual administration and management, at first, should be limited to protection and the preparation of management plans including plans of work for relief camps. Obviously, no expenditure for such work is required until title is actually acquired. Should the 1943 Legislature act on this proposal, it may be 1944 before the first title changes hands. Therefore, a sum of only \$10,000 should be ample and should be appropriated separately.

When sizable areas have been accumulated and State forest units are completed, future legislatures will have to appropriate additional money for administration and management, until returns can be realized. Returns will not be large during the first ten or twenty years, the income depending, of course, upon the present condition of the lands bought. Thereafter, they should increase rapidly and eventually more than cover costs.

Possibility of Returns

In the Eastern States forest returns come predominantly from second growth. This is particularly true in the great Southern Pine belt. Tens of millions of cutover acres were ignored by their owners who regarded timber a one-crop resource. But the young volunteer trees grew and gradually reached merchantability. Then, almost unnoticed, small mills began converting it into lumber. Today, perhaps 90 per cent of the southern pine cut is second growth and it brings stumpage prices that appear fabulous to us in the West. Sales at \$5.00 per thousand are not uncommon and many have been made for considerably more. This was not a wartime increase.

In the West we cannot expect such values yet. Nevertheless, second-growth ponderosa pine in the Sierra pine belt is already commanding \$2.00 per thousand feet. As a result of the maritime strikes in the 1930's, supplies of piling from the Northwest were cut off and this product was sought in our California second-growth forests and found to be abundant. A new industry developed rapidly. Stumpage on young Douglas-fir piling is commonly \$1.00 per tree. Some foresighted buyers of second-growth Douglas-fir have already taken off enough piling alone to pay for the property. These facts are cited to call attention to the values already placed on California second growth in the infancy of its utilization.

Future returns depend much on anticipated growth. In the pine region volunteer growth has been found

to range from 100 to nearly 500 board feet per acre per year. In the redwood region annual growths exceeding 2,000 board feet per acre have been measured by the author, but the average is considerably less. Growth rate depends not only on the site, but also on the density of stocking. Most of our cutover lands, though on excellent sites, are understocked. This deficiency can be corrected by certain forestry measures. Quality also can be improved. Such improvements of growth on State forests are well worth their cost.

In addition to saw logs and piling, the state forests should become profitable sources of poles, pulpwood, chemical wood, Christmas trees, tan bark, Cascara oak, alder, and other products.

A well balanced State forest acquisition program will include the purchase of lands already reforested from seed trees. Early returns from such lands are quite possible, though it should be preferable to delay actual cutting until the State forests are well established and complete management plans have been prepared.

It is contemplated that the State forests will be used to provide work for future jobless men. The money spent for their relief would serve a double purpose if applied to growth improvement work in the State's own forests. The State forests do not get something for nothing from such employment, nevertheless, it is a more certain way of getting more for the relief dollar than was gotten in the depression of the 1930's.

Precedents

There are plenty of precedents establishing the wisdom of State forests. Several states have had State forests for more than forty years and their citizens would be as favorable to giving them up as they would be to losing the war. New York, for example, leads with 2,776,330 acres. In 1932 its voters mandated it to undertake a program of acquisition and reforestation of 1,000,000 acres of abandoned farm land, to cost \$20,000,000. Already 457,974 acres have been acquired and most of it has been reforested. Pennsylvania, Michigan, Minnesota, and Oregon each own more than 1,000,000 acres each. Some states have a definite program for additional purchases. Most of the State forests in the United States have been created from cutover lands and on them we find some of the best forestry practices in the country. These forests have been highly successful and have won public favor and satisfaction.

California is one of the few forested states without State forests. This is incongruous, because California has the largest and one of the oldest state forestry departments in the United States. It was set up in 1885 for strictly forestry purposes, one being to collect and disseminate information on forest practices designed to keep forest lands continuously productive. Yet without State forests it could not give advice based on actual experience. Consequently, it developed largely along fire-protection lines, so that today it is more correctly a fire department than a complete forestry department.

California is far behind its sister western states. Its resources, its rapid growth, and its future needs should prompt it to take leadership in actual forestry work, and not alone in fire protection.

