INTERVIEW I

DATE: January 16, 1969

INTERVIEWEE: BOYD RASMUSSEN (with comments by Irving Senzel and Jerry O'Callaghan)

INTERVIEWER: JOE B. FRANTZ

PLACE: Mr. Rasmussen's office, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.

Tape 1 of 1

F: Mr. Rasmussen, tell us a little bit first about yourself--where you're from and how you came to be the head of the Bureau [of Land Management].

R: I was born in southern Idaho in 1913. My father was a railroad engineer, and we moved from Glenns Ferry, Idaho to Ontario, Oregon, which is sixty miles away, when I was a small boy. I was raised in eastern Oregon, went to high school in Ontario, then to Oregon State University where I majored in forestry. I received a bachelor degree in forestry in 1935.

In 1934 I started as a lookout working for the Forest Service. That was my initial contact with the Forest Service. In 1935 when I graduated I passed the junior forestry examination and was given a junior forester appointment working for the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station in Oregon. I worked in this assignment for two years. Then I was assigned to the administrative branch of the Forest Service as a junior forester in a CCC camp. I worked in the CCC camp for a few months. Then I progressed from a district ranger to a timber staff man to a forest supervisor in the states of Oregon and Washington. I then joined the chief's staff in

Washington for the Forest Service, worked there for two years, moved out to Ogden, Utah, worked there for five years in fire control and state and private forestry. Then I moved back to the Forest Service headquarters in Washington as an assistant to Mr. [Edward] Cliff, now chief of the Forest Service. Then I moved to Montana as regional forester for the Forest Service in charge of the northern region where we managed the National Forests for multiple uses--grazing, recreation, forest protection, insect and disease control, and cooperative programs with states, the management of the Forest Service activities in the northern Rocky Mountain country.

Then I moved back to Washington as a deputy chief of the Forest Service in charge of Cooperative Forestry Programs with all the states in the Union in fire protection, insect and disease control technical forestry assistance, general tree planting, and raising of nursery stock.

At this time I was placed on the Executive Roster. As you remember, President Johnson established a roster of career executives who would be available for transfer to other jobs. I was placed on that list. I had never met President Johnson personally at that time. I was over in my office one day when my secretary came in and said, "There's a man by the name of Udall who wants to talk to you. He says he's Secretary Udall of the Department of Interior." And it was Stewart Udall.

He said, "Boyd, I don't know whether you know what I'm calling about, but your name has appeared on the Executive Roster, and I am

considering you for the director of the Bureau of Land Management because of your long background with conservation work in all the activities that we have. If you're not interested, say so now, or come over and talk to me." I said, "Well, you catch me by surprise, but I am interested and I will come over and talk to you."

I did go over and talk to Secretary Udall and accepted the job as director of the Bureau of Land Management.

F: There's a certain amount of overlap, isn't there, between the Forest Service activities and the Department of Interior activities as far as looking after the management of forests and management of outdoor areas generally?

R: There are, you might say, some overlaps of responsibility but in the same way that there are overlaps between the Park Service because they're managing a piece of land for recreation purposes. The national forests are managed for multiple use. The lands that the Bureau of Land Management is administering are the old public domain lands, and they're covered by different sets of laws, many old laws. And we do recreation in areas that are separate from the Forest Service. So there's an overlap in that we all do some recreation, but we don't do it on the same land areas.

F: One thing I was thinking was that you do have a situation where you have a kind of a natural transferability of skills from one area to the other, so that you didn't learn a new job in a sense when you came here. You just improved on what you already had.

R: That is correct because management of the timber is the same for the lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management as they are the Forest Service. Management of the ranges is the same. The fire fighting is the same. The protection--these are the same. So the same skills that were developed while I worked in the Forest Service for thirty-one years applied equally well to this job. And the background that I'd had working with committees on the Hill, presenting budgets to the Congress, working with the states, all very well qualified me for this job.

F: Now the approximate figures I have in my mind are that you have about seven hundred and sixty-five million acres of public land in this country, of which about four hundred and fifty-three million are managed--these may not be up-to-date figures--that at least are managed by you.

R: Yes.

F: What determines what comes under the Bureau of Land Management?

R: These are the old public domain lands that were never transferred from the ownership of the United States government for any particular purpose. In other words, a great deal of the present national forest areas was transferred from the public domain to the national forest. Large areas of the public domain were transferred to the national parks. Large areas of the public domain were transferred to the military establishments. Large areas of the public domain were transferred to the fish and wildlife refuges. They are specific

land transfers from the public domain, and they're administered by the agencies that received them.

The public lands are those lands, again, that are left. After the railroad grants, the statehood grants, the school grants, the homestead grants, these are the lands that were left. And they constitute a great deal of Alaska. Two hundred and seventy-eight million acres of public domain lands are in Alaska, and the remaining are mainly in the Western United States. Basically, a great many of them are arid lands, the drier lands. The National Forest received the forest lands; the National Parks, many of the scenic wonders of this country; the Fish and Wildlife Service, the areas that were prime fish and wildlife areas.

The remaining public lands have been known as leftover lands. If you look at the map, the original territory of the thirteen states as shown on there belonged to the states. There is very little public domain land in the East. The Louisiana Purchase was a purchase by the United States government of a vast area of land. Much of this land was transferred to private individuals for farms and ranches under the Homestead and other acts.

F: Would you identify the map for the transcript?

