A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF CONSOLIDATION

at the

NATIONAL FOREST AND DISTRICT LEVEL

in the

U.S. FOREST SERVICE

May, 2007

Analysis and Report by
Tom L. Thompson
T. L. Thompson Consulting, L.L.C.
303-552-1711
tommylthompson@comcast.net
Littleton, Colorado

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Historical Analysis of Consolidation at the National Forest and District Level In the U. S. Forest Service

T. L. Thompson Consulting, L.L.C.
Littleton, Colorado
May, 2007

Executive Summary:

This report documents, in a historical context, organizational change at the forest and ranger district levels of the National Forest System over the hundred-year history of the U.S. Forest Service. Using tables provided in the Appendix for each region within the agency, individual forest information can be tracked for every forest over time. The tables, which were developed using organizational directories dating back to 1905, display when forests were established and what happened to them over the course of time. Numbers of ranger districts that existed on individual forests at select periods of time on a ten-year interval are also provided.

At present there are 113 organizational units at the forest level. Since 1891, when the first forest reserve was created, there have been a total of 380 forests or forest level units established. The analysis done for this project indicates at least 278 units have been combined or consolidated and 94 units remained or were specifically created in the process. In the early part of the Forest Service history, most of these combinations were done by Executive Order or by congressional action; however, since the 1950's, most have been done administratively within the agency. A number of combined units are comprised of more than one originally established forests so there are actually 155 national forests still remaining, plus the Dakota Prairie Grassland, the Midewin Tallgrass Prairie, and the Land Between the Lands units.

In 1920, when Ranger Districts were first being organized, there were 821 ranger districts, and most were in the west. In the following years, another 137 were established in the south and east as forests were created under the authority of the Weeks Act of 1911. There were also another 27 districts added in the west in California, Oregon, and Alaska. So in total there have been at least 985 districts in existence at one time or another. Today there are 523 ranger districts.

The Rocky Mountain geographic area, which includes Regions 1-4, has seen the greatest reductions in numbers of districts with 323 fewer. The Pacific area, with Regions 5 and 6, and Region 10 in Alaska have 87 fewer districts in total today. Regions 8 and 9 in the east have 52 less than they had in their peak years.

Changes in organizations at both the forest and district level have been influenced by budgets, development of programs, workload shifts, changes in transportation and technology, leadership direction, and loss or addition of lands.

Introduction and Description of Analysis:

As part of a study being undertaken of recent consolidations in the National Forest System, an interest was expressed in developing a history that would provide background and perspective about how National Forests and District organizations have changed or shifted over the past hundred years. This report provides a historical picture of change in Forest and District organizations nationwide. It illustrates how these organizations have changed, have been changed, and continue to be change.

The report provides an overview of organization and structural changes that have led to the current number and location of both forests and districts nationwide. Factors that likely have influenced or been reason for changes have been identified. The historical analysis which was done to develop the conclusions and perspectives developed in the report was conducted by compiling information and preparing tables and summaries which help record and illustrate a history of how individual forests changed as well as the cumulative effect of those changes. This report and/or its the findings will be included as part of the larger analysis and report.

A number of documents were reviewed and used to develop information about how forests and districts changed since the time of establishment of the Forest Service in 1905. To gain insight into what organizational factors may have influenced change, a review was made of national and regional historical writings, establishment and modification records, and directories of the Forest Service Organization. Regional historical publications were very helpful. Some regions do not have their specific history documented in a published form so it was difficult to depend or rely upon that source. Consistency in information from these sources was also problematic because none were done at the same time and all used a somewhat different approach of documentation.

The approach used to develop the data necessary to understand regional and national trends involved a review of organization directories dating back to 1905. The sampling procedure involved using directory information from at a single point in time in each decade starting in 1911 and ending in 2001. The most current published directory from 2004 was used as the basis for the present situation even though it is recognized that there have been additional changes since 2004. Information from other sources was used to help display the initial establishment and adjustments that were made prior to directories being used to document current organizations.

Forest Service publication FS-612, “Establishment and Modification of National Forest Boundaries and National Grasslands” which was completed in November 1997 by the National Forest System Washington Office lands staff, was used to help develop the framework for the regional summary charts which are included in this report. Publication

FS-612 also was very important in confirming chronological record of organizational changes indicated within the historical directories.

Findings and conclusions described later in this report have for the most part been drawn from evaluation of the data summarized from the analysis specifically done for this history project. There are individual Regional summary tables in Appendix A that provides the basic information, which is used throughout this report. These data are as accurate as the directories are themselves and some interpretation was necessary for consistency.

Regional Organization Structure:

Organization information in this report has been principally organized by Regional categories. Since there have been a number of changes to the regional headquarters organizations over the years, it is important to understand the evolution of Regional headquarters offices as we know them today. For purposes of comparison every attempt has been made to keep consistency in numbers even though the Regional organization structure changed, especially in Regions 8, Region 9, Region 10, and the disbanded Region 7.

Early subdivision of field offices was by Districts. Six District offices were established in 1908 as follows:

District 1	Missoula, Montana	Montana and parts of Washington, Idaho, S. Dakota, Michigan, Minnesota, and N. Dakota
District 2	Denver, Colorado	Colorado, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Michigan
District 3	Albuquerque, New Mexico	New Mexico, Arizona, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Florida
District 4	Ogden, Utah	Utah, Nevada, and parts of Wyoming, Idaho, and Arizona
District 5	San Francisco, California	California and part of Nevada
District 6	Portland, Oregon	Oregon, Washington, and Alaska

District 7 was added in 1914. Existing forests in the eastern part of the country and new forests added principally under the authority of the Weeks Act of 1911 came under the responsibility of that subdivision. In the early twenties, District 8 was created to represent Alaska separately. Until then Alaska had been a part of District 6 headquartered in Portland, Oregon. Michigan and Minnesota forests, which had been a part of District 1, were moved in this period also to be under District 2. Forests in these states remained under District 2 until 1929 when District 9 was created in the Lake States.

In 1930 these regional organizations were designated Regions rather than Districts. In 1934 a separate region (Region 8) was created for the south and the Alaska Region was changed from Region 8 and became Region 10. Region 7 remained in the northeast until

the mid-sixties after the Deckerd Report questioned its viability and a decision was made to eliminate it by Chief Cliff.[i] Region 7 forests were divided logically between the existing Region 8 and Region 9.

There have been no major adjustments or changes to Regions since the mid-sixties even though some have been evaluated and proposed. The nine Regions cover the U.S. Forest Service's responsibility for management of nearly 193 million acres of National Forest System land as illustrated in Table 1:

Table 1

Region/Name	States	NFS Acres	# Forest	# Districts	# Personnel
		Based on 2005 data[ii]	Based on 2004 data	Based on 2004 Data	Based on 1993 Data[iii]
Region 1 Northern	Montana, northern Idaho, North Dakota and part of South Dakota	25,450,317	13	61	3,335
Region 2 Rocky Mtn.	Colorado, Nebraska, South Dakota, eastern Wyoming, and Kansas	22,088,183	11	50	1,955
Region 3 Southwest	New Mexico, Arizona, and a part of Oklahoma and Texas	20,809,796	11	53	2,287
Region 4 Intermountain	Utah, Nevada, western Wyoming, southern Idaho, and piece California/Colo.	32,025,617	13	70	2,617
Region 5 Pacific S.W.	California, piece of Nevada, Hawaii, Guam, and the Pacific Trust Territories	20,181,995	17	65	5,715
Region 6 Pacific N.W.	Oregon and Washington	24,803,002	16	68	6,714
Region 8 Southern	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, SC, NC, MS, OK, TX, TN, LA, PR, VA, and VI	13,305,609	15	89	3,795
Region 9 Eastern	IL, IN, ME, MA, MO, MN, MI, NH, VT, NY, OH, PA, WV, WI	12,094,684	15	54	2,421
Region 10 Alaska	Alaska	21,973,139	2	13	854
		192,732,342	113	523	29,693

Influence of the national budget:

Funding is generally viewed as the major influencing factor in determining organizational size and structure. The Forest Service's budget within U.S. Department of Agriculture is ultimately driven by national priorities and by annual congressional appropriations action. In review of historical writings, the budget is repeated referenced in discussions of organizational study or change at both the Forest and District levels. In a decentralized organization, ultimately success depends upon how much money finds its way down into the working or producing level. In 1903 the Department of Interior budget for managing about 61 million acres of forest reserves was approximately three hundred thousand

dollars, which was just over a quarter of a cent per acre available for the work of the ranger on the ground when other expenses were taken away.[iv] In 1905-1906, the newly formed Forest Service had a budget of over nine hundred thousand and the budget would continue to increase as forests were added and the organization developed programs and structure. Even though there were rangers and ranger stations, it was not until the early 1920's that a system of Ranger Districts existed as we know and understand it today. The automobile was still in its early years of development and roads were few and far between. The automobile would ultimately change significantly the need for and the location of many of the first established districts.

In 1931, as the nation struggled with a dust bowl and depression, the budget was $27.3 million[v] and did not change much for a number of years. In 1940, just before World War II, as a result of increased need and partly because of dedicated work of the Civilian Conservation Corps, there were 87,000 miles of road on the National Forests. War demands for forest products were great and development of the National Forests began in earnest. The timber program went from 1.5 billion board feet in 1941 to 4.1 billion board feet in 1951.[vi]

By 1951 the budget had grown to $82.2 million.[vii] The agency responded to the Housing Act of 1949 and tried to serve nearly 150 million people, many of whom wanted to build homes in a new suburban neighborhood and were learning to recreate on the public lands.

By 1961, the timber program had grown to 8.3 billion board feet[viii] and there were over 160,000 miles of road. In 1971, the timber program was at around 11.5 billion board feet[ix] and the budget was $676.6 million.[x] Even so in the 1972 budget hearings, the Chief indicated that the agency didn't know how to provide everything expected in the new era of environmental awareness and that the "Forest Service cannot do the things the President has directed us to do without more money and people".[xi]

With a fuller understanding of what the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 meant and with new expectations of the public translated into statutes like the Endangered Species Act and the National Forest Management Act[xii], the budget quickly reached a billion and then into the two billion range by 1979. The eighties saw increased specialization throughout the agency along with increased emphasis on environmental assessment, planning, appeals, and responding to lawsuits.

As the dawn of "New Perspectives" and "ecosystem management" emerged in 1991[xiii] the budget rose to $3.2 billion.[xiv] The complexity of the organization and the changes that the agency saw in the nineties, especially in the Pacific Northwest, caused tremendous adjustment and major budget and workforce adjustments. Presently, in 2007 the agency has a budget of $5.0 billion, which is down from $5.5 billion just two years ago.

In review of the information in Table 2 on the following page, it can be seen that there have been ups and downs over the years even as the budget has generally continued to increase overall. It was quite often in the down years that efforts were made to reduce

costs by making changes in organization by combining offices and reducing overhead. For example, in 1943 Chief Lyle Watts directed a team of three Regional Foresters to look at consolidating some forests "to obtain greater efficiency and promote more economical use of Government funds."[xv] The overall budget had dropped over 17 per cent down to $30.4 million in just four years since 1939.

