

8.03

Factors Governing the Determination
of a Policy for Utilization and
Development of County Owned
Tax Delinquent Lands
by
Fremont W. Merewether

A Thesis
Presented to the Faculty
of the
School of Forestry
Oregon State College



In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Science
June 1940

Approved:

Professor of Forestry

SCHOOL OF FORESTRY
OREGON STATE COLLEGE
CORVALLIS, OREGON

INTRODUCTION

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this paper is to attempt to set forth the problems involved in formulating a sound administrative policy for the development and successful utilization of county owned tax delinquent lands.

WORKING PLAN

The working plan was to make a study of five typical counties of western Oregon, namely: Coos, Curry, Clatsop, Columbia, and Tillamook; all suffering from a burden of tax delinquency and most closely approximating the general conditions of all the counties of western Oregon. These five were chosen on the basis of the amount of pertinent information available, the extent of tax reverted land in each, special problems characteristic of the individual counties, and the progressiveness of those in charge in solving their own problems. The scope of the paper is limited to the counties of Oregon west of the Cascade mountains.

PROCEDURE

Facts, figures, and conclusions are based on data from four sources as follows:

(1) letters in answer to requests from county judges, county agents, farmers and sheepmen investing in logged-off lands, the superintendent of the John Jacob Astor and Northrup Creek Grazing Experiment Station in

Clatsop county, and the Agricultural and Livestock Agent of the Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Company, Portland.

(2) intense research in books, magazines, and government publications pertaining to the subject.

(3) a personal visit to the Northrup Creek Grazing Experiment to study conditions and determine success of the project.

(4) my former experience on a dairy ranch in the foothills of the Coast Range and in logging.

LIMITATIONS

Research and study in this field are limited first of all by the great diversity of opinion between the grazing men and the professional foresters as to proper land use. Secondly, the lack of a sufficient number of experiments and the incomplete status of the Northrup Creek Experiment are definite handicaps to the formulation of accurate predictions on land use returns. The uncertainty of future governmental policy as to regulations, restrictions, federal aid, etc., is the third factor that makes the estimation of future returns difficult.

IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Tax delinquency and the question of the best use for tax delinquent lands is one of the greatest problems facing county governments of western Oregon today. The fact that already over one million acres have come under county ownership through tax delinquency does not seem excessive in a

state of 61,188,000 acres, but the alarming rate at which private lands are reverting makes necessary research to determine the best way to return this vast domain to economic self-sufficiency. It has been estimated from the amount of land now tax delinquent but not as yet defaulted that by the end of the year 1941 there will be at least (1) 8,000,000 acres reverted to the counties via tax delinquency.

Passage of the compulsory foreclosure law by the 1939 Oregon legislature (Chapter 485, Oregon Laws, 1939) has forced the counties to go into the real estate business on a wholesale scale, even though they as yet have no definite agency or policy for handling the land or disposing of it.

AN APPROACH TO A SOLUTION

The solution to the problem of tax delinquency in accord with our democratic American ideals would be that plan which would promote and encourage private ownership insofar as the land could be managed so as to support private endeavor and at the same time safeguard the public interests in land as a basic natural resource.

It would seem that the ideal time to begin a program to alleviate the burden of tax reversion would be while the property was yet in private ownership. Inasmuch as 90% of those reverting lands are cut-over forest lands, this would seem the logical place to look for reform.

It is questionable whether an individual has the right to harvest the wealth of a natural resource for personal gain from a storehouse of riches built up by nature over thousands of years at no effort from or inconvenience to

himself. Some of the wealth reaped from the profits of such enterprise should be used to insure the replacement of such resource and the productivity of the land. That the individual should devastate such land and then return it to the county as a public burden seems incredible; yet we see our government encouraging such action by imposing excessive taxes and failing to enact legislation which would allow the individual to retain his lands and manage them so as to maintain a permanent industry.

DISCUSSION

CAUSES OF TAX DELINQUENCY

Before any plan for the encouragement of permanent private ownership can be formulated, the causes of rapid timber liquidation and tax reversion must be examined.

These are, briefly:

(1) excessive carrying charges such as taxes, interest, and protection costs

(2) risk of investment: danger from fire, insects, and disease

(3) declining value of stand; timber over-mature

(4) speculative over-investments in stumpage

(5) joint ownership of timber and mill; need to meet overhead costs

(6) decreasing markets; passing of agricultural expansion and decline of world trade

(7) excessive manufacturing capacity of mills; high overhead

(8) fear of increasing governmental regulation

In these we see that the private owner has some cause for his practice of wholesale liquidation. It follows that our public policy should first be concentrated on removing these obstacles to the private ownership of timber lands through proper legislative action; and, second, should formulate a policy of administration of the existing tax delinquent lands. Since the first is more a matter of legislative action and beyond the scope of this paper, the discussion

will be confined to the formulation of a sound policy for the administration and disposal of tax reverted county lands.