R: As you see, Texas was annexed, and it has no public lands because the lands within the state of Texas belong to the state. Any federal lands there have been purchased or exchanged. The land acquired from Mexico by treaty, the Northwest Territory, the Gadsden Purchase, those were public domain lands that belonged to the United States

government. Many of those were transferred to the states for their statehood grants, to the railroads, to the homesteaders, and what we are managing are the lands that were not transferred. They still remain as public domain lands, and mainly they're governed by the Taylor Grazing Act, which states that they will be managed until disposed of, but it doesn't say how they'll be disposed of.

F: Are you empowered to buy land?

R: We're not empowered to buy land except for administrative sites.

F: You wouldn't buy land just for management purposes?

R: No, we have never been granted that authority. We do have the right to exchange lands when it's to the benefit of a grazing district.

F: Exchange with other services or with private--

R: Yes, private individuals or services.

F: When you talk about management now, how do you manage?

R: I thought this might come up. In 1964 there were three very significant acts passed. One created the Land Law Review Commission. A second was what we called the Classification and Multiple Use Act, its companion bill, which told the Bureau of Land Management either to classify public domain lands for retention and management under multiple use, with all of the various uses listed, or to look at them for disposal. The third was the right to put up for sale pieces of the public domain that were agricultural in character, needed for development, commercial uses, and to sell them under competitive bidding. These were very significant acts. In fact, this was the first time, I think, that the Bureau of Land Management was

authorized by law to manage lands for their many uses. This is to me the most significant piece of legislation passed. Our Classification and Multiple Use Act was limited to the time the Land Law Review Commission was in operation. It was extended at the same time so that it expired in 1970. This is the "Right to Classify."

F: This was terminal legislation.

R: Yes. However, our solicitor has ruled that once these lands are classified that they remain classified until they're changed. This is a most significant opinion. But of all the events that happened in conservation, I think that the Classification and Multiple Use Act is to us, and to many of the conservation people in the United States, the most significant piece of legislation, although it isn't really recognized as such.

F: Was this a result of a long-time sort of education and pressure, or was this something that developed rather swiftly?

R: I think it developed rather quickly because of the need to carefully look at the public land laws. The 1872 Mining Act is a typical example of a law that creates some tremendous difficulties. I think the legislation was developed perhaps because of the need to manage the public domain land. For years there were no management principles.

F: It was more of a holding operation.

R: It had been a holding operation. Congress had been unwilling to invest in money in the public domain lands; they'd been unwilling to invest money in recreation, range improvements of any kind in these lands because someday they might be disposed of. The operation under

this law started a series of events. One of them was that we promulgated regulations that described how we were going to proceed. It took us about a year to do that, because they had to be reviewed by many people, discussed at local levels, and tried on a pilot basis.

Basically, this was an expansion of the creative federalism President Johnson was talking about. That is working with local authorities, the federal government going to the communities, the states, and the local people, saying, "Now, what do you want us to do to this land! We propose to classify it for recreation, grazing timber, wildlife or mining--all of these things." We would hold a series of hearings in which local people would tell the federal government what they wanted to do with the land. As a result, we classified--

O: That's the latest report on December 31.

R: --about a hundred and thirty-seven million acres of land to be managed for multiple use purposes as described by this act.

F: This takes considerably more staff, doesn't it, than you've had heretofore?

R: Yes, it takes additional people.

F: Has Congress been reasonably realistic in enlarging appropriations?

R: Gradually the appropriations have been enlarged; our staffing has increased, not as much as we'd like, but we have recreation people who deal in recreation; we have people who specialize in wildlife; we have a whole group of multiple use people who did not work for the Bureau a few years previous.

F: Do you run some sort of a forecast of what multiple uses should be; that is, long-range recommendations of various parcels of land that we may want to utilize this way or another? How do you determine what is suitable for multiple use?

R: We started by breaking the land mass down into what we call planning areas: Type 1 planning areas, Type 2, Type 3 and Type 4. Then we looked at these pieces of land for all of their uses. Our Type 1 areas were those areas that contained the greatest concentration of federal land--the largest holdings, 50 per cent or more. The class 3 lands were--what were they, Irving?

S: I'd say joint management with other agencies.

R: We also considered those lands where we had scattered holdings--the lands that should be considered for disposal. Our planning efforts were concentrated mainly in the well-blocked areas, because these areas offered the greatest opportunities in the practice of multiple use of all kinds.

We are in the recreation business, because desert recreation is a great thing. It's one of the coming things. It has just started because of shorter work weeks and a more affluent society--

F: More accessibility.

R: --and more accessibility, better equipment. Folks no longer take vacations only in the summertime. The desert is not a place to really take a summer vacation, but it's a wonderful place in the wintertime. There's tremendous recreation potential in the desert.

Under this program we classified in every state, first of all, the pieces that were well-blocked; and then we classified the scattered ownerships.

But what it gives us is a planned operation whereby we concentrate our efforts in the management of the well blocked lands and the disposal activities on the scattered ownerships. It's really a very effective and efficient way to go about it. For the first time, we now say, "You do not file applications for homesteads in these areas. You don't file applications in lands classified for retention. You file in the areas that we have classified for disposal." This has helped us. It gave us a planned program. It allows us to concentrate disposal efforts in disposal areas, because undoubtedly, quite a little of the land should be disposed of and will be eventually.

F: Do you have a steady rate of disposal, or does this come in spurts?

R: I think we dispose of about a million acres each year. It has been at this level for some time. This has been for state selection by the states, to counties and local governments, and exchange.

F: Have the states and local entities pretty well understood now the new procedures?

R: Yes, very well. Irving, do you have an estimate of the public hearings we've had?