Even though the appropriated budget does give some indication of the potential stress or satisfaction in agency organizational structure, the amount of funding actually getting to the Forest and District levels does not necessarily track with the appropriated trends. Overhead costs and a number of other related factors have actually been just as dominant factors in determining how much of a appropriated dollar finds its way to the ground. With a string of high cost fire years starting in 2000, the agency now finds itself with over 45% of a $5 billion budget committed to fire suppression and other associated fire activities. This is a huge impact to district and forest organizations trying to keep programs viable.

It is estimated that today less than thirty percent of the $5 billion Forest Service budget is available for normal business at the Regional, Forest, and District level. In 1994, just over ten years ago, approximately fifty percent of $3.6 billion was available to directly manage the 193 million acres of National Forest System land.[xvi] With no adjustment for increases in costs or complexity of management today, there is easily $300 million less available today of the appropriated budget for the National Forest System

Table 2

TOTAL FOREST SERVICE BUDGET 1931-2007
APPROPRIATION ACT IN NOMINAL DOLLARS[xvii]

Year	Budget (Millions)	Year	Budget (Millions)	Year	Budget (Millions)	Year	Budget (Millions)
1931	27.3	1951	82.2	1971	676.6	1991	3,223.5
1932	33.6	1952	98.1	1972	778.7	1992	3,754.1
1933	*24.9*	1953	102.9	1973	850.3	1993	*3,347.1*
1934	*19.2*	1954	108.0	1974	*795.9*	1994	*3,539.3*
1935	*12.6*	1955	111.0	1975	987.0	1995	*3,599.7*
1936	*21.8*	1956	132.2	1976	1,064.1	1996	*3,189.1*
1937	29.0	1957	158.0	1977	1,281.2	1997	*3,387.6*
1938	33.9	1958	203.0	1978	1,778.6	1998	*3,504.8*
1939	36.4	1959	*198.6*	1979	2,035.1	1999	*3,402.9*
1940	*33.1*	1960	217.1	1980	*2,032.3*	2000	*3,685.9*
1941	*29.6*	1961	249.0	1981	2,078.1	2001	5,263.7
1942	*32.7*	1962	301.8	1982	*1,906.1*	2002	*4,794.9*
1943	*30.4*	1963	321.8	1983	*1,963.9*	2003	5,532.3
1944	*32.2*	1964	363.9	1984	2,082.3	2004	*5,257.2*
1945	36.8	1965	382.1	1985	*1,943.2*	2005	5,546.2
1946	40.7	1966	490.7	1986	2,480.2	2006	*5,048.4*
1947	72.4	1967	522.0	1987	*2,306.8*	2007	*5,012.5*
1948	*64.4*	1968	556.1	1988	2,553.1	2008	
1949	*66.3*	1969	*536.7*	1989	---	2009	
1950	74.7	1970	568.1	1990	3,151.3	2010	

Years with budget in *italics* are years when the budget was less than a previous year

Trends in combinations and consolidations in Forests by Region:

After many years of combining, splitting, and reconfiguring forests by executive order or congressional action, only 155 National Forests still remain in the National Forest System. There are twenty National Grasslands, most of which are administered as part of an existing forest organization, such as the Pike-San Isabel National Forest in Colorado or the Ochoco National Forest in Oregon. There are 113 Forest or Grassland units which are managed as individual units at the Forest level, including the Dakota Prairie Grasslands in North Dakota, Midewin Tallgrass Prairie in Illinois, and Land Between the Lakes in Tennessee. Thirty-one of those 113 are "administratively" combined units.

Each forest in the system has a unique development story. Tables in Appendix A provide a regional record of the history of development starting with the first establishment of the Yellowstone Reserve in 1891. The Tables include establishment year, abolishment year where appropriate, numbers of districts by decade, and indication of the historical track of both present forest units and past forests units. These tables provide a basis to understand collectively the combinations, consolidations, splits, and renames of forests for the entire history of the agency. When forests were simply renamed by a proclamation, or other action, the old name is indicated by <u>underline</u> in the tables.

A number of factors appear to have influenced change in the number, size, and location of national forests throughout the country. Most common among these are:

Budget, funding, and workload changes
Leadership reaction to changes and crisis
Geographic factors
Overall political and state government interests
Desire to improved efficiency
Acquired lands primarily through the Weeks Act
Loss of land through transfer (ex. to N.P.S).

As can be seen in the Table 3 below, 272 reserves or forests were established before 1910. In review of the table, it can be seen that establishment trends vary significantly between most Regions. Most units in Regions 1-6 and 10 were created from 1891-1920, while many of the units in Regions 8 and 9 were not established until after the Weeks Act of 1911. Because of general depressed economic conditions across the country in the 1930's, land prices were low enough that purchase of cutover and eroded was possible in Regions 7, 8, and 9.[xviii] There were definite and different establishment approaches and timing even within different regions in the west and among the original three regions in the east. By far, Region 4 had the most units established with a total of 65.

Of the total 380 reserves or forests units established since 1891, only 158 still remain including Midewin Tallgrass Prairie, Land Between the Lakes, and Dakota Prairie Grasslands.

Table 3

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF RESERVES/FORESTS ESTABLISHED BY DECADE
(Units accounted for in present regions)

Region	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	Total
Region 1	4	38	3								1	**46**
Region 2	8	36	4	1	1				1			**51**
Region 3	5	37	2		1	1						**46**
Region 4	4	55	3		1	2						**65**
Region 5	10	24	1		2	1	1					**39**
Region 6	8	29	5	2	2							**46**
Region 8		6	4	14	22	1	3	2			1	**53**
Region 9		4	1	11	10		2			1	1	**30**
Region 10	1	3										**4**
TOTAL	**40**	**232**	**23**	**28**	**39**	**5**	**6**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**3***	**380**

***Includes Midewin Tallgrass Prairie, Land Between the Lakes, and Dakota Prairie Grasslands**

As shown in Table 4 below, before 1910 a total of 254 forests had been established, but almost as quickly as some were created they were combined with others to form new units. Boundaries were adjusted and new lands were added, and in some cases lands were removed. Smaller forests were joined together and by 1910 the total number of forests was down to 175. Seventy-nine forests had already been combined with others, or in a few cases units were simply abolished. For the western regions this trend of combining and overall reduction in the number of forests has continued on until today, even though the pace has lessened significantly.

Regions 1, 2, and 4 account for the greatest number of losses of forests even though many of those can be attributed to combinations in the first or second decade of the agency's history. Region 3 also had a similar early record but has been relatively stable for at least eighty years. Because most forests are isolated "islands" of forestland scattered throughout Arizona and New Mexico, combinations have not likely been seen as desirable or necessary in this Region.

After the 1930's and through today, Region 5 has seen very little change in the pattern or number of forests. Region 6 has until recently also been fairly stable. This region, which has seen major changes in it's workload and programs primarily because of the Northwest Forest Plan, has been very actively adjusting forest organizations in attempts to be responsive to the changes they face. Region 10 has basically had just two forests since it's beginnings a hundred years ago, except for the original Afognak Forest and Fish Culture Reserve and the Alexander Archipelago and some administrative splitting of the Tongass from 1960's until the 1990's.

For the last 60 years, there have been very few changes in Regions 8 or 9 comparatively.

Table 4

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF FORESTS BY DECADE
(Region 7 units distributed in Region 8 and 9 for comparison)

Region	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
Region 1	42	26	24	23	17	16	15	15	13	13	13	13
Region 2	40	30	23	21	21	17	15	15	12	12	10	11
Region 3	40	22	15	15	13	13	13	12	11	11	11	11
Region 4	54	37	26	26	25	20	18	18	17	16	13	13
Region 5	31	21	16	17	17	18	17	17	17	17	17	17
Region 6	33	26	22	22	20	20	19	20	19	19	19	16
Region 8*	6	6	10	14	18	19	16	17	16	15	15	15
Region 9	4	5	4	8	17	15	15	15	15	14	15	15
Region 10	4	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	2	2
Western	**244**	**164**	**128**	**126**	**115**	**106**	**100**	**100**	**93**	**92**	**84**	**83**
Eastern	**10**	**11**	**14**	**22**	**35**	**34**	**31**	**32**	**31**	**29**	**30**	**30**
TOTAL	**254**	**175**	**142**	**148**	**150**	**140**	**131**	**132**	**124**	**121**	**114****	**113****

* See Region 8 table for actual number of forests and unique small forest situation by state
** Includes additions of Midewin Tallgrass Prairie, Land Between the Lakes, and Dakota Prairie Grasslands

Several Regions lost significant acreage and portions of forests as lands were designated for inclusion into the National Park System as parks or monuments. Although it was difficult to identify the impact of these actions and the influence that these withdrawals may have had on a forest combination or consolidation, these transfers certainly have caused significant changes to some forests and regions. Most notable among these are the transfer of the Grand Canyon National Forest in 1919, which allowed for the creation of the Grand Canyon National Park, and the transfer of much of the Colorado National Forest in 1915, which resulted in the creation of the Rocky Mountain National Park. Appendix B has a listing of many, but certainly not all, of the transfers to the Department of Interior specifically for creation or expansion of parks and monuments.

Over the years there have been many attempts to evaluate and perhaps test the limits of practical and supportable combinations of forests. In 1944 there were experiments with "superforests" like the Boise and Payette to look at ways to increase efficiency. For the times, these forests had much larger and more specialized staffs than other forests. They could "thus concentrate on particular areas of expertise".[xix] There were also salary savings when duplicate positions could be eliminated. In the early 1990's Region 2 proposed combination of four forests into two to reduce costs at the Forest level and get more money to districts. Recently there have been eighteen other forests combined into nine. The experimentation and testing of the limits of forest size and manageability continue. The Humboldt –Toiyabe Forest, that covers over 5 million acres, stretches across the entire state of Nevada and into parts of California.

To better understand the extent of combinations and consolidations over time, Table 5 is provided. It displays the number of forest consolidations/combinations/splits/renames nationwide by decade by region and is shown as a ratio of the number of units combined or consolidated to the number of units created by the action. Also included is a record of the number of units that were officially renamed and are not included in the ratio data.

In total, using the data from Table 5, there have been 278 forest combined or consolidated resulting in 94 remaining or newly created units. In the 100 plus years of record, Region 4 has highest numbers in the ratio because of the large number of original forests. There were 139 combinations before 1920. After that there were large numbers combined in the decade of the 30's, the 40's, the 70's, and most recently in the 90's. These periods were times of relatively tight budgets as shown in Table 2.

Table 5

NUMBER OF FOREST CONSOLIDATIONS/COMBINATIONS/SPLITS/RENAMES BY DECADE BY REGION

(Shown as a ratio of unit's combined/split to units created--- number renames in smaller number)

Region	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Total
Region 1	19:0 1	1:0	1:0	5:0	1:0	1:0	--	3:1	--	3:2*	--	**34:3**
Region 2	16:2 4	3:0	2: 1	-- 1	4:0	2:1	--	6:3	--	4:2	1:2*	**38:10**
Region 3	19:6 3	4:1	--	3:1	--	1:0	1:0	2:1	--	--	--	**30:9**
Region 4	21:7 6	14:5	4:0	3:1	7:2	2:0	--	2:1	2:1	6:3	--	**61:20**
Region 5	16:2 3	2:0	2:1	2:1	2:1	2:1	--	--	--	--	--	**26:6**
Region 6	16:5 2	4:0	-- 2	4:2	-- 1	2:1 1	--	2:1	--	--	6:3	**34:12**
Region 8		2:1	2:3 1	7:5 2	9:2 1	6:2	2:1 2	2:1	2:1	2:1	--	**34:17**
Region 9		--	1:2	1:2	4:2	--	1:0	1:0	2:1	3:3*	--	**13:10**
Region 10	2:1	--	--	--	--	1:2	--	2:3	--	3:1	--	**8:6**
(Renames)	19		4	3	2	1	2					31
TOTAL	109:23	30:7	12:6	25:12	27:7	17:7	4:1	20:11	6:3	21:12	7:5	278:94

*Includes a de-combination or splitting of previously combined units

Table 6 provides the totals in percentages by both region and decade. Over time, Regions 5, 9, and 10 have the lowest percentages. Region 4 accounts for 22 per cent of the total.