FACTORS INVOLVED IN DETERMINATION OF A POLICY

The county in an effort to determine its policy as to the disposal or administration of reverted lands immediately faces the problem of placing a valuation upon the property based on past, present, and potential uses, developments if any on them or near by, their location and integration as to whether in small, scattered tracts or in a group large enough for development and administration as one unit, the influence of the land use on the major industries and finances of the county, plus the more general considerations of watershed protection, regulations of stream flow, erosion control, future industry, wild life, and recreation.

Therefore, a rough survey of the land is the first step to be considered in undertaking to provide the necessary information as to their present value to the county and potential value for development. Their low value prohibits detailed work or elaborate studies in most cases. This survey should include the following factors:

(A) Physical factors

- (1. climate; available from U.S. weather bureau records
2. native vegetation; acquired in the field or from type maps of the area
3. topography; U.S. Geological survey topographic maps, soil conservation service photographic maps, or rough, generalized survey of the area

4. soils; information available from soil survey made by Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, U.S.D.A., 1910, or by field survey

(B) Economic factors

1. present land use; available for some counties in "Land Use Studies" by the U.S. Resettlement Administration, or secured by field survey

2. public and private improvements, including rural dwellings, schools, stores, churches, roads, telephones, power lines, railroads

3. distribution of live stock

4. community pattern, distribution of school children

5. land ownership

(C) Financial

1. land assessment valuation and tax base

2. distribution of county tax base

3. bonded or other indebtedness

4. tax collection

5. county budget

LAND USE CLASSIFICATION

The results of such a survey should be used as the basis for a land use classification with the thought in mind that the most profitable use is that which best preserves and builds up the natural soil resource and productivity and at the same time makes a return to society through crops, livestock, timber, water supply, recreation, or other contribution.

In the evaluation of best land use, site quality and

yield tables of timber growth can be compared with the carrying capacity and fees from grazing, balancing the good and bad effects upon the soil with the necessity of an immediate return. Difficulties arise in trying to compare the return from the individualistic enterprise of grazing with multiple returns from a forest inasmuch as the value of watersheds, wildlife, and recreation cannot be tagged with a price label. For instance, in Tillamook county, the worth of a beautiful forest may bring greater return through recreational facilities and attraction of tourist trade than from lumber since the new Wolf Creek highway brings the ocean within a two hours* drive of Portland.

BASIS FOR LAND USE CLASSIFICATION (2)

(A) Agricultural areas

1. areas in which at least fifty per cent of the acreage has soils and topography suitable for intensive cropping
2. soil productive, over three feet in depth and free from stones
3. drainage good, generally suited to forage or special crops
4. soil capable of supporting intensive farming such as dairying or crop production
5. areas reasonably well supplied with public facilities
6. areas accessible to markets and supplies
7. assessed valuation generally higher than other types of land

8. tax delinquency not excessive

9. capable of supporting one family to every 40 acres of the better soil types or its equivalent

(B) Grazing areas

1. topography rolling, not over 25% slope

2. soils yellowish to dark brown or black, slightly acid

3. generally not adapted to cultivation except in isolated areas along streams

4. drainage generally adequate

5. capable of supporting 1/3 to 1 sheep per acre or equivalent for twelve months

6. public facilities adequate but not as accessible as in agricultural areas

7. assessed valuation lower than agricultural areas

8. tax delinquency normal to subnormal

9. generally capable of supporting one family per 500 acres to 1000 acres

10. containing no large tracts timber

(C) Forest land

1. topography level to rough and mountainous

2. soils residual, usually acid in reaction and low in organic matter, often rough and stony

3. drainage usually excessive

4. usually covered with extensive stands of timber

5. public facilities inadequate or wholly lacking

6. usually inaccessible to markets and supplies

7. wide variation in assessed valuations

8. delinquency usually subnormal

9. generally capable of supporting good tree growth

Since little of the land characteristically listed as agricultural reverts to the county or presents any such problem, this study will be limited to that classified as grazing and forest land.

THE PROBLEM

The next step in determining a land utilization policy is to decide just how much and what land should be set aside for timber production and what designated for range use. A purely optional division might classify all the land of less than 25% slope and without present timber or reproduction cover as grazing land and that over 25% slope as forest land. Such a classification might have its advantages so far as retention of water and regulation of stream flow would be concerned but would set up staggering problems of management and administration due to the scattering, small size and isolation of areas. Instead, definite areas in which grazing units could be established and units for sustained yield timber operations should be set up according to the following:

(1) the land use classification outlined above

(2) economic studies of present and future domestic and world market needs

(3) financial computations of greatest net return per acre for long time use.