S: The formal run into several hundreds. This process, as well as being something that's helping the Bureau of Land Management, has been very important to the public who own these lands, including the

state and local governments who have interests in them. It's the assurance that there are certain types of programs that are going to be conducted on lands of value for the general public. And the assurance that the lands that should go into the private and state economies are going there is something that has satisfied a long-time need expressed by the people for state fish and game departments and other interests on the future of public lands.

F: You get rid of that old feeling that the federal government just is operating a great big freeze in an area?

S: That's right. And stopped operating a giveaway. You come up with professional findings that are worked up with the people in the area who know the local needs and the local. . . .

R: The other day Secretary Udall gave what we would call a mission paper which told us what he expected to do in the future with these lands that have been classified for retention and multi-use management. He also told us to name these lands national resource areas--this means that we can designate national resource areas that will be managed for multiple use in all states. They will be managed for all of the people. In some areas there will be a number of different uses, but in other areas there may be one or just two.

We have been pleased that in a few years we've been able to classify this large area for management without a major upheaval, without a major saying, "You're wrong." And this has been very satisfactory. We've found out, though, that the local governments themselves are quite concerned about these federal lands; that in

many cases these federal lands are the play areas; these are the rock-hounding areas. These are the areas that people use. They're the only public lands in some places.

We're also finding that there is considerable opposition to disposal of small tracts of land just because they're scattered. In south central Washington we had about four to eight thousand acres of scattered land. This was a difficult piece of land to administer because we didn't see it very often, so we put forth a preliminary proposal that we would dispose of it. We received protests from everywhere. They said, "No. These lands are the lands that we didn't select for our farms. These are the non-agricultural lands. These are the lands we hunt on. They're the ridgetops. These are the lands where we pick rocks. We look for artifacts. We picnic on them. And we don't want them to go." So we had to change our thoughts on this. We learned that every piece of government land, even though it was an isolated place, was important to local people. Eighty acres near a city or town was extremely important, and they preferred that it be retained until at some time in the future they might want to ask for it--the county or the city.

F: It fits in a bit with that open space concept.

R: Correct. It has been developed. They've also realized that space itself is a premium, even in the West, and that any push to dispose of these lands should have very careful public scrutiny. This is what this law meant to us, and this is what we've done. It has been

done rather quietly. It hasn't been a big push. It has been a steady push. We started this really in earnest in 1966.

F: As far as you know, has the President himself taken any direct interest in this, or is he pretty well just agreed with the general concept as forwarded by you and Mr. Udall and so on?

R: I think if he hadn't agreed with the general concept we wouldn't have been allowed to proceed. Certainly there was pressure from western congressmen to stop the program. I think he knew of these dissensions. The first recreation area that we designated was Red Rock Recreation in southern Nevada, and it had national publicity.

S: His budget has contained specific items for the classification program.

F: Has Mrs. Johnson visited any of the areas?

S: Mrs. Johnson has been on the lands. I don't know whether she has always realized it. But she did on her trip in connection with the Park Service program take along with her and distributed the bureau's publication "Room to Roam," which points out the various public recreational attributes of the public lands. That's some indication that the White House has been familiar with Public Lands.

O: And the publication "Room to Roam" is a reflection of President Johnson's desires that the public be informed, one of the many.

F: One thing I was wondering was, you have here a president who comes from that sort of background, the same background as you all do. And from what I know of him personally, it fits his own philosophy, and I didn't know whether he had gotten actively involved or whether

he was just approving. How do you stay out of conflict with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation?

R: We're not in conflict with them. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation does the national overall planning, and we cooperate with them. We work with them all the time.

F: Would they work with you when you wanted to take one of these areas and classify it for recreational uses, or do you do that independently of them?

R: We would do that independently in line with the broad overall Bureau of Outdoor Recreation reports. You see, it reviewed our areas. It sets up standards which we followed. In our classification we used their standards so there would be no reason for us to go to them and say, "Do you approve of this, or don't you," because what we're doing is obviously on a rather small scale, but it does fit their criteria, their standards. We use their plans. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has a local regional director in various areas, and our state people work very carefully and very closely with him. We are in constant contact with them. They know what we're doing.

S: As well as other agencies, we used criteria of the Outdoor Recreation Bureau in our inventory of recreational sites and complexes which they use for their planning, and we use for our planning. As Boyd says, it's constant dialogue so that the national program happily affects the bureau's activity.

R: You see, there is a difference of function. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation essentially is a staff agency, and we're a land management agency.

F; How does this Wilderness Act affect you?

R: The Wilderness Act does not affect the bureau directly in that it did not provide for any wilderness areas on the public lands, nor did it provide provisions for the establishment of wilderness areas on the public lands. It did not oppose it, but it did not provide it. The Classification and Multiple Use Act doesn't specifically define the bureau's mission--preservation of wilderness values on public land, on national resources land.

F: With the coming of classification, have you set up a research section within the bureau?

R: No. We do not have a research unit. We do contract with private individuals. We use the research findings by the Forest Service research. We use findings that the BOR comes up with. But as such, we do not have research work going on.

F: You do a certain amount of watershed management, right?

R: We do a considerable amount of watershed management. This is one of our big jobs.

F: What sort of relationship do you have with the Corps of Engineers on this?

R: Our watershed management areas do not have very much to do with the Corps of Engineers. We are in the more arid climate areas. They do cover some of the headwaters streams, but we maintain liaison. We

have meetings with them and work with them, but we don't have any agreements with them.

S: We have no agreement. We participate in so-called impact study programs where--this supplies not only the Corps of Engineers, but the Bureau of Reclamation or any other dam-building agency--we report to the construction agency the relationship between the proposals and the public lands in the vicinity. And if the project should require special attention upstream in the way of erosion control, that means we put it in our report so that the construction agency can report to the Congress the full implication of its program.