Table 6

PERCENTAGE TOTALS OF CONSOLIDATIONS BY REGION AND DECADE

(Consolidation ratios are included from previous table for illustrative purposes)

Region	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Total
Region 1	19:0 1	1:0	1:0	5:0	1:0	1:0	--	3:1	--	3:2*	--	**12%**
Region 2	16:2 4	3:0	2:0 1	-- 1	4:0	2:1	--	6:3	--	4:2	1:2*	**14%**
Region 3	19:6 3	4:1	--	3:1	--	1:0	1:0	2:1	--	--	--	**11%**
Region 4	21:7 6	14:5	4:0	3:1	7:2	2:0	--	2:1	2:1	6:3	--	**22%**
Region 5	16:2 3	2:0	2:1	2:1	2:1	2:1	--	--	--	--	--	**9%**
Region 6	16:5 2	4:0	-- 2	4:2	-- 1	2:1 1	--	2:1	--	--	6:3	**12%**
Region 8		2:1	2:3 1	7:5 2	9:2 1	6:2	2:1 2	2:1	2:1	2:1	--	**12%**
Region 9		--	1:2	1:2	4:2	--	1:0	1:0	2:1	3:3*	--	**5%**
Region 10	2:1	--	--	--	--	1:2	--	2:3	--	3:1	--	**3%**
TOTAL	**39%**	**11%**	**4%**	**9%**	**10%**	**6%**	**1%**	**7%**	**2%**	**8%**	**3%**	**100%**

*Includes a de-combination or splitting of previously combined units

Looking at the time period from 1970 until today in Table 7 which follows, it can be seen that Region 4 and Region 2 have been most active in consolidating and combining but Region 6 has been most active recently. Regions 1, 2, and 9 in the 1990 and 2000 decades, as indicated by the asterisk, actually had units de-combined. In Region 1, the Dakota Prairie Grassland unit was separated from the Custer National Forest. The Wayne and the Hoosier National Forests were split apart as separate units and in Colorado, it was decided that the recently combined San Juan-Rio Grande Forest should be separated into its original two forests.

Table 7

CONSOLIDATION/COMBINATION/SPLIT RATIOS AND PERCENTAGE TOTALS FROM 1970 TO 2004

		Region	1970	1980	1990	2000	Total as %
		Region 1	3:1	--	3:2*	--	10%
		Region 2	6:3	--	4:2	1:2*	18%
		Region 3	2:1	--	--	--	3%
		Region 4	2:1	2:1	6:3	--	18%
		Region 5	--	--	--	--	0%
		Region 6	2:1	--	--	6:3	13%
		Region 8	2:1	2:1	2:1	--	10%
		Region 9	1:0	2:1	3:3*	--	10%
		Region 10	2:3	--	3:1	--	8%
		TOTAL	37%	11%	39%	13%	100%

***Includes a de-combination or splitting of previously combined units**

Most combinations in recent years have been done administratively, whereas in the early years most were done by Executive Order, Proclamation, or Public Land Order. Table 8 records the number of forest administrative combinations, consolidations, or splits by Region and Decade. Region 8 has the largest number of administrative actions over the longest period of time. Many of these administrative combinations bring together small individually established forests under one unit within a state, like Mississippi or Florida.

Table 8

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONSOLIDATIONS/COMBINATIONS/SPLITS BY REGION AND DECADE

Region	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	TOTALS	%
Region 1						1		1		**2**	**5%**
Region 2					1	3		2	1	**7**	**17%**
Region 3						1				**1**	**2%**
Region 4						1	1	3		**5**	**12%**
Region 5				1						**1**	**2%**
Region 6				1		1			3	**5**	**12%**
Region 8		1	4	2	1	1	1	1		**11**	**26%**
Region 9		1	3				1	2		**7**	**17%**
Region 10				1		1		1		**3**	**7%**
TOTAL		**2**	**7**	**5**	**2**	**9**	**3**	**10**	**4**	**42**	
%		**5%**	**17%**	**12%**	**5%**	**21%**	**7%**	**24%**	**10%**		100%

Summary of findings in the analysis of forest level consolidations:

- There have been a total of 380 forest level units established.
- Presently there are 113 organizational units at the forest level.
- At least 278 units have been combined or consolidated and 94 units remained or were specifically created in the process of undertaking those combinations
- Many combinations occurred in the early years of the agency's history
- A number of combined units are comprised of several established forests so there are actually 155 national forests still remaining, plus the Dakota Prairie Grassland, the Midewin Tall Grass Prairie, and the Land Between the Lands units.
- There are significant differences between Regions in the history of forests, especially those in the east as compared with the west.
- There are interesting differences even within a Region
- There has been shifting emphasis on consolidations depending upon budget situation
- There has been amazing stability in some forests (ex: San Bernandino in California)
- In the last fifty years most combinations have been done administratively

Trends in combinations and consolidations in Districts by Region:

The early alignment of rangers was influenced greatly by the need to manage grazing. The ranger district organization as we know it today emerged gradually as an organizational unit in the 1910's. Before that there were rangers and ranger stations, as early as perhaps 1908. The 1920 Service Directory clearly shows a system of ranger districts had been established in all parts of the country. Most of these districts were relatively small which allowed for travel to be practical within a district, but there were few personnel other than the ranger and perhaps a few assistants and part-time workers to help in the summer season.[xx]

It is possible to track the history of districts in the agency starting in 1920 because they are indeed listed in the Directory. Using ten different years of directories from 1921 until today, the number of districts by decade has been recorded. This data, by forest and region, can be found in Appendix A and includes grassland units and a few other units that are managed as districts. The following table (Table 9) shows differences in totals between regions relative to the establishment and continuance of districts over time.

Table 9

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY DECADE
(Region 7 numbers shown in parenthesis for information only)

Region	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
Region 1		154	135	106	101	100	87	71	66	61	61
Region 2		134	109	107	104	96	87	69	68	52	50
Region 3		102	85	79	73	78	75	65	59	54	53
Region 4		167	135	129	129	123	120	83	78	72	70
Region 5		82	87	91	90	100	91	79	78	65	65
Region 6		116	102	98	101	119	100	100	91	80	68
Region 7		(46)	(45)	(44)	(30)	(36)					
Region 8		40	36	69	79	112	110	107	105	91	89
Region 9		18	24	76	78	82	83	79	73	60	54
Region 10		8	8	5	9	9	10	13	14	13	13
TOTAL		**821**	**721**	**760**	**764**	**819**	**763**	**666**	**632**	**548**	**523**

The trends in district numbers follow similar patterns as previously described for forests with more change in the western forests, but in recent years there has been considerable loss of districts throughout the system. In review of the Regional summary tables, it can be clearly seen that forest consolidations quite often lead to significant district consolidations. There are at least three dozen examples that reflect that trend. This has particularly been common in the west.

Addition of the twenty National Grasslands in the 1960's (Appendix C) resulted in additional fifteen districts nationwide that are primarily associated with management of the grasslands. Most of these are in the western part of the country.

The very apparent differences in numbers of districts over time, years of peak numbers, and stability in those numbers between regions and parts of the country are shown more clearly in Table 10.

Table 10

DISTRICT SUMMARY BY DECADE BY REGION AND LOCATION
(Peak years indicated with slight tint)

Region	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
Region 1		154	135	106	101	100	87	71	66	61	61
Region 2		134	109	107	104	96	87	69	68	52	50
Region 3		102	85	79	73	78	75	65	59	54	53
Region 4		167	135	129	129	123	120	83	78	72	70
Rocky Mtns.		**557**	**464**	**421**	**407**	**397**	**369**	**288**	**271**	**239**	**234**
Region 5		82	87	91	90	100	91	79	78	65	65
Region 6		116	102	98	101	119	100	100	91	80	68
Pacific		**198**	**189**	**189**	**191**	**219**	**191**	**179**	**169**	**145**	**133**
Region 10		8	8	5	9	9	10	13	14	13	13
Alaska		**8**	**8**	**5**	**9**	**9**	**10**	**13**	**14**	**13**	**13**
Western		**763**	**661**	**615**	**607**	**625**	**570**	**480**	**454**	**397**	**380**
Region 8		40	36	69	79	112	110	107	105	91	89
Region 9		18	24	76	78	82	83	79	73	60	54
Eastern		**58**	**60**	**145**	**157**	**194**	**193**	**186**	**178**	**151**	**143**
TOTAL		**821**	**721**	**760**	**764**	**819**	**763**	**666**	**632**	**548**	**523**

To facilitate a better understanding of this history, the analysis of this table is organized by different categories or parts of the country. There is some consistency in District size and organization realities within these different categories, but between groupings there are significant differences. Many of these differences can be attributed to both how the respective forests were established and how the programs in different parts of the country have developed differently.

In 1920, when ranger districts were being organized and district offices being constructed, there were 821 ranger districts. Most were in the west. Another 137 were established in the south and east as forests were created under the authority of the Weeks Act of 1911. There were also another 27 districts added in the west in California, Oregon and Alaska as programs grew and complexity increased. So in total there have been at least 985 districts in existence at one time or another.

Throughout the history of the Forest Service there has been continual emphasis on looking at organizational efficiency within the different levels of the organization. In 1965 the Deckerd study team, a team of three Civil Service and Bureau of the Budget people, conducted a review of Forests and Districts. They developed optimum size

district standards.[xxi] In the late sixties, the Washington Office "mandated" workload analysis and "consideration of possible consolidation of districts with headquarters in the same community, with seasonal headquarters, and small workloads."[xxii] A Washington Office study determined that the optimum size of a ranger district was determined by balancing budget, base workload, and acreage factors.[xxiii]

Today there are 523 ranger districts or units that operate like districts. The Rocky Mountain geographic area, which includes Regions 1-4, has seen the greatest reductions in numbers of districts with 323 fewer. The Pacific area, with Regions 5, 6, and 10, have 87 fewer districts today, while Regions 8 and 9 in the east have 52 less than they had in their peak years.

--Rocky Mountain geographic area--

It is apparent that the regions in the general area of the Rocky Mountains were formed up first and had large numbers of smaller districts. Activity in the early years of the century in these mountains was high because of grazing, mining, railroad development, and timber use.

Travel was limited to horseback until the mid-twenties and even then as referenced in a letter by Forest Supervisor Pierce in Wyoming, there was reluctance to use the automobile on some forests. He stated that "ordinarily trips between two points should be made on horseback across the Forest in order that the ranger may be on the scene of his normal work." He did "not feel that ownership of an automobile by any member of the ranger force is essential to good administration of any district on this Forest, and to get value received they should be used very carefully."[xxiv] The travel issue was a dominant factor in the number of districts in this part of the country. As the automobile's usefulness increased with greater dependability and more roads, travel was easier. Gradually fewer districts were needed. Size of districts increased as field units were combined.