DETERMINATION OF LAND USE BASED ON ECONOMIC DEMAND

"Land planning is the analysis and measurement of national needs, both present and prospective, quantitatively and geographically, for every type of service and commodity derived from land. The problem is to balance between uses of lands and human dependence on services and products of the land." (3)

IMPORTANCE OF TIMBER AS MAJOR LAND USE

It must be recognized that wood is one of the most important and widely used resources filling our everyday needs from the books and newspapers on the wooden library table to the clothing we wear, the houses which shelter us, and the containers in which our food is shipped. Basic characteristics of wood give it special properties superior for many uses to any other material. But the most important fact about wood is that it is the one natural resource which can be replaced if man so wills.

Timber growing as a land use fills three all-important functions in satisfying the needs and desires of man: wood products, water supply, and recreational facilities. Wood products may be further separated into two broad fields of major use in order to demonstrate its importance in modern life. These are lumber, building materials, and fuel as the first, and pulp for paper and rayon as the second.

Although the stagnation of population growth in the U.S. has been reflected in a declining per capita lumber consumption from 525 board feet in 1906 to 184 board feet in 1937, the

per capita requirements for pulpwood have risen from 194 lbs. in 1920 to 220 lbs. in 1929 and are estimated by good authority to equal 300 lbs. by 1950. (4)

Even today with the heating facilities of gas and electricity generally available, wood still takes its place as a fuel, comprising twenty-seven and six tenths percent of the volume of all wood used. Therefore, we may expect a continuing demand for wood products for many years to come.

LAND AREA NECESSARY FOR TIMBER GROWTH

Having established the need for wood in our modern scheme of living, it is necessary to approximate the amount of land which should be set aside for this use. There are now 669,300,000 acres of forest land in the U.S., which is more than one third of the total land area and more than one half again as large as the area now devoted to farm crops. (5) Of this, 108,700,000 acres are noncommercial forest lands and 52,000,000 acres should be reserved for recreation, leaving 508,600,000 acres available for timber production. Using the annual growth rate of 66.7 cubic feet per acre, which was determined by the U.S. Forest Service to be the average for forest areas of the U.S. if given intensive management, this would yield 33.9 billion cubic feet annually as opposed to 16.5 billion cubic feet estimated to be the normal requirement. (6)

Thus by applying intensive timber management to the entire area of suitable forest land, twice as much timber would be produced as needed for our own domestic use.

Realizing this, together with the fact that the U.S. furnishes the largest market for wood products on the world, we see what a huge supply of timber we would produce in excess of demand. Under such conditions, it would be questionable whether delegating such a quantity of land to this one use is a sound policy. But here watershed protection and recreation values enter the picture.

RECREATIONAL VALUES OF FOREST LANDS

Under our present urbanized system of society, the psychological necessity for escape to the beauty and solitude of nature may become of equal importance to the physiological needs of food and drink for the continuing health and virility of the American people and the perpetuation of our civilization. An average of 30 million people visit our national forests each year, or approximately 250 million man days, computed on the basis of time, are spent in the forests. In addition to this, an average of 100 million visitors find recreation each year on private forest land. Thus we see that forest lands play an important part in the recreational life of over three quarters of the American people. For this reason, recreation is given equal rank with timber production as an economic land use although its value is a less tangible one.

VALUE OF FOREST LANDS FOR WATERSHED PROTECTION

Land is a basic resource which cannot be replaced once carelessly destroyed. Year after year \$400,000,000 worth of this vital resource is lost through the erosion of good land

by water or the loss of good land from productivity by deposition on it of worthless eroded material.

Flood control assumes greater importance in Oregon as we realize the millions of dollars being spent on the Willamette Valley Flood Control Project which has been thought necessary since the depletion of timber on the various watersheds.

Water for city reservoirs, for irrigation, and power for electricity furnishes us with vital services in our everyday life. It has been proven that the distribution and kind of vegetal cover determine the amount and rate of run-off and the amount of water available at any given time for each of these uses. (7) For these reasons, timber growth for water protection is given equal rank with wood products and recreation as major land use.

DOMESTIC MARKET DEMANDS FOR MUTTON AND WOOL

Lamb and mutton have been of minor importance in the American diet. Per capita consumption has exceeded eight pounds only once since the beginning of the century and for the most part was below seven pounds as opposed to about seventy pounds annual consumption for beef and pork. Past consumption trends indicate no increase in the demand for mutton.