F: On some major controversy like the Lower Colorado River power problem that they've had in Arizona and California, or Hells Canyon, and so on, do you get involved in that at all?

R: Yes, we do get involved in that. Just a few months ago the Secretary assigned the Bureau of Land Management responsibility for the Lower Colorado planning area, the Lower Colorado project. This is part of our work now. We have responsibility for the Bureau of Reclamation's withdrawal lands, for the recreation work on them.

We work on committees with the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation.

F: When you talk about watershed management, what do you mean?

R: What we're talking about is the measures that we take to retain the soil on the land. There might be reseeding of the range where it has been overgrazed. Before the Taylor Grazing Act in 1934 was passed, many of the public lands in the West were open to grazing by

anybody that wanted to graze. The migrant flocks of sheep went clear across these lands, the cattlemen had free access to it, so there was no real management of those lands, and many of them were overgrazed. After the Taylor Grazing Act, we gradually started managing them. We prepared inventories of the areas to show the needs. We call it "conservation needs inventory."

What we do on a piece of land is to examine a watershed. By watershed, we mean an area that flows in one general direction, the drainage--if there was any water. Sometimes there isn't, but it's still a watershed, and there's water [during] some times of the year. It may come all at once in a downpour; it may come after the snow melts and then dries up. We put in structures at the heads of these draws, at the heads and tops of the ridges, that prevent a rapid movement of water, that slows the water. We plant grass and forbs and various other things on the land. I think one of the large projects that we have is in Arizona. There is quite a large project in an area that was once a very fertile and very fine grazing area which at the turn of the century was almost destroyed.

S: That's the San Simon area.

O: Actually, it started with just the impact of the stagecoach trail that got well used. That cut the fabric, you might say, and started the unraveling.

F: Of course, the country scars easily and no scar ever heals.

R: It's very difficult to heal. But our watershed management work also consists of management of the way the stock uses the area. We are

now planning how the livestock use an area, setting opening and closing times. In many areas we are establishing a rest-rotation system of grazing.

F: Do you need a reseeding?

R: We do reseeding, and we do fencing. We put in small structures in draws; we provide waterholes and water. Many times some of the areas are not used because there isn't sufficient water. This program has gradually stepped up the last few years.

S: Of increasing importance here is the quality of water. As our public lands become open and accessible to the general public, the quality of water is of increasing importance, and is being incorporated into the watershed program.

R: I'd like to talk about another aspect of the land. We had the Small Tract Act. When was that passed? Jerry, do you remember?

O: 1938.

R: Which permitted the bureau to sell small tracts of land for homes and homesites. We went into that program rather naive, I would say, without much planning, and sold off tracts of land without worrying about the school system, water, transportation--

F: You'd just give me my plot if I'd meet the conditions.

R: Yes, that's right. You had to put a small building on it, and I understand that they would sell you a building--now, this is just what I understand--that would be 8 x 8, and that would satisfy the Small Tract Act. And we made some slums, really. Our experience in

the fifties in this led us to withdraw. We just stopped selling land under the Small Tract Act because it didn't fit into overall good planning.

So one of the problems that we were wrestling with in the last three or four or five years was "How do we dispose of this land best? Where should we build? Where shouldn't we build?" The local counties were having problems in zoning and where to build and not to build, what to do. We ourselves were having some problems. So we started out a project--about three years ago--to put together all the things that we would know about open space. This is following the President's directive to think about open space, and Mrs. Johnson's own space work and beautification.

After considerable work through a contract we produced our first publication, a technical bulletin, titled "Where Not to Build." This is a land-use planning book--how you fit communities into open space and beautification in the areas where there is open space. We're desecrating the land in the West as rapidly as we're doing anything else, by poor planning. We had a very nice letter from Mrs. Johnson regarding the publication. It's part of my file. I deeply appreciate that letter. The bulletin is receiving worldwide recognition. It's a funny title, "Where Not to Build," but it's something that we're giving increasing attention.

F: I'll agree with you on this aspect of the problem, and that is the matter of controlling the periphery to your spaces because I myself

have observed too many [times] you had to go through some kind of gaudy piece of tinsel or broken-down area or something to get to something that kind of filled your soul.

R: In the eastern United States--we're getting calls from colleges, from the architects, from the state planners, for this bulletin. We had a letter the other day from Pennsylvania from one of the state planners, and he said, "While you really produced this for the West, it applies in the East, and I wish you'd produced it ten years ago because we wouldn't have made some of the mistakes that we're faced with. May we have fifty copies because I'm going to have my staff take a look at how you plan open space because it can apply well in Pennsylvania--the principles that you've stated here."

F: How'd you get into the Outer Continental Shelf?

R: This was assigned to us by the Secretary, the responsibility for the leasing. We only have the responsibility for the leasing. We do not administer the actual drilling, the geological survey end.

F: Does your oil and gas office take care of that?

R: The oil and gas office doesn't have anything to do with the Outer Continental Shelf.

S: We have our own offices to conduct our phase of the work. As Boyd says, we're responsible for issuance of the lease, but it's not as simple as it sounds.

F: I was going to ask. Does this complicate your procedure particularly?

S: No, not our procedure. For determining when and where to issue leases, we have to take into consideration a lot of factors and consult with

quite a few agencies. The responsibility is assigned to the department as a result of the settlement of the issue whether the states or the federal government owned the tidelands. At that time the tidelands--the lands within historical boundaries--were granted to the states, and the lands outside that area were assigned to the federal government. Mineral leasing and other resource activities for the outside lands were assigned to the secretary of interior. The secretary has given us responsibility for the administration of the mineral leasing laws on the Outer Continental Shelf.