In the twenty years from 1921 until 1941, there were 136 fewer districts in Regions 1-4. There was little growth in budgets during this period. The Civilian Conservation Corps was a major influence and contributor of work being done during this period. Organizations at the Forest and District level did not grow during this period and some even appeared to be "down at the heel".[xxv] As described earlier, Chief Watts directed a study of organizations in 1943 and to improve efficiency. That team concluded that "ranger district ought to have a minimum load of 2,000 hours per year, and a national forest should have 18,000 to 25,000 hours of ranger work."[xxvi]

After World War II, development in roads and timber sales in these Regions increased and recreation use and development increased significantly as well. District organizations generally began to change and as the concept of multiple use developed complexity of District management was on the rise.

The reduction in the numbers of districts in these four regions continued but at a slower pace until the 1960's when the dominance of the Pacific Northwest in timber production fully kicked in. The Rocky Mountain regions then lost 126 more districts in the thirty years from 1961 until 1991. Regional Forester J.S. Tixier in Region 4 expressed a common feeling among some leaders of the agency in 1986 when he announced that the region had been "advised we have gone as far as we should go in Ranger District consolidation." [xxvii] Since then at least eight additional districts have been consolidated in that Region.

In 1990, based on the total acreage and the number of districts in the Rocky Mountain regions, the average size of a district was around 366,000 acres and had on average 15 people. Conversely, in the Pacific Southwest and Pacific Northwest combined, the average size of the district was 265,000 acres and on average had 43 people on it.

Budget issues continued to drive district size and consequently had also resulted in a continuing reduction of numbers of districts. By 1990, the four Rocky Mountain regions with over 99 million acres (52% of total NFS acreage) only received 22 per cent of the total NFS budget. The Pacific Southwest and Pacific Northwest regions with 44.8 million acres (23% of total NFS acreage) accounted for 32 per cent of the total NFS budget.

Even within this Rocky Mountain grouping, there were differences however. For example, a number of forests show little change in the number of districts over their history. Region 3, as was described in the analysis of forests also had considerably less reduction in numbers of districts over the same period as Regions 1, 2, and 4. This is likely attributed to differences in a number of factors including geography, little change in workload, and partly due part to the reality that the forest supervisors offices also had not be changed significantly over the same time period.

There are many districts in this part of the country that have become very large and cover acreage comparable to what could be considered a reasonable good sized forest. For example, in the Gunnison area in Colorado the remaining one district of over 1.2 million acres is the same as the old Gunnison National Forest that existed in 1970 with five districts within the forest.

--Pacific Southwest and Pacific Northwest regions--

After World War II Region 5 "underwent a massive field study on workloads" and Regional Forester S. B. Snow and his staff concluded "that the job on many districts remained far higher than the officer time available." As a result, a major realignment in boundaries of both forests and districts was undertaken.[xxviii] Again, as the country changed rapidly after the war, the major influence in the field organizations within these regions was mainly the large and complex development of the timber program. This factor coupled with important recreation values and a large fire program especially in Region 5, caused a slight and steady increase in district numbers in these regions rather

than the decrease seen in the Rocky Mountains. "This splitting was considered necessary because of the quickly increasing workload and the hundreds of new employees handling timber management, road construction, engineering, and fire-fighting." [xxix] Numbers of districts in Region 5 and Region 6 both peaked in the 1960's. There were small decreases in numbers after that peak, but the regions maintained strong well-staffed district organizations. Obviously the changes resultant from the Northwest Forest Plan in the mid-nineties had an impact to the budgets and the workload, and consequently the district organizations in both regions. However, there are only 65 fewer districts today than there was in 1920. Comparatively, in Regions 1-4, there are 323 fewer districts.

--Region 10--

The Alaska Region has a unique story as well. District numbers, even though the total is small, have actually increased over the past eighty years. In the 1960's and into the 1970's, district organizations were dominated by presale and sale administration personnel as work peaked on long-term timber sale contracts. Organizations shifted in the early to mid-1970's as the traditional district organization disappeared when the region went to an "area concept" of management and the on-the-ground presence was principally a "resource management assistant" assigned to the staff at the Forest or area office. Districts were reestablished in 1980-81 under Regional Forester John Sandor. [xxx]

There was significant loss in acreage in the Region as a result of land ownership adjustments with the State and with tribal organizations. These losses didn't create any significantly changed organizations at the forest or district level with the exception of the loss of all of Afognak Island on the Chugach National Forest. Development activity, national recognition, and increased recreation use have added to the need for a larger district presence. In 1920 there were 8 districts in Alaska and very few people. In 1993 there were 280 people on 14 districts. Presently there are 13 districts in Alaska. With over 22 million acres to cover that is still minimal presence on-the-ground. Size of districts, compared with the "lower 48" states, is extremely large. The Chatham District on the Tongass in the 1960's was over 4.6 million acres and had only12 permanent staff.

--Region 8--

By the early 1940's, six years after the Southern Region was established, there were 69 districts including the 4 on the Cumberland National Forest in Kentucky which was still in Region 7 but would ultimately become part of Region 8. For the next twenty years Region 8 continued to add lands and districts. By 1960 the Region had a peak 112 districts. The numbers stayed fairly stable until the last ten years when about 16 units were lost to combinations or consolidations. Quite a number of the districts in Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia include or represent a separate forest, which have been administratively consolidated with a group of other forests within the respective state and managed as one forest.

--Region 9--

Thirteen of the original 18 districts in Region 9 actually were in Michigan and Minnesota and were originally part of District 1 and then District 2. The other five were on the White Mountain National Forest that was part of District 7 when it was created in 1914. By 1940 Region 9, which was established in 1929, had 63 districts. With an additional thirteen, which were in Region 7 but would eventually come to Region 9, the total number would have been 76.

The level of activity in the middle of century in this Region is reflected well in the number of nurseries found during that period of time from the 1940's until the 1960's. In 1941 there were thirteen nurseries found in this Region as shown in Appendix D.

For sixty years, there was very little variation in the number of districts. The maximum deviation was in the 1960's when there were 6 more districts. When forests were combined during this period, districts were pretty much left intact which is generally a different situation than occurred in most other regions. In the 1990's there were still 73 district. Since then twenty districts have been consolidated into others and one new district unit (counting the Midewin Tallgrass Prairie unit as both a forest and a district) is included in the total numbers making a total of 19 fewer districts.

The following two tables (Tables 11 and 12) provide a summary of differences between the west and the east:

Western in total---

Table 11

WESTERN DISTRICT SUMMARY BY DECADE

Region	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
Rocky Mtns.		557	464	421	407	397	369	288	271	239	234
Pacific		198	189	189	191	219	191	179	169	145	133
Alaska		8	8	5	9	9	10	13	14	13	13
Western		**763**	**661**	**615**	**607**	**625**	**570**	**480**	**454**	**397**	**380**

With the exception of the 1960's, when new districts were created in the timber country of the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest, the overall trend in numbers of districts has been down in the west. The differing trends between parts of this western category somewhat offset each other; even so, there are 383 fewer districts today in the west than in the 1920's. The decreases were greatest earlier, but have been steady all along. Districts continue to be consolidated and average district size continues to increase. There are a number of large districts approaching or exceeding a million acres in the west.

Eastern in total---

Table 12

EASTERN DISTRICT SUMMARY BY DECADE

Region	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
Region 8		40	36	69	79	112	110	107	105	91	89
Region 9		18	24	76	78	82	83	79	73	60	54
Eastern		**58**	**60**	**145**	**157**	**194**	**193**	**186**	**178**	**151**	**143**

The trends of district consolidation are significantly different in both Region 8 and Region 9 from trends identified in the west. Both regions had increasing numbers of districts until the 1960's and both have seen much less consolidation or combination.

Summary of factors which have influenced size of Districts

There have been many changes in the nation, the Forest Service, and the public that the agency serves over the last hundred years. In review of the history of combinations and consolidations at the district level, it is obvious that there have been many changes as well. The influencing factors and reasons, that account for why we have districts where we do and why we have the number we do, are perhaps as numerous as the numbers of districts themselves; however, the following likely have had more consistent influence than others:

- Budget
- Geography
- Community connections
- Timing
- Workload changes
- Skill specialization
- Unique and specific purpose of unit
- Political influences
- Travel distances
- And perhaps, on occasion, even a personnel issue

Ultimately, the size and configuration of ranger districts on a given forest is the collective decision of a Forest Supervisor, a Regional Forester, and a Chief. There always have been and likely always will be differing opinions among managers and leaders as to how to respond to the factors that tend to influence organizations like those listed above. Regional Forester Craig W. Rupp, in a 1983 letter written to Forest Supervisors in Region 2[xxxi], expressed his strong opinion that he would no longer support any additional district combinations. He stated that he would rather "return to one person districts with zoning of all technical and professional assistance, than combine Ranger Districts and lose Ranger contacts." Mr. Rupp was concerned that district combinations were threatening the very essence of what the Forest Service was because of the resultant disconnect that occurs with people in communities across the country.

There have been many leaders, like Mr. Rupp, who have fought to keep the local district intact and viable, but over time the trend has continued as other leaders see organizational combinations as a short term solution, or at least a way to survive growing financial problems. The struggle to find the right balance, approach, and policy continues.

Inconsistencies, Issues, and Inferences:

In doing this analysis and preparing this report the following have surfaced as perhaps the most challenging inconsistencies, issues, and inferences facing the U.S. Forest Service relative to future organization changes at the district and forest level.

Decision processes:

The decision process used to determine when, where, and how a district or forest organization is changed has varied over time within the agency. In recent years, the agreed upon process has not always been followed and in some cases has not provided an appropriate or through consideration of advantages and disadvantages. In discussions with people in several Regions about the status of various proposed combinations, there seems to be a certain level of confusion about the status of ongoing combinations and approvals. In some cases districts actually appear to have been fully combined or consolidated, but nothing has been done officially and units still remain in the "Directory" as separate districts with the same ranger. Overall, the decision process for these determinations needs to be improved.

Role of the ranger:

Because of the size and complexity of some districts that have evolved today, the role of the ranger has in some cases changed significantly from what it was in the past or from what it is with fellow rangers in other areas. Some rangers may have the same or even greater geographic responsibilities and span of control of personnel as Forest Supervisors in other areas. Some rangers are now responsible for multiple communities and in some cases their travel may take several hours by highway from one part of their district to another part. Rangers are in some cases being asked to manage personnel in several different locations in work centers, visitor centers, and former district locations where the forest continues to try and maintain a presence.

Role of the forest supervisor:

When size of a forest reaches a point where there Forest Supervisor no longer can fulfill expected traditional roles, the agency no longer benefits fully from that level of the organization. Where that point is and what happens within a region or on a forest when that threshold is crossed is the question. The role issue is of greater concern at the district level than at the forest level, but both are important and should be considered carefully.

Community presence:

Recognizing differing high points by region, the maximum number of districts that have existed over time is 985. Based upon the best information available, there are presently 523 districts; therefore, there are perhaps as many as 462 communities that once had a district that no longer do. That number is likely somewhat high since some communities once had more than one district and may not have lost a district presence totally. Nevertheless, there are many communities, probably over 450, where the Forest Service had a physical presence with a district where we no longer have such.

Attempts to maintain a physical presence after moving a district headquarters out of a community are often times short-lived and in time the presence is lost. Community presence may not be as significant an issue in most forest combinations.