Legislation Required

No special legislation is needed to enable the State to buy lands for State forests except the necessary appropriation acts. The 1937 Legislature passed "An act authorizing The Director of Natural Resources to receive and hold land for forestry purposes, to enter into agreements with the Federal Government or other agencies for acquiring by lease, purchase or otherwise such lands as are desirable for State forests, to manage such land and to dispose of the products thereof, and providing for the distribution of revenue therefrom, and to acquire land for development for State forestry purposes to make an appropriation therefore, ..." (Stats. 1937, Chap. 309)

Since timber production is a long-time process there must be stability of policies. There is not sufficient assurance of such stability or continuity at present in the policy-making body-the State Board of Forestry. The present Board has embraced the State forest proposal with enthusiasm and has assigned a man to it for preliminary studies. But the term of office of each Board may end with each change in the governorship. It were far better to lengthen the term of office to seven years and put the terms of the seven members on a staggered or overlapping basis. At the same time the status of the Board as a policy-making body and as to its authority should be clarified.

Unemployment Emergency Work Features

It is the likelihood of a post-war unemployment stringency that gives immediate weight to the desirability of a State forest program, and why action in buying cutover lands should not be delayed. Remembering our experience in coping with unemployment during the 1930's, its inordinate cost, its waste, and its failure to produce tangible results commensurate with the cost, it would seem best for the State to own forest land to which the labor can be applied on works that appreciate in value with time, accomplish at once the two desirable objectives of restoring cutover lands and ameliorative social distress, and cause the relief money to come back with interest rather than forever be a loss. The forest is a huge work reservoir. It responds rapidly and handsomely to activities affecting future growth and yield. Such work as liberation of crowded trees from overtopping brush or from other trees, pruning selected specimens, planting and seeding, and the like, sets nature to work without entailing future maintenance costs. In contrast, much of the relief work of the 1930's entailed heavy future maintenance, and deteriorated when this was not provided. There would be, of course, also some work like road building for developing access to the State property and its products and for its protection, and perhaps stream improvement for better spawning grounds. Forest work is fascinating and wholesome; and it has an elevating effect in the morale of men in distress.

All such work requires advance planning and, before plans are started, the land must be owned. Even if an emergency does not develop for several years after the War it is not too early now to acquire lands and prepare plans.

Of so-called "deficit spending," a recent author, Richard M. Bissell, Jr., in Fortune for July 1942, writes that it "should take the form either of direct outlays for the creation of productive assets and for raising productivity or else of direct government subsidies to private investment." Subsidies are abhorrent to most Americans, but spending to create assets is generally approved. Spending for State forests meets this pattern nicely and effectively.

Competition with Private Enterprise

The State should engage only in timber growing, and its business activity should be limited to selling ripe trees on advertised bids. Logging and sawmilling should be left to private enterprise. Should the State ultimately acquire 1,000,000 acres of forest land, largely cutovers, it will be about 20 per cent of the total present cutover area but only about 7 per cent of the total commercial timber area.

Summary

A program of cutover land acquisition for future State forests is proposed for the pine and redwood regions.

There are about 5,000,000 acres off cutover land in the State at present, varying from, wholly nonreproducing land to well stocked second growth.

About 2,000,000 acres need help to put them back into production. This land once supported the best

and most accessible timber. It is now idle, but it is capable of again producing timber and payrolls.

About 1,000,000 acres should be acquired for State forests.

The program would cost a total of \$5,000,000 over a period of ten years. The first appropriation should be for \$1,000,000 for purchases, available until expanded; plus \$50,000 for surveys and appraisals and \$10,000 for management plans.

Taking the property off the tax rolls would not seriously affect local finances. But some plan must be evolved to compensate the counties either by payments equal to current taxes or a share of the returns.

Timber growing for ultimate harvest and utilization should be the primary purpose of acquisition and management, with water supplies, recreation, hunting, fishing, etc. not omitted.

Other states have such programs and they are successful. California has the largest forestry department, but does little forestry work aside from fire protection.

Policies must be established early. Purchase units need to be set up. Continuity of policy must be provided for by lengthening the terms of the State Board of Forestry members and staggering their terms.

Existing laws provide the authority for purchases. There is more required now only the appropriation acts.

A set of principles must be set up early to guide the purchase program. Use of the State forests for unemployment relief work is an integral feature. This work would be designed to regenerate the lands, increase and improve the growth in quantity and quality. Such labor brings tangible results in greater ultimate yields.

November 30, 1942

[Home](#) | [Historical Documents](#)