F: This is just a continuation really of your regular mineral leasing activity?

S: We have similar responsibility as far as we're concerned. The reason is one of the requirements of the future is we have to work with the fish and wildlife people, and then our industry and mineral interests and Coast Guard and all those--Department of Defense. Everybody's interested in this environment. It's a very fascinating activity. We were authorized within the last year or so to have a mineral economics unit to improve our ability to cope with these economic phases of the minerals program.

R: This is a recognition by the President's Bureau of the Budget of the need to make a better assessment of the values involved. It's only recently, in the last few years at least, that these tremendous bids have been received and interest in the Outer Continental Shelf has grown by leaps and bounds.

F: Do you do a certain amount of environmental or marine life management in this as a coincidental in the fact that, of course, leases disturb a life there above the shelf?

R: This is the responsibility of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

F: Do you make some sort of an agreement with them, or at least there is a minimum of cooperation there?

S: There's a working agreement with them in writing.

F: In writing?

S: Yes. Endorsed by the secretary. It provides that the interested agencies will have the opportunity to participate before any decision is made as to timing or to the extent or in terms of conditions of leasing. It's our responsibility to make sure that all agencies having an interest in the area are contacted and proper provisions are put in our leases to protect the multiple values of the green environment. It's a similar concept to multi-use of the offshore land.

F: My view of the drilling on the offshore lands is that originally it did not provide the instant resources, because of certain technical and financial problems that were anticipated, but now it is finally beginning to realize on what its more optimistic predictors had expected. Is this correct?

R: I think this is correct. I think drilling techniques and the development of the drilling platforms--all this technology has come together to make it possible to effectively and efficiently

drill in certain depths. Up till recently it was about six hundred feet, but new technological breakthroughs that have been made in the last year or two look like they will be drilling offshore in much greater depths. Our last sale offerings in the Santa Barbara channel were--

S: Twelve hundred feet.

R: Considerable depth, further than it had ever been so before.

S: We've heard it said, to put it this way, industry can drill anywhere. And they've now made major breakthroughs as to underwater completions at depth.

F: Do you set up certain anti-pollution standards in a case like this?

R: Yes.

S: They are incorporated. Again, it's developed with other agencies.

R: With the permit.

F: Are you involved in the oil shale prospects?

R: Yes.

F: Do you do any prospecting yourself?

R: No. We're responsible for the surface of the land, the protection of the surface.

F: You don't concern yourself with the subsoil except as maybe water tables--

R: It depends on whether it's a lease program or what kind of program is developed.

S: On the oil shale we share major responsibilities, as with other minerals, with the Geological Survey, and if there is any drilling or testing that is done by or through the Geological Survey. Normally, the federal government doesn't do any drilling or testing. Private industry does that. But in the oil shale country in developing some of the parameters as to the determination of what the program should be. As you know, that has been one of the areas of public debate and discussion. There has been some drilling done actually by the Bureau of Mines to determine the extent and character of the deposits that we have there. That was in connection with the Secretary's Experimental Leasing Program which was completed this month--not by the issuance of leases, by rejection of the bids as being inadequate under the circumstances.

F: One question I wanted to get in before we leave this: do you have good documented instances of your water tables rising because of good conservation practice?

S: Again, the Geological Survey is responsible for the government's activities on it with respect to the location and management and determination of the status of the country's surface and subterranean water supplies. They keep records of what's happening. And since we generally share a watershed with other owners, whatever happens to that watershed is usually a result of multiple activities.

R: Ours is by visual looking at the land, whether the land is productive as it was, whether it has cover--what's the progress? We measure the amount of forage on the land, which in turn means how much cover,

so that in the various projects that we work on in our watershed management, I think our only evaluation is in how the land produces--whether it produces more forage for both wildlife and domestic cattle, the run-off and the water.

O: We get some dramatic instances once in a while. For example, there was a fire on the watershed immediately back of Boise, Idaho. I've forgotten just when it was, but anyway it stripped that watershed and subjected Boise to disastrous floods. We went in there with the Forest Service and some other people, on a very steep watershed and instituted these practices and so on. And that watershed took an awful pounding in 1964. There were torrential, almost hundred-year storms. And I think the last storm finally broke lose a little bit of that watershed. But Boise was safe. We, of course, catalog that sort of thing.

R: They had disastrous floods in Boise before, and they had had fires so that they knew they were coming. And never before had a massive watershed rehabilitation project been put into effect so quickly and so constructively. But this was a cooperative venture with the Forest Service and the local people.

F: You were prepared to do this sort of thing, though, repetitively as necessary?

S: We have another project, not as dramatic as this one but again a cooperative one, around Reno, Nevada, again for flood protection purposes in cooperation with other interested agencies. The cooperation in water and other matters goes both ways. In the conduct

of our operation we keep in constant contact with the state water people, the state reclamation people, and try to make sure that critical watersheds in the areas are protected and enhanced, and that the utilization of water because of private or federal activities on federal land is consistent with the conservation policies of the states.

F: How active are you in wildlife management?

R: Extremely active. We have a great deal of habitat. We manage the habitat on a hundred and seventy-five million acres in the West. There is found much of the big game habitat and much of the small game, antelope, deer and elk.

F: Do you run into conflict with state parks and wildlife groups?

R: No. We have cooperative agreements with all of the state game commissions to do wildlife management work. Now, the state actually maintains control of the game, the seasons, the harvest--this sort of thing. They work with us on the habitat. We're responsible for the land, so that we have many cooperative agreements where the state game commissions are putting money into the public lands to improve the habitat for deer and for access to streams.