Limits of what is a manageable district and forest size:

As district and forest size increases, there is a point where a large district or a extremely large forest no longer functions as it was intended and no longer fulfills the purpose intended for it in the decentralized organizational structure of the Forest Service. In some cases districts and even forests have been combined so that specialized staff may be shared and available to accomplish diverse and complex work facing a district today. There is a point where large size has a counter effect and actually reduces effectiveness of staff because of travel and area to cover. These limits are likely being reached or have been reached already in some Regions.

Inescapable pressure to become more efficient with a declining effective budget:

Budget no doubt is the largest driving force leading to continual combination of ranger districts and/or forests. It is an unavoidable reality and one that will likely not go away in the short term. The agency must do all it can to stop the downward spiral in budget to the field organization. Unless this is done or unless it can be shown that combinations truly do not save money, then the trend to less forest and fewer districts will continue.

Closing Observations:

To better understand the history of individual forest units within Regions, it is recommended that the regional summary tables, found in Appendix A, be carefully reviewed. These tables provide an interesting and accurate perspective of the evolution of the National Forest System, as we know it today.

Much of the information and particularly the numbers found in the tables throughout this report are a reflection of the data kept in the agency's annual organizational directories. As with any organization, information in these directories has continually changed and often is already out of date when the directory was published. For purposes of this

analysis and for an understanding of historical trends, these numbers are quite adequate. Trends that tell what has happened over time are most important in this analysis and that is where the study emphasis was placed.

Finally, in 1903, two years before the U.S. Forest Service was established, E.T. Allen, who later was selected by Gifford Pinchot to be the first District Forester in the Pacific Northwest, wrote about the Federal forest reserve system and said that:

> "The institution will never be successful as long as it is maintained without the sympathy of the people, and they will have neither the sympathy nor confidence until they see a strong field force, not too closely restricted in details, and an undivided central management having knowledge of western conditions and backed by statutes enforcing its authority."[xxxii]

Those words are still appropriate today. With over 300 million people in this country it is extremely important that the agency have both the sympathy and confidence that the agency is there at the field level to protect and manage the National Forests and Grasslands. Having a strong and visible field force at the ranger district level is essential if the U.S. Forest Service is to have and maintain the support it needs in the years ahead to "Care for the Land and Serve the People".

The Forest Supervisor organization is likewise critical to accomplishing the work of the agency on the ground. It is critical to the future success of the agency that the Regional and National headquarters have a full appreciation and commitment to ensuring that the districts and forests are organized to ensure that the work at the field level gets done with professionalism and dependability.

References:

Alexander, Thomas G., The Rise of Multiple-Use Management in the Intermountain West: A History of Region 4 of the Forest Service, FS-399, U.S. Forest Service, May 1987.

Allen, Edward T., "The Application and Possibilities of the Federal Forest Reserve Policy", speech delivered to Society of American Foresters, March 26, 1903, Journal of Forestry, 1903.

"Clearcutting on Federal Timberlands", Report by the Subcommittee on Public Lands to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, GPO, March 1972.

Conrad, David E., The Land We Cared For…A History of the Forest Service's Eastern Region, 1997.

Establishment and Modification of National Forest Boundaries and National Grasslands, A Chronological Record: 1891-1996, FS 612, U.S. Forest Service, U.S.D.A., November 1997.

Godfrey, Anthony The Ever-Changing View: A History of National Forests in California, R5-FR-004, July 2005.

Land Areas of the National Forest System, FS-383, U.S. Forest Service, USDA, September 2001.

LeMaster, Dennis C., Decade of Change: The Remaking of Forest Service Statutory Authority during the 1970's, Greenwood Press, 1984.

Pierce, Wallace, "Letter from Forest Supervisor, Hayden National Forest", copy on file in Region 2 headquarters, 1923.

Rakestraw, Lawrence W., A History of the United States Forest Service in Alaska, Alaska Historical Commission and U.S. Forest Service R-10, 1981.

Randall, Charles E., "Washington Office Field Inspection Report", October 1, 1935.

Rupp, Craig W., Letter to Region 2 Forest Supervisors, January 4, 1983

Steen, Harold K., The U.S. Forest Service: A History, University of Washington Press, 1976.

Steen, Harold K., The Chiefs Remember: The Forest Service 1952-2001, Forest History Society, 2004.

U.S.D.A. Forest Service Organization Directories:

- Field Programme for July, 1905, U.S.D.A Forest Service, July 1905.
- February Field Program, 1910, U.S.D.A Forest Service, February 1910.
- January Field Program, 1911, U.S.D.A Forest Service, January 1911.
- USDA Forest Service, Service Directory, October 1920.
- USDA Forest Service, Service Directory, April 1922.
- 1931 Forest Service Organizational Directory, U.S.D.A Forest Service.
- 1941 Forest Service Organizational Directory, U.S.D.A Forest Service.
- 1951 Forest Service Organizational Directory, U.S.D.A Forest Service.
- 1961 Forest Service Organizational Directory, FSH 2 1231.5, U.S.D.A Forest Service, January 1961.
- 1971 Forest Service Organizational Directory, FS-65, U.S.D.A Forest Service, January 1971.
- 1981 Forest Service Organizational Directory, FS-65, U.S.D.A Forest Service, March 1981.
- 1991 Forest Service Organizational Directory, FS-65, U.S.D.A Forest Service, July 1991.
- 2000 Forest Service Organizational Directory, FS-65, U.S.D.A Forest Service, July 2000.
- 2004 Forest Service Organizational Directory, FS-65, U.S.D.A Forest Service, March 2004.

Anderson, Rolf, ed., We Had An Objective in Mind: The U.S. Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest 1905-2005, A Centennial Anthology, Pacific Northwest Forest Service Association, 2005.

Williams, Gerald W., The Forest Service: Fighting for Public Lands, Greenwood Press, 2007.

Appendix

Appendix A:

Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and Record of District Numbers by Decade[xxxiii]

- **A-1** Region 1
- **A-2** Region 2
- **A-3** Region 3
- **A-4** Region 4
- **A-5** Region 5
- **A-6** Region 6
- **A-7** (Region 7) For Information Only
- **A-8** Region 8
- **A-9** Region 9
- **A-10** Region 10

Appendix B:

Major Transfers of NFS land to Department of Interior

Appendix C:

Grassland establishment in National Forest System

Appendix D:

Regional summary of number of nurseries by decade

A-1 --- REGION 1: Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and District Numbers by Decade

Est.	Forest: End	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1907	Palouse 1908											
1906	Coeur d'Alene	#	6	6	4	4	4 N	4 N				
1910	Pend Oreille1933	#	5	6								
1908	Kaniksu	#	5	5	8	7	8	8				
1897	Priest River 1908											
Adm	**Idaho Panhndle**								8 N	7 N	7 N	7 N
1911	St. Joe	#	4	6	6	6	5	5				
1908	**Nezperce**	#	5	5	7	7	8	7 J	6	6	5	4
1908	**Clearwater**	#	4	5	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	5
1911	Selway 1934	#	6	6								
1907	Cabinet 1954	#	4	7	5	5						
1903	**Flathead**	#	9	7	8	8	8	6	5	5	4	4
1908	Blackfeet 1935	#	5	4								
1906	**Kootenai**	#	9	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	5	5
1906	**Lolo**	#	5	9	8	7	10	6	6	5	5	5
1906	Missoula 1931	#	4									
1908	Deerlodge	#	8	7	6	6	5	4 J	4 J	4 J		
Adm	**Bvrhd-Deerldge**										7 J	7 J
1908	**Beaverhead**	#	8	6	7	9	8	5	5	5		
1905	Hell Gate 1908											
1906	Big Hole 1908											
1897	**Bitterroot**	#	9	6	6	6	5	5 J	4 J	4 J	4 J	4 J
1907	Otter 08											
1908	**Custer**	#	9	7	8	6	9 G 4	8 G4	7 G4	7 G4	3	3
1908	Sioux 1917	#										
1906	Long Pine 1908											
1905	Short Pine 1908											
1904	Slim Buttes 1908											
1904	Cave Hills 1908											
1908	Ekalaka 1908											
Adm	**DakotaPrairie**										4 G4	4 G4
1903	Absaroka 1945	#	8	5	4							
1908	Beartooth 1932	#	4	3								
1906	Pryor Mtns. 1908											
1902	Yellowston 1908											
1906	Crazy Mtns.1908											
1902	Madison 1931	#	7	5								
1899	**Gallatin**	#	6	5	5	7	7	6	5	5	5	5
1905	Big Belt 1908											
1906	**Helena**	#	8	7	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
1897	**Lewis Clark**	#	5	4	7	7	7	6	5	4	4	5
1908	Jefferson 1932	#	11	7								
1905	Elkhorn 08											
1903	Highwd Mts.08											
1902	Ltle Belt Mts.08											
1906	Snowy Mtns. 08											
1907	Ltle Rockies 08											
1908	Dakota 1917 ND	#										
42	**# Forests**	**26**	**24**	**23**	**17**	**16**	**15**	**15**	**13**	**13**	**13**	**13**
	# Districts		**154**	**135**	**106**	**101***	**100***	**87***	**71**	**66**	**61**	**61**

*-Colville included in R-6 J-Job Corps Ctr. Is not Included N-Nursery is not included G-Grassland is included *Adm*-Admin.

A-2 --- REGION 2: Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and District Numbers by Decade

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1905	Gunnison	#	7	6	6	6	6	5				
1892	Battle. Mesa 1908											
1908	Battlement 1924	#	4									
1924	Grand Mesa	#		4	4	4						
Adm	**GrdMsUncmpGn**								7	7	5	5
Adm	Grnd.Mesa-Ump.						6	6				
1907	Ouray 1908											
1905	Uncompahgre	#	5	5	5	5						
1906	Fruita 1908											
1911	Durango 1920	#										
1905	**San Juan**	#	9	7	6	9	8	7	5	5		3
1905	Montezuma 1947	#	6	5	5							
Adm	San Juan-RioGrd										6	
1908	**Rio Grande**	#	6	6	6	7	6	6	5	4		3
1908	Cochetopa 1945	#	6	7	5							
1905	Cochetopah 1908											
1908	Pike	#	7 N	7 N	6 N	6 N	5 N	4				
1892	Pikes Peak 1908											
1892	Plum Creek 1905											
1892	South Platte 1905											
Adm	**Pike-San Isabel**								8 G2	8 G2	8 G2	8 G2
1902	San Isabel	#	6	5	5	7	7 L3	6 G2				
1905	Wet Mtns. 1908											
1907	Las Animas1910											
1905	Leadville 1930	#	5									
1891	White Rv. Plat. 02											
1902	**White River**	#	7	5	5	10	8	8 N	7 N	7	7	5
1909	Sopris 1920	#										
1905	Holy Cross 1945	#	8	5	5							
1908	Arapaho	#	4	4	5	5	5	5				
1910	Colorado 1932	#	7	4								
1932	Roosevelt	#			4	5	6 L	5 G				
Adm	**Arapaho-Roose.**								6 G	6 G	5 G	5 G
1908	Routt	#	6	4	4	4	5	5	5	5		
1905	Park Range 1908											
1908	Hayden 1929	#	4									
Adm	**Med. Bow-Routt**										6 G	6 G
1902	MedicineBow WY	#	5	7	9	9	9 L	9 G	5 G	5 G		
1900	Crow Creek1908											
1906	Sierra Mad.1908											
1908	Cheyenne 1910											
1891	Yellowstone 1908											
1908	**Shoshone**	#	5	4	4	7	5	5	5	5	3	3
1911	Washakie 1945	#	3	3	3							
1897	Big Horn 1908											
1908	**Bighorn**	#	7	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	3	3

J-Job Corps Ctr. is not Included N-Nursery is not included G-Grassland is included L-Land Util. Proj. is included

(Continued on next page)

REGION 2 (continued)

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1908	Sundance1915	#										
1907	Bear Lodge 1908											
1897	**Black Hills**	#	9	7	6	6	11 L	7 J	7 J	7 J	4 J	4 J
1911	Harney 1954 SD	#	7	6	6	6						
1908	**Nebraska**	#	1 N	2 N	2 N	1 N	3 LN	4G3NJ	4G3NJ	4G3NJ	5G3NJ	5G3NJ
1902	Niobrara 1908											
1902	Dismal 1908											
1906	North Platte 1908											
1971	S.McKelvie											
1905	GardnCity'12KS	#										
1908	Kansas 1916 KS	#										
1901	Wichita 1936OK	#	(1)									
1909	Michigan 1931	#	(3)									
1908	Minnesota 1928	#	(3)									
1909	Superior	#	(7)									
40	**# Forests**	**30**	**23**	**21**	**21**	**17**	**15**	**15**	**12**	**12**	**10**	**11**
	# Districts		**134**	**109**	**107**	**104**	**96**	**87**	**69**	**68**	**52**	**50**

J -Job Corps Ctr. Not Included N-Nursery not included G-Grassland included L -Land Util. Proj. is included

- Michigan, Minnesota, and Superior Forests were included in District 2 in early years, but these District numbers are included in Region 9's totals for comparison purposes
- Wichita Forest in Oklahoma was included in District 2 until 1920's, but is included in R-8's totals for comparison
- *Adm* Represents an "Administrative" designation not a "proclamation" or "congressional" designation

A-3 --- REGION 3: Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and District Numbers by Decade

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
Adm	Panhandle NG						3 L					
1931	**Cibola**	#			7	6	6	8 G3	7 G3	6 G3	6 G3	6 G3
1906	Manzano 1954	#	4	4								
1906	Mt. Taylor 1908											
1908	Datil 1931	#	10	6								
1906	Magdalena1909											
1906	San Mateo 1908											
1909	Zuni 1914	#										
1908	**Carson**	#	8	5	6	6	7	7	7	6	6	6
1906	Taos 1908											
1905	Jemez 1915	#										
1915	**Sante Fe**	#	11M	7	7	7	8	7	7	5	5	5
1908	Pecos 1915	#										
1892	Pecos River1908											
1905	**Gila**	#	7	6	7	7	8	7	8	8	6	6
1899	Gila River 1905											
1907	Big Burros 1908											
1902	**Lincoln**	#	8	6	6	5	6	6	4	4	3	3
1906	Gallinas 1908											
1908	Alamo 1917	#										
1907	Sacramento08											
1907	Guadalupe08											
1899	**Prescott**	#	8	5	6	6	5	5	3	3	3	3
1908	**Kaibab**	#	2 *	1 *	5	4	5	5	4	4	3	3
1910	Tusayan 1934	#	6	5								
1893	Grand Canon 06											
1906	Grand Canyon08											
1908	**Coconino**	#	8	8	6	6	6	7	7	6	6	5
1898	San Frans. Mt.08											
1907	Verde 1908											
1905	Pinal Mtns.1908											
1908	Crook 1953	#	4	6	6	5						
1908	**Tonto**	#	6	8	8	6	7	7	6	6	6	6
1898	Black Mesa1908											
1902	Mt. Graham1908											
1908	Sitgreaves	#	5	4	4	4	4	4 J				
Adm	**Apach./Sitgreav**								7	6	5	5
1908	Apache	#	6	5	5	5	6	5				
1908	**Coronado**	#	9	**9**	**6**	6	7	7	5	5	5	5
1907	Dragoon 1908											
1902	Santa Rita 1908											
1902	Santa Catalina 08											
1902	Ciricahua 1917	#										
1906	Peloncillo1908											
1908	Garces 1911	#										
1906	Baboquivari08											
1906	Tumacacori08											
1906	Huachuca08											
1944	Mesilla 1950											

N-Nursery not included G-Grassland is included L-Land Util. Proj. is included M-Bandelier Nat. Monument included **(Cont.)**

REGION 3 (continued)

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
40	# Forests	22	15	15	13	13	13	12	11	11	11	11
	#Districts		102	85	79	73	75	78	65	60	59	53

J-Job Corps not included G-Grassland is included L-Land Util. Proj. is included M-Bandelier Nat. Monument included

- Kaibab was in Region 4 as indicated by asterisk but is included here for consistency
- *Adm* Represents an "Administrative" designation not a "proclamation" or "congressional" designation

A-4 --- REGION 4: Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and District Numbers by Decade

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1944	**Payette**(new)					10	9	9	6	6	5	5
1908	Idaho 1944	#	8	7	6							
1905	Weiser 1944	#	6	5	4							
1905	Payette(old) 1944	#	6	5	5							
1908 1944	**Boise**	#	6	5	5	10	10	10 N	6 N	6 N	5	5
1908	Challis	#	4	5	5	8	8	5	4	4		
1906	Lemhi 1938	#	5	4								
Adm	**Salmon-Challis**										7	7
1906	Salmon River08											
1908	Salmon	#	6	7	8	7	5	5	4	4		
1905	Cassia 1908											
1906	Raft River 1908											
1908	Minidoka 1953	#	6	4	4	4						
1905	**Sawtooth**	#	5	5	5	5	8	8	5 R	5 R	5 R	4 R
1907	Caribou	#	6	5	5	6	6	6	4	5 G		
Adm	**Caribou-Targh.**										8	8
1908	Targhee	#	10	8	8	9	8	8	5	5		
1910	Palisade 1917	#										
1905	Henry's Lk 1908											
97,8	Teton 03,	#	9	6	6	5	4	4				
Adm	**Bridger.-Teton**								7	6	5	5
1891	Yellowstone 08											
1908	Wyoming 1941	#		7								
Adm	Wyo.-Bridger		9									
1911 1941	Bridger 1923	#			6	6	6	6				
1911	(Washakie) 1945	#										
1908	Bonneville 1916	#										
1908	**Ashley**	#	6	5	5	5	5	5	4 R	4 R	4 R	4 R
1897	Unitah 1906											
1906	**Uinta**	#	8	6	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	3
1908	Nebo 1915	#										
1901	Payson 1908											
1906	Vernon 1908											
1904	Grantsville 1908											
1904	Salt Lake 1908											
1906	Wasatch	#	5	5	5	5	6	6	6			
Adm	**Wasatch-Cache**									6	6	6
1908	Cache	#	9	6	6	6	5	5	5			
1906	Bear River 1908											
1903	Logan 1906											
1907	Port Neuf 1908											
1903	Pocatello 1915	#										
1903	Manti 1950	#	7	5	5							
1950	**Manti-LaSal**					7	7	7	5	5	5	5
1908	La Salle 1909											
1906 1909	La Sal 1908 1949	#	4	3	3							
1907	Monticello 1908											

N-Nursery is not included G-Grassland is included R -National Recreation Areas are included **(Continued on next page)**

REGION 4 (continued)

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1908	Kaibab	(#)	(2)	(1)								
1903	Aquarius 1908											
1908	Powell 1945	#		4	4							
Adm	Powell-Sevier		5									
1905	**Dixie**	#		4	4	8	8	8	5	5	5	5
Adm	Dixie-Sevier		6									
1905	Sevier 1922	#										
1906	Beaver 1908											
1906	Fillmore 1923	#										
1907	Glenwood 1908											
Adm	Fishlake-Fillmore		11									
1908	**Fishlake**	#		8	8	8	7	7	4	4	4	4
1899	Fish Lake											
1906	Santa Rosa 1917	#										
1906	Independence 08											
1906	Ruby Mt. 1908											
1912	Ruby 1917	#										
1908	Humboldt	#	8	5	4	4	8	8	5	5		
Adm	**Hmbdt.-Toiy.**										10 R	9 R
1909	Nevada 1957	#	4	3	4	4						
1908	Mono 1945	#	4	4	5							
1907 1937	Toiyabe 1932	#	4	4	4	7	8	8	5	5		
1907	Toquima 1908											
1907	Monitor 1908											
1908	Moapi 1915	#										
1906	Charleston 1908											
1907	Vegas 1908											
54	**# Forests**	**37**	**26**	**26**	**25**	**20**	**18**	**18**	**17**	**16**	**13**	**13**
	# Districts		**167**	**135**	**129**	**129**	**123**	**120**	**83**	**78**	**72**	**70**

N-Nursery is not included G-Grassland is included R -National Recreation Areas are included

- Kaibab is included in Region 3 totals for comparison
- Mono was part of Region 5 but district numbers are included here for comparison
- Waushakie is included in Region 2 for comparison
- *Adm* Represents an "Administrative" designation not a "proclamation" or "congressional" designation

A-5---REGION 5: Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and District Numbers by Decade

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1908	**Cleveland**	#	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
1893	Trabuco Canon07											
1907	TrabucoCnyon08											
1897	San Jacinto 08											
1893 1925	08 **San Bernandino**	#		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3
1908	**Angeles**	#	2	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	3	3
1892	San Gabriel 1908											
1936	**Los Padres**				7	7	7	7	5	5	5	5
1903	Santa Barb. 1936	#	8	6								
1908	San Luis 1910	#										
1898	Pine Mtn. 1903											
1898	Zaca Lake 1903											
1899	Santa Ynez 1903											
1906	SnLuisObispo 08											
1906	Monterey 1919	#										
1906	Pinnacles 1908											
1907	San Benito 1908											
1893	**Sierra**	#	5	6	6	6	7	6	5	4	2	3
1908	**Sequoia**	#	6	7	7	6	5	5	5	5	4	4
1910	Kern 1915	#										
1910	**Eldorado**	#	3	3	4	4	6	6	4 N	4 N	4 N	5
1905	Yuba 1906											
1899	Lake Tahoe 1905											
1905	**Tahoe**	#	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	5	5	5
1904	WarnerMt. 1908											
1904	**Modoc**	#	6	6	6	6	6	4	4	4	4	4 *G*
1954	Calav. Big. 1990											
1897	**Stanislaus**	#	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
1908	(Mono 1945)	(#)	(4)	(4)	(5)							
1907	**Inyo**	#	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
1905	**Plumas**	#	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	3
1905	DiamondMt.1908											
1905	Lassen Peak1908											
1908	**Lassen**	#	5	5 N	5 N	5	7	5	3	3	3	3
1932	**Mendocino**	#			4	4	5	4	4 N	4	3	4
1908	California 1932	#	4	4								
1907	Stony Ck. 1908											
1905	Shasta	#	6	6	7	7 N						
Adm	**Shasta-Trinity**						10 N	8	7	7	4	4
1905	Trinity	#	5	5	6	4						
1905	**Klamath**	#	5	6	6	4	8	8	6	6	5	4
1947	**Six Rivers**					4	6	4 N	4 N	4 N	4 N	4
31	**# Forests**	**21**	**16**	**17**	**17**	**18**	**17**	**17**	**17**	**17**	**17**	**17**
	# Districts		**82**	**87**	**91**	**90**	**100**	**91**	**79**	**78**	**72**	**70**