For instance, on the Deschutes River in Oregon, which is one of the very fine fishing streams in the West, there was no access for many years. We, in cooperation with the state game commission, secured access. We received money for the building of the access road. This was completed last year, and opened up twenty-six miles of the Deschutes River which had never been really

open for fishing. It's a great public resource. Actually the land was old public domain land that no one ever wanted because it was steep and rough. But it did control the banks of the Deschutes River.

Our work with the fish and game commissions is recognized by them. We recognize the right of the state to control the game and manage it. We don't try to manage it. It's a cooperative venture, and we have it in every state. The bulk of the hunting land, for instance, in Nevada is the public domain lands. We have cooperative agreements, and we have no problems. This is something that the Bureau of Land Management works out with almost every agency of the state in every state.

F: Do you have a leasing office in these big game areas to handle hunting leases?

R: We don't handle hunting leases.

F: That's done, again, entirely by the state?

R: By hunting lease, you mean licenses?

F: Yes. I was thinking more of an area in which I can hunt, giving me the right to hunt within an area.

O: He's thinking of the access problem, I believe.

F: Right.

O: That's one of our real problems on the public lands. The fragmented land ownership or jurisdiction pattern, you know, cuts the land up on a map as it isn't in nature.

F: This is a problem in Texas, of course, where what you have does not pertain to us, but I have to work out a lease situation with someone before I can go hunt.

S: The public lands are open to the general public for hunting and fishing, so that a prior permission is--

F: How do you control my blasting your head off because--?

S: The state fish and game department boys issue the licenses and manage the hunter. We try to maintain and improve the habitat by putting in minimum facilities for the use of hunters, dry camps in some instances, parking areas in other instances. Mainly, a very important effort is to gain access, either by the construction of roads as we did in the Deschutes River area, or by acquiring lands by exchange so that the people can cross. . . .

F: You do provide some shelters?

S: Recreation areas, yes. As I say, on a minimal basis we provide really sanitation and protection.

R: This map of Wyoming illustrates the land use problem where the land grant railroads were granted every other section. This is an area where every other section is private land. The solid colored areas are our most solidly blocked areas. But they are the exception and this does create a problem that we haven't fully solved. We just haven't fully solved this because the alternate white sections are private land.

F: And you have no opportunity to fill them in either.

R: This is such a big area. For instance, we're working with the state of Montana on access to public land; we've worked out cooperative agreements through the State Game Commission with the adjoining private landowners. They open their lands to private individuals to hunt. In those areas the individual hunters pay a fee to the state which is in turn partially distributed to the land owners. For instance, an antelope permit would provide a dollar of the fee for the landowner.

We have cooperative agreements through the state with a lot of private landowners to open their land to private hunting and provide free access to public lands. For example here is a prime antelope area. The landowner puts a notice in the paper, "Hunters welcome." Now, when the hunter comes he has a tag on his permit which he gives to the landowner, the landowner turns the tag in, and in turn receives a fee. This is a part of the license that the state issues. Then in turn the state puts some of their money back into development of water holes, development of guzzlers for small birds, small animals, development of some reseeding areas, too--shrubs and forage.

F: You don't have any systematic thinning out like the Park Service does in its areas for elk?

R: No. This is done by public hunting. We work with the State Game Commission very carefully. In an area where there are too many deer we talk to the state and say, "Now, look, we're having overgrazing by wildlife in this area. We want to do something about it." Then maybe in a year, they'll have an extra hunt. They'll add ten days

to the hunting season, or they'll say you can take an extra deer to thin down the herd. But it's done by public hunting by the public.

F: Do you contract studies to see that you keep a balance between, say, the predators and the deer, the small game and so on?

R: No, we don't have anything to do with the predators.

S: We have no control of that.

R: But we do make studies all the time of the animals using the range, including the wildlife and the domestic livestock. Our management plans now call for an allowance of the feed for the wildlife. It isn't always as much as the wildlife people would like to have, but at least the recognition is there.

F: Let's shift our talk to that of the Civilian Conservation Centers and what you have been doing along that line.

R: We have five centers--I guess it's four now, we had to close one--scattered out through the West. This offers an opportunity for young people to work and get some further education in the West. As far as we're concerned, they're a very fine achievement. They're something that has long been neeeded.

F: How many people are we talking about?

O: There are about a thousand in five camps.

R: Something like that.

F: Who are these people?

R: They're from various parts of the United States. I think we're averaging about 60 per cent from the southern part of the United States, some of them a little higher than that.

F: Are they all male?

R: Yes. We don't have any camps for women.

F: Do you work this completely independently, or do you cooperate with some of the other youth employment programs in this? How do you select your people, in other words?

R: They're selected for us.

F: Who selects?

O: OEO. We're something like an army base commander. We just get told, "You're going to get a shipment of men to arrive on such-and-such a day."

R: And our job is to provide them with the facilities for eating, sleeping, education, and work--the opportunities.

F: Are they on your payroll, or are they just part of your expenses for upkeep?

R: They're not on our payroll.

F: They are OEO people?

R: OEO people.

S: This is part of the Job Corps program.

F: How long has this been going on?

S: Ever since the Job Corps was established.

O: [In] 1965 I think we got the first camps going.

R: Somewhere right in there.

F: How does it work?

O: I think it works very well.

S: I think the experience sets a fairly uniform pattern. The local reaction at first is adverse, and it gradually changes to admiration and then to affection. When we had to close the one unit, there was public objection. We think the boys are having good opportunities for a very fine experience. One of our graduates was in the Olympic Games. I think he took the gold medal for boxing.