N represents a nursery and not included G represents a grassland and is included

- Mono is included in Region 4 for comparison
- *Adm* Represents an "Administrative" designation not a "proclamation" or "congressional" designation

A-6 --- REGION 6: Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and District Numbers by Decade

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1907	**Colville**	#	5	5	4	4*	5*	4 J	5 J	5 J	4 J	4 J
1897	**Olympic**	#	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	2
1897	Pacific 1897											
1908	Columbia 1949	#	3	3	5 N							
1949	**Gifford Pinchot**					6 N	8 N	6 N	5 N	5 N	3	3 M
1897	Mt. Rainier 1899											
1899	Rainier 1933	#	7	6								
1897	Washington 1924	#	4									
1924	Mt. Baker			4	6	6	6	4				
Adm	**Mt. Baker-Snoq.**								7	5	5	4
1908	Snoqualmie	#	4	3	6	6	6	5				
1908	Chelan 1954	#	8	5	6	6						
1911 1955	Okanogan 1920	#					5	4	4	3	2	
Adm	**Okanog-Wnach.**											7
1908	Wenatchee	#	7	5	5	6	7	6	8	6	6	
1907	**Umpqua**	#	4	4	4	4	6	5 J	5 J	4 J	4 J	4 J
1908	**Siuslaw**	#	5	4	3	3	5	5 J	5 J R	5 J R	5 J R	2 J R
1907	Tillamook 1908											
1907	Coquille 1908											
1906	Siskiyou	#	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Adm	**Rogue-Siskiyou**											9 N
1932	Rogue River				4	5	6	4 N	4 N	4 N	4 N	
1908	Crater 1932	#	5	4								
1893	Ashland 1908											
1908	Oregon 1924	#	7									
1892	Bull Run 1908											
1924	**Mt. Hood**			6	6	6	9	7 J	7 J	7 J	4 J	4 J
1933	**Willamette**				5	6	9	7	7	7	5	4
1911	Santiam 1933	#	2	2								
1907	Cascade 1933	#	3	3								
1893	Cascade Rge 07											
1908	**Deschutes**	#	4	4	4	4 N	5 N	4 N	4 N	4 N	3	3
1911	Paulina 1915	#										
1961	Winema							3	3	3	3	
Adm	**Fremnt-Winem**											7
1906	Fremont	#	5	5	4	5	6	4	4	4	4	
1906	Goose Lake 1908											
('06)	(Blue Mtns. '08)											
1911	**Ochoco**	#	5	5	5	4	5 L	4 G	5 G	5 G	5 G	3 G
1908	**Malheur**	#	6	5	5	5	6	4	4	4	3	3

J- Job Corps not included N-Nursery not included G-Grassland included L-Land Util. Proj. included
M-St. Helens Monument included R-National Recreation Area included

(Continued on next page)

REGION 6 (continued)

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1908	**Umatilla**	#	8	6	5	6	6	6	5	4	4	4
1906	Heppner 1908											
1905	Wenaha 1920	#										
1905	Maury Mtn. 1907											
1906	Blue Mtns. 1908											
1904	Baker City 1906											
1905	Chesnimnus 1907											
1907	Imnaha 1908											
1905 1908	Wallowa 1907	#	6	4	4	4						
Adm	**Wallowa-Whit.**						9	8	8 R	7 R	7 R	5 R
1908	Whitman	#	8	8	7	6						
1911	Minam 1920	#										
33	**# Forests**	**26**	**22**	**22**	**20**	**20**	**19**	**20**	**19**	**19**	**19**	**16**
	# Districts		**116**	**102**	**98**	**101**	**119**	**100**	**100**	**91**	**80**	**68**

J- Job Corps not included N-Nursery not included G-Grassland included L-Land Util. Proj. included
M-St. Helens Monument included R-National Recreation Area included

- *Colville was part of R-1 in the 1950's and 1960's but is included in R-6 for comparison
- The Pacific, Columbia, and Cascade reserves covered most of the Region and ultimately were broken into smaller units
- *Adm* Represents an "Administrative" designation not a "proclamation" or "congressional" designation

A-7 --- REGION 7: Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and District Numbers by Decade

(Region 7 was reconfigured several times and in 1965-66 was divided between Regions 8 and 9)

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1918	**White Mountain**		5	4	4	5	5					
1923	**Allegheny**		1 P	2	2	2	4					
1932	**Green Mountain**			1 P	2	2	2					
1920	**Monongahela**		1	2	5 N	5 N	6					
1932	**G. Washington**				5	6	7					
1918	Nat. Bridge 1933		2	2								
1918	Shenandoah 1932		4	4								
	Jefferson				4	5	6					
1937	Cumberland 1966				4	5	6					
1918	Alabama 1936		1	1								
1926	**Ouachita**			6								
1907	Arkansas 1926	#	7									
1908	Ozark	#	5	4								
1908 1927	Choctawhatch-11	#		2								
	Ocala			1								
1931	**Osceola**			1 P								
1911	Florida 1927		5									
1936	**Kisatchie**			1 P								
1920	**Cherokee**		4	3								
1920	Unaka 1936		4	3								
1920	**Nantahala**			3								
1916	**Pisgah**		6	4								
1903	Luguillo 1915		1	1								
	# Forests	**(3)**	**(13)**	**(18)**	**(7)**	**(7)**	**(7)**					
	# Districts		**(46)**	**(45)**	**(44)**	**(30)**	**(36)**					

N-Nursery not included P-Purchase Unit included

- These Forests and Districts were all once part of Region 7 but are included in totals for Region 8 and 9 not included as Region 7

A-8 --- REGION 8: Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and District Numbers by Decade

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1903	Luquillo 1935	#	1**	1**								
1935	**Caribbean**				1	1 TFR	1 TFR	1 ITF	1	1	1	1
1908 1927	Ocala 1911	#		1**	(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(3)	(2)	(2)	(2)
1908 1927	1911 Choctawhatchee	#		2**								
1911	Florida 1927		5**									
Adm	**Florida N.F.s**				4	4	6	5	6	5	5	5
1931	Osceola			1 P**	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1936	Apalachicola				(2)	(2)	(3)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)*	(2)
1925	Lee 1928											
1925	Eustis 1927											
1925	Humphreys 1928											
1932	G. Washington				5	6	7	7	6	6		
1918	Nat. Bridge1933		2	2								
Adm	**G.Wash-Jeff.**										11 J R	10 J R
1918	Shenandoah 1932		4	4								
1936	Jefferson				4	5	6	6 J	6 J R	6 J R		
1920	Unaka 1936		4**	3**								
1920	Cherokee		4**	3**	4	4	6	6 J	6 J	6 J	4 J	4 J
1999	Land betw. Lakes										1	1
1936	Croatan				2	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1916	Pisqah		6**	4**	4	5	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
1920	Boone 1921											
Adm	**N. Carolina NFs**						11	10 J2	10 J2	10 J2	10 J2	10 J2
1961	Uwharrie					1	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1920	Nantahala			3**	3	3	(4)	(4) J2	(4)J2	(4) J2	(4) J2	(4) J2
1936	Chattahoochee				4	4		(7)	(7)	(7)	(6)	(5)
Adm	**Chattah/Oconee**							9	8	8	7	6
Adm	Georgia N.F						8 L					
1959	Oconee							(2)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1924	Benning 1927											
1924	Jackson 1928											
1936	Francis Marion				1	2	4	(3)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)
Adm	**FraMar-Sumter**							8	7	7	4	4
1936	Sumter				3	3	3	(5)	(5)	(5)	(3)	(3)
								SavhRv	1974			
1925	Knox 1928											
1937	Cumberland 1966				4**	5**	6**					
1966	**Daniel Boone**							8 J2	7 J2	7 J2	6 J2	6 J2

J-Job Corps Center not included N-Nursery not included L-Land Util. Projects included
P-Purchase Unit district included G-Grassland units included

(Continued)

REGION 8 (continued)

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1936	Talladega				(2)	(3)	(4)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
1936	Conecuh				(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1918	Alabama 1936		1**	1**								
Adm	**Alabama NFs**				4	5	8	7	7	6	6	6
1936	Black Warrior				(1)							
1942	W.Bankhead					(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1959	Tuskegee						(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1924	McClellan 1928											
1936	**Kisatchie**			1 P**	3 N	3 N	6 N	6	6	6	5	5
1960	St. Francis							1 J	1 J	(1)J	(1)J	(1)J
Adm	**Ozark-St. Fran.**									7 J	7 J	7 J
1908	Ozark	#	5**	4**	4 N	5	9 L	6	6	(6)	(6)	(6)
1907	Arkansas 1926	#	7**									
1926	**Ouachita**			6**	8	7	12	12 J	12 J	12 J	12 J	12 J
1946	Tishomingo Ok ?					?						
Adm	**Mississippi NFs**				7	9 N	12 NL	10 N	10 N	10 N	7	7
1936	Bienville MS				(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)
1936	Holly Spr.				(1)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1936	DeSoto				(3) N	(4) N	(4) N	(3) N	(3) N	(3) N	(2)	(2)
1936	Homochitto				(1)	(1)	(3) L	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)
1961	Delta				(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1959	Tombigbee							(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Adm	**Texas NFs**				4	6	7	7	8	8	5	5
1936	Angelina TX				(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1936	Davy Crockett				(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)
1936	Sabine				(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)
1936	Sam Houston				(1)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)
1969	Caddo NG											
1969	LBJ NG								(1) G2	(1) G2	(1) G2	(1) G2
Adm	Cross Timber NG							1 G				
1901	Wichita Ok 1936	#	1*									
6	**# Forests**	**6**	**10**	**14**	**18{29}**	**19{30}**	**16{31}**	**17{36}**	**16{36}**	**15{36}**	**15{37}**	**15{37}**
	# Districts		**40**	**36**	**69**	**79**	**112**	**110**	**107**	**105**	**91**	**89**

JC-Job Corps Center not included N-Nursery not included L-Land Util. Projects included
P-Purchase Unit district is included G-Grassland units included

- ( ) Parenthesis indicate number of districts by separate unit in combined unit
- { } Brackets indicate unique situation in R-8 with many smalled forests lumped by state
- TFR-Tropical Forest Research/Region or ITF-Institute of Tropical Forestry managed the Caribbean from 1950's to 1970's, but is included as part of Region 8 for comparison
- * Wichita Forest in Oklahoma was in District 2 but is included in R-8 for comparison
- ** These units were part of Region 7 as indicated, but are included in R-8 for comparison
- *Adm* Represents an "Administrative" designation not a "proclamation" or "congressional" designation

A-9 --- REGION 9: Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and District Numbers by Decade