F: [George] Foreman.

O: I was the chairman at the dedication of that camp, and he must have been there in the crowd, I think.

F: Ideally, how long do they stay?

O: I don't have any figures on it, but it's an individual basis. When a boy reaches, I think, eighth grade abilities in arithmetic, reading, and English, he goes.

R: We've had some problems in this area. If we can get them to stay thirty days, this is fine. But they're in a different environment, far from home, and really probably are away from home for the first time.

F: Do they tend to be city boys, rural boys--what kind of boys?

R: All kinds.

F: It's the first exposure, though, of some of them probably to the outdoors, isn't it?

R: To many of them, it's their first experience.

F: At least the first prolonged [exposure].

R: Although most of the southern boys are well acquainted with the woods.

F: What do you teach them in the way of outdoor skills or practices?

R: There are a number of things. For example, they build campgrounds, and they build them from scratch. That includes the tables and the layout.

F: They learn about space clearing and carpentering and so on?

R: They learn to use tools. They learn to do masonry work. They learn to do carpentry work. In the camp in Utah, they recently completed a building in an area where many of the dinosaurs have been found and called the Dinosaur Museum.

S: This has a double name I don't remember.

R: Wide something. But this is a place where all the dinosaurs, or the big share of them, have been discovered and found. So the Job Corps camp made this visitors' center where you can look and see where the dinosaurs were uncovered. They have some of the relics there in the little museum. It isn't a large affair, but they built that from scratch.

F: You had some experience with the old CCC as a manager. How does this contrast with that?

R: I haven't personally lived in a Job Corps camp. I did when I was in CCC program many years ago. I think there's a great deal of difference. In the first place the boys that we received in the CCC camps when I was working there in 1935 were boys from the Deep South and from the East. Most of the camps I worked in were the boys from Kentucky and Tennessee, North Carolina, and the South. They were not uneducated boys. They were boys that didn't have jobs. Their education was much better, although we did have an education program

for those that weren't. But the vast majority of them were better educated. They were looking for a job. They learned skills like logging and sawing, working in the woods, using bulldozers. Most of them stayed in the West. Some of them went home, but many of them ended up back in the West. They signed up for six months, but usually the average period they stayed was about a year and a half. I think probably the same things go on. The army was clothing and messing them and keeping care of them. We had the work project. But they were a different quality of boys. The boys that we receive now have been screened and we're receiving them where their education has not been up to standard. So one of the first efforts is to educate them.

F: Have you developed any boys you can use?

R: Yes, we use a number. I haven't the history of their employment. One of the problems, as I said, was we were not keeping them quite long enough. They were in a different environment.

F: It must have been an isolated environment for some of them, too.

R: Well, yes.

F: Or at least seemed that way to them.

R: A lot of them were from the big cities. I think that was one of the other differences. We found more country boys in the CCC days, at least the ones I worked with, although there were some from New Jersey that were strictly big city boys.

F: I could backstop what you're saying about CCC camps because there was one right outside our town and the same proposition. In fact we had

a little college, and some of them even took the time to go to college on the side.

R: But we've been pleased with the progress of those that did stay. In some of our camps, the period now is rather short. I can see where transporting them clear across the country to a strange location and then expecting them to get busy and learn creates problems. We've been real pleased with some of the boys who've developed, for instance the cooks and the people that work in the kitchen. They always have places to go.

F: You've had the advantage of working both sides of the road. I'd be interested in your comments on the continuing idea, which sometimes is probably talk and sometimes threatens to develop into more, that the whole matter of what you might call outdoor services needs to be rearranged, that you need a Department of Natural Resources, the Forest Service ought to be brought in, et cetera. You know the ingredients. I'd like to hear how you think this would work.

R: Before giving you a yes or no answer, one of the problems is that--

F: I'm not going to force you into a yes or no answer, but I would like to explore it.

R: --the public lands are administered under many different laws, many laws that do not apply to the Forest Service. Their Organic Act permitted them to do many things that we have been unable to do and are still unable to do. So until the laws are straightened out, it would be difficult to mesh them. We've had experience in this because we meshed the old Grazing Service and the Land Offices, and it

takes years to do this. So it isn't an easy thing to say that one outfit should be managing it all. But we do need to look at it very carefully, because I think now that the opportunity is there to move the agencies closer together.

The biggest difficulties that I see are trying to expand it into the whole universe of outdoors. This is a real complicated problem. My personal opinion would be that we're not quite ready for it, but we are moving closer.

F: I'm about at the end. Is there anything that we've overlooked?

R: I've taken longer than I wanted to, but the boys haven't been back with the papers. They may be hiding, waiting out there.

F: I do want to get in these other two names that we have here. It's Jerry O'Callagham. Title?

O: I'm chief of the Office of Legislation and Cooperative Relations; also the resident historian.

S: Irving Senzel, assistant director of Lands and Minerals in the Bureau of Land Management.

R: I've got one more thing before we close.

F: I do, too. I want to ask you one very quick question, then I'll let you take yours. It seems to me that in the other Interior agencies, services, and so on, bureaus, that you are getting more and more of an eastward thrust. Now I can't see that in the Bureau of Land Management, but Reclamation, Park Service, et cetera, which used to be so largely western oriented, has come east of the Mississippi tremendously, particularly in the past decade. There's no prospect really--

R: No. The public domain lands are mostly in the West. But the eastern influence is being felt. Whenever we do anything with public domain lands anywhere, the people in New York are as interested, or Florida--

F: It's not something way out there to them anymore?

R: No. I would illustrate this by the problem that we had with some wild horses. There are wild horses in the West. We classify a horse that's unbranded, running free on the range, as wild, regardless of his ancestry--as long as he isn't branded. We were trying to deal with a group of horses in the Pryor Mountains that had eaten the range down to where we were worried about the fact that they just weren't going to have enough to survive. They were ruining the watershed. Between the horses and the wildlife, the watershed was deteriorating, and we were afraid that within a few years something would happen. We started out to check with the public and review a plan of action. We met in hearings, and we provided them with some alternatives. An NBC writer with a crew went out. He didn't visit with us, but visited with the local ranchers and people and came up with a horrible film that accused us of saying these horses were going to be sold to canners, and we were going to get rid of all the wild horses. Well, that documentary film hit in New York, and one congressman got something like a thousand letters the first week. We heard from all over the United States about us abusing wild horses, which was the furthest from our thoughts. We were trying to figure out how to manage them. We got out of this dilemma by the Secretary allowing me to appoint a wild horse committee composed of wild horse enthusiasts, protectionists,

people who knew the range, and people who knew the animals. That committee's working now. Once in a while we hear something. They'll have their reports in. The horses are there; we haven't killed them. But the response from the eastern United States about these horses was tremendous.

F: Even though you didn't like the documentary, you got a good idea of the range of interest?

R: Right. Of the range of interest. Right back to the same thing. Recently the Secretary of Interior and the Bureau of the Budget announced an increase in grazing fees over the next ten years. The grazing fees have been an issue since 1934. As far as the Bureau of Land Management is concerned, the fees have increased one cent a year since 1934 until we have thirty-three cents, which is really outrageous. The fees have been kept from being increased by a number of things--from outcries to placing it on the political arena. In 1966 through the help of the Bureau of the Budget, we set up a study that cost a million dollars of the range fees. The Forest Service and BLM cooperated with the Bureau of the Budget. The Statistical Reporting Service of Agriculture conducted the survey. Twenty-five thousand interviews were made and I think ten thousand from BLM, about the same from the Forest Service, quite a few from the private sector. Then we had some further studies. But this started in 1966. We completed it. Since then, we've been trying to get what would be an equitable fee under fair market value. With the

direction of the Bureau of the Budget, we were funded for it; we completed it.

A week ago the Secretary announced that the fees would be increased over the next ten years to fair market value. We'll probably go to court over it, but at least this issue of fees is out in the open. The administration has a position that we will reach fair market value in ten years and that we will keep the prices current by the use of an index that takes into account inflation--as it goes up and down, we have an index to adjust the fair market value.

S: As to this question of eastern interest, it might be said the Bureau of Land Management is coming back East. The old General Land Office had most of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, the Northwest Territory, as public lands. Boyd has indicated some of the things that are bringing this back East. I'd like to mention two others: one, of course, the offshore activity and the waters off the Gulf and in the Atlantic Ocean where interest is starting to develop; and also in the environmental program that President Johnson and the administration have been emphasizing so much.

In connection with that and to help us cope with the tremendous litter problem on the public lands, the bureau has created a fictional character, "Johnny Horizon." The interest, after his introduction to the general public, was nationwide. The General Federation of Women's Clubs have taken a particular interest in it. You may know that in the last Rose Bowl Parade there was a float including "Johnny Horizon,"

and we foresee, and we hope, that Johnny will be adopted all over the country in helping the nation in the anti-litter program.

R: His slogan is, "This is your land. Keep it clean."

O: Here's our latest issue of our little BLM newsletter. Incidentally, it shows the Director and our Associate Director and their distinguished service awards here. But on the back page, there's an illustration here of something that again is a reflection of the President and Mrs. Johnson, and this is of course the purpose of this Johnny Horizon as a symbol. It's actually to mobilize the people themselves to do this, because obviously officialdom cannot do it. Here are some very vivid pictures of citizens under our stimulus taking the ball themselves and getting these lands cleaned up as a kind of first step to natural beauty, just to let the natural beauty be seen by the removal of litter.

R: He's a new man on the horizon. He's something that was--I think Jerry said this--developed because of this need to clean up our environment and keep it clean. One of the big problems that we're finding in the West is that very few people take the time and effort to realize that when they throw away their beer can, everybody else does the same thing, and that's a lot of beer cans.

F: Even in the West, there are lots of beer cans.

S: It's noticeable even in the great open spaces.

R: This is a character that we designed and brought out of nowhere in response to some urging that we get on top of our litter program.

F: This was conceived within the bureau?

R: We take the responsibility. We like him.

[End of Tape 1 of 1 and Interview I]

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON LIBRARY

Legal Agreement Pertaining to the Oral History Interview of Boyd Rasmussen

In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 21 of Title 44, United States Code and subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, I, Boyd Rasmussen of McLean, Virginia do hereby give, donate and convey to the United States of America all my rights, title and interest in the tape recording and transcript of the personal interview conducted on January 16, 1969 at Washington, D.C. and prepared for deposit in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

This assignment is subject to the following terms and conditions:

(1) The transcript shall be available for use by researchers as soon as it has been deposited in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

(2) The tape recording shall be available to those researchers who have access to the transcript.

(3) I hereby assign to the United States Government all copyright I may have in the interview transcript and tape.

(4) Copies of the transcript and the tape recording may be provided by the Library to researchers upon request.

(5) Copies of the transcript and tape recording may be deposited in or loaned to institutions other than the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

Boyd Rasmussen
Donor

5/18/82
Date

Archivist of the United States

June 7, 1982
Date