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
Adm	Hiawatha-Marq.				5 N							
1931	**Hiawatha**				(3 N)			5	5	5	5	5
Adm	Upper Michigan					5 N	5					
1909 1931	Marquette 1915 1962	#		3	(2)							
1909	Michigan 1931	#	3*									
1928	Huron			2	2 N							
Adm	**Huron-Manist.**							7 N	7	7	4	4
Adm	Lower Michigan					6 N2	7 N					
1938	Manistee				4 N							
1931	**Ottawa**				6 N	6 N	6 N	6 N	6 N	6 N	6 N	5 N
1909	**Superior**	#	7*	5 P	10 N2	10 N	9 N	9 N	7 N	5	5	5
1908	Minnesota 1928	#	3*									
1928	**Chippewa**			3	7 N	8 N	8 L	7	5	5	3	3
1933	Nicolet				5 N	5 N	5	5 J	4 J	4 J		
Adm	Wisconsin PU			3 P3								
Adm	**Chequ-Nicolet**										5 J	5 J
1933	Chequamegon				5 N2	5 N	5	5	5	5		
1925	Savanna Ill											
1939	**Shawnee**				3	3	7***	4 J	4 J	4 J	4 J	3 J
1996	**Midewin TGP**										1	1
1926	Bellvue-Sav. '54											
1939	**Mark Twain**				5 N	5	5	6	13	9	6	6 J
1939	Clark 1976				7	7	4	7 L				
1951	**Wayne**				2 P						3	2
Adm	Wayne-Hoosier					4 N	4 N	4	4	4		
1951	**Hoosier**				2 N						2	2
1925	PinePlains,NY 27											
1925	Upton NY 1927											
1985	Finger Lakes								1			
Adm	**GrnMtn-FingLk**									4	4	4
1932	Green Mountain				2**	2**	2**	3 L	3			
1918	**White Mountain**	#	5	4**	4**	5**	5**	5	5	5	5	3
1925	TobyhannaPA 28											
1923	**Allegheny**			2**	2**	2**	4**	4	4	4	2	2
1920	**Monogahela**			2**	5 N**	5 N**	6**	6	6	6	5	4
1925	Dix NJ 1928											
1925	Meade MD 1927											
4	**# Forests**	**5**	**4**	**8**	**17**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**14**	**15**	**15**
	# Districts		**18**	**24**	**76**	**78**	**82**	**83**	**79**	**73**	**60**	**54**

JC-Job Corps Center not included N-Nursery not included L-Land Util. Projects included
P-Purchase Unit district is included G-Grassland units included

- Parenthesis indicate number of districts by separate unit in combined unit
- *Superior, Minnesota, and Michigan forests were part of Dist. 2 but are included in R-9 for comparison
- ** These units were part of Region 7 as indicated, but are included in R-8 for comparison
- ***Four districts on the Shawnee were in Missouri and subsequently moved to Mark Twain
- *Adm* Represents an "Administrative" designation not a "proclamation" or "congressional" designation

A-10 --- REGION 10: Summary of Forest Splits and Consolidations and District Numbers by Decade

Est.	Forest:	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
1892	Afognak											
1907	**Chugach**	#	3	3	2 #	2 #	2	3	3	3	3	3
1902	Alexander Arch.											
1907	**Tongass**	**#**	5	5	3 #	7 #					10	10
Adm	North Tongass*						4	4				
Adm	South Tongass*						3	3				
Adm	Chatham Area*								4	5		
Adm	Stikine Area*								2	2		
Adm	KetchikanArea*								4	4		
4	**# Forests**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**4**	**4**	**2**	**2**
	# Districts		**8**	**8**	**5**	**9**	**9**	**10**	**13**	**14**	**13**	**13**

- From 1908 until 1921 Alaska was a part of the North Pacific District which included OR and WA.
- From 1921 to 1934 Alaska was identified as Region 8
- In 1934 Alaska became Region 10
- # Combination of Divisions with District Ranger/Division Supervisor and Districts with Ranger
- During the mid-seventies into the nineties, Forests were called Areas
- Districts were eliminated in mid- seventies until 1983, but there were Resource Management Assistants at Districts
- *Adm* Represents an "Administrative" designation not a "proclamation" or "congressional" designation

Appendix B:

PARTIAL LISTHING OF MAJOR DEPT. OF INTERIOR TRANSFERS SUMMARY BY FOREST BY DECADE[xxxiv]

NPS Unit	Region	FOREST
	Region 1	
Glacier	1915	Blackfeet, Lewis/Clark
Yellowstone	1929	Absorka
Big Hole NM	1939	
	TOTAL	
	Region 2	
Rocky Mtn.	1915	Colorado/Arap.
Grt.Snd Dns NM	1956	Rio Grande
Mt. Rushmore	1925	Black Hills
Yellowstone	1929	Yellowstone/Shoshone
	Region 3	
Coronado NMem	1952	Coronado
Grd. Canyon	1919	Kaibab
Grd. Canyon	1919	Tusayan
Bandelier NM	1932	Sante Fe
Montz. Castl NM	1937	Coconino
Walnut Can. NM	1933	Coconino
Tonto NM	1933	Tonto
Chiricahau NM	1933	Coronado
Elmapais NM	1987	Cibola
Suguaro NP	1933	Coronado
Sunset Crater	1933	Coconino
	Region 4	
Grand Teton	1929	Teton
Yellowstone		Yellowstone
Bryce Canyon	1928	Powell
Utah	1924	Powell
Cedar Breaks	1933	Dixie
Jackson Hole NM	1943	Teton
Great Basin	1986	Humboldt
	Region 5	
Kings Canyon	1940	Sequoia/Sierra
Yosemite	1905,42	Stanislaus
Yosemite	1932	Sierra
Sequoia	1926	Sequoia
Sequoia	1926	Inyo
Lassen Volcan.	1916	Lassen
Calveras Big Tree	1990	Calveras St. Pk.
DevilsPostpileNM	1933	Sequoia
Lava Beds	1933	Modoc
	Region 6	
Crater	1902	Cascade/Crater/RR
Olympic		Olympic
Mt. Rainier	1899	Mt. Rainier
North Cascades		Mt.Bakr/Snoq.
Oregon Caves	1933	Siskiyou
	Region 7	
	Region 8	
Grt.S.Mt. NM	1950	Pisgah
	Region 9	
	Region 10	
Glacier Bay NM	1939	Tongass

Appendix C:

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF NUMBER OF GRASSLANDS/PRAIRIES ESTABLISHED BY DECADE[xxxv]

Region	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Total
Region 1						4					**4**
Region 2						7					**7**
Region 3						4					**4**
Region 4						1					**1**
Region 5						1					**1**
Region 6						1					**1**
Region 8						2					**2**
Region 9									1		**1**
Region 10											
TOTAL						**20**			**1**		**21**

Appendix D:

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF TREE NURSERIES BY DECADE[xxxvi]

·	Region	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	Present
	Region 1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Region 2	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	1
	Region 3											
	Region 4							1	1	1		
	Region 5			1	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	
	Region 6				1	2	2	3	3	3	1	1
	Region 7											
	Region 8					1	1	1	1	1		
	Region 9				13	9	4	3	2	1	1	1
	Region 10											
	TOTAL	1	2	3	18	16	11	13	13	10	6	4

End Notes:

[i]Conrad, David E., *The Land We Cared For…A History of the Forest Service's Eastern Region*, 1997, p. 181
[ii] Land Areas of the National Forest System, U.S.D.A, Forest Service, January 2002, p. 2
[iii] Comparison of Regional Budgets to Permanent Staffing Paper, Region 2 files, January 1994
[iv]Allen, E. T., "The Application and Possibilities of the Federal Forest Reserve Policy", paper delivered before Society of American Foresters, March 1903, Journal of Forestry, 1903, p. 45
[v] "Total Forest Service Budget FY 1931-2007", staff paper, Rick Ullrich, April 2007
[vi] Steen, Harold K., *The U.S. Forest Service: A History,* University of Washington Press, 1977, p. 314
[vii] "Total Forest Service Budget FY 1931-2007", staff paper, Rick Ullrich, April 2007
[viii] Ibid, Steen, Harold K., *The U.S. Forest Service: A History,* p. 314
[ix] Ibid, Steen, Harold K., *The U.S. Forest Service: A History*, p. 314
[x] Ibid, "Total Forest Service Budget FY 1931-2007", April 2007
[xi] "Clearcutting on Federal Timberlands", Report by the Subcommittee on Public Lands to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, March 1972, GPO, p. 7
[xii] LeMaster, Dennis C., *Decade of Change: The Remaking of Forest Service Statutory Authority during the 1970's*, Greenwood Press, p. 175
[xiii] Steen, Harold K., *The Chiefs Remember: The Forest Service 1952-2001*, Forest History Society, 2004, p. 100
[xiv] Ibid, "Total Forest Service Budget FY 1931-2007", April 2007
[xv] Alexander , Thomas G., *Rise of Multiple-Use Management in the Intermountain West: A History of Region 4 of the Forest Service*, FS-399, U. S. Forest Service, May 1987, p. 132
[xvi] Summary of National Forest System budget by year
[xvii] Ibid, "Total Forest Service Budget FY 1931-2007", April 2007
[xviii]Ibid, Conrad, David E., *The Land We Cared For…A History of the Forest Service's Eastern Region*, p. 85
[xix] Ibid, Alexander, Thomas G., *Rise of Multiple-Use Management in the Intermountain West: A History of Region 4 of the Forest Service*, p. 133
[xx] Schmitz, J. M., *We Had An Objective in Mind: The U.S. Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest 1905-2005*, A Centennial Anthology, Rolf Anderson, Editor, Pacific Northwest Forest Service Association, 2005, p. 7
[xxi] Ibid, Conrad, David E., *The Land We Cared For…A History of the Forest Service's Eastern Region*, p. 179-180
[xxii] Ibid, Alexander, Thomas G., *Rise of Multiple-Use Management in the Intermountain West: A History of Region 4 of the Forest Service*, p. 188
[xxiii] Ibid, Alexander, Thomas G. ,*Rise of Multiple-Use Management in the Intermountain West: A History of Region 4 of the Forest Service*, p. 189
[xxiv] Letter from Forest Supervisor Wallace Pierce, Hayden National Forest, 1923, Region 2 Historical File
[xxv] Chiefs Office Inspection Report of Region 2, C.E. Randall, October 1, 1935, Region 2 Historical File
[xxvi] Ibid, Alexander, Thomas G., *Rise of Multiple-Use Management in the Intermountain West: A History of Region 4 of the Forest Service*, p. 132
[xxvii] Ibid, Alexander, Thomas G., *Rise of Multiple-Use Management in the Intermountain West: A History of Region 4 of the Forest Service*, p. 220
[xxviii] Godfrey, Anthony, *The Ever-Changing View: A History of National Forests in California*, R-5-FR-004, July 2005, p. 322
[xxix] Williams, Gerald W., *The Forest Service: Fighting for the Public Land*, Greenwood Press, 2007, p. 216
[xxx] Rakestraw, Lawrence W., *A History of the United States Forest Service in Alaska*, 1981, p. 157
[xxxi] Rupp, Craig W., Letter to Region 2 Forest Supervisors, January 4, 1983
[xxxii] Ibid, Allen, E. T., "The Application and Possibilities of the Federal Forest Reserve Policy", p. 52
[xxxiii] "Establishment and Modification of National Forest Boundaries and National Grasslands: A Chronological Record 1891-1996", FS 612, Nov. 1997, and Forest Service Directories from 1905-2004, USDA, Forest Service

[xxxiv] Ibid, "Establishment and Modification of National Forest Boundaries and National Grasslands: A Chronological Record 1891-1996", p. 1-96
[xxxv] Ibid, "Establishment and Modification of National Forest Boundaries and National Grasslands: A Chronological Record 1891-1996", Addendum 2-1
[xxxvi] Information from Forest Service Directories from 1905-2004, USDA, Forest Service