On the other hand, wool has for many years been a considerable item of import trade. For actual figures, a table is presented from the United States Department of Commerce publications as follows:

UNITED STATES WORLD WOOL TRADE (8)

| YEAR | IMPORTS - LBS. | EXPORTS - LBS. |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1909-1913 average | 203,298,000 lbs. | 46,000 lbs. |
| 1926-1930 average(9) | 253,242,000 " | |
| 1932 | 56,535,000 " | 179,000 " |
| 1933 | 178,928,000 " | 19,000 " |
| 1934 | 108,342,000 " | 119,000 " |
| 1935 | 200,461,000 " | 20,000 " |
| 1936 | 253,273,000 " | 16,000 " |

These figures clearly indicate the necessity for the expansion of our sheep industry if only for wool production to meet our economic needs. So far, satisfactory substitutes to replace this essential commodity are very costly, and no lessening of its use is anticipated so long as our standard of living remains at its present level.

DETERMINATION OF LAND USE BASED ON ECONOMIC RETURNS

Since timber growing and grazing are the foremost uses providing income from land unsuited for agriculture and form the bulk of that coming into county ownership, a comparison of the two can be made concerning the returns under various phases of development. Values and prices used are intended as a conservative average and a basis for a rough comparison between different land uses.

Timber value returns must necessarily be based on the value of average annual board foot per acre increment. A detailed financial problem charging compound interest against the investment for the entire rotation from planting to harvesting the final crop was considered but had to be discarded since no accurate data is available upon which to base stumpage values at eighty or one hundred years hence. A yield table for a fully stocked stand is used as basis for timber growth computations since by planting, full stocking may be expected.

Land use returns from grazing are calculated on the basis of one band of 1200 sheep which is designated as the smallest economic grazing unit. This will provide an annual labor income of \$1500 to \$1800 for an average family of five.(10) At the present time the bulk of the grazing use on cutover land in western Oregon is by sheep which are shipped from eastern Oregon for summer pasture. More than 20,000 sheep from eastern Oregon were shipped into Columbia county alone for summer grazing in 1935.

The demand for summer range today has been determined

to be at least 60% in excess of its grazing capacity which has led to overgrazing followed by erosion and further diminishing carrying capacity of eastern Oregon range land.

In making the cost analysis study, it was found through correspondence with the county courts that tax reverted land is being sold at \$1.00 per acre but has an assessed valuation of \$2.00 per acre. By examining the tax levies of western Oregon counties, it was found that fifty mills on the dollar would be the maximum tax levy expectation. A conservative interest rate of 2% was adopted upon which to base carrying charges since neither forestry nor agriculture under present economic conditions can carry high interest rates.

The carrying capacity of western Oregon lands for grazing was determined on the basis of past use. The Northrup Creek Grazing Experiment in Clatsop county successfully carried 320 head of sheep and 60 head of cattle on 325 acres. Rating by the generally accepted grazing rates of one cattle unit equal to five sheep units, this would correspond to 620 sheep units on 325 acres, roughly two sheep units per acre. On a privately owned adjacent area run by Mr. Gus Swanstrom, former Oregon State College graduate, grazing has been carried on continuously since 1917. One hundred and forty acres were sown to grass after a fall burn in 1917 and were badly overgrazed, carrying 70 head of cattle. Since then, the area has been reseeded twice and is successfully carrying 40 cattle and 30 sheep, which corresponds to 230 sheep units on 140 acres or a little less than two sheep units per acre.

Douglas C. Ingram, in his studies of grazing as a fire prevention measure on Douglas fir cut-over land, found that on the Columbia National Forest the average requirement for sheep was one third acre per month per sheep with satisfactory gains made by the stock. In the Coos Bay region on seeded areas, sheep have made profitable gains on less than one half acre year long.

On the basis of these studies, the carrying capacity of good sites seeded to sod-forming grasses which conserve the moisture of the soil and produce forage during the dry season of late summer was set at two sheep per acre year long.

Given natural vegetation such as fireweed, native grasses and sedges, pea vine, groundsel, thistle, hazel, willow, thimbleberry, and huckleberry taking over an area after a fire, grazing capacity varies from $\frac{1}{4}$ to 5 surface acres per head for sheep. (11) The report of the Clatsop county agricultural outlook conference sets the acreage requirement at between $2\frac{1}{2}$ and 3 acres per head for sheep and 10 acres per cow on natural revegetation to prevent damage by overgrazing. (12)

In the following calculations of land use statistics, the derivation of returns from natural revegetated areas were on a basis of maximum capacity of 1.2 acres per head for sheep or 6 acres for a cow. Normally, areas most accessible and also of most favorable exposure, soil, and moisture conditions will be chosen as grazing lands. Soils and growing conditions optimum for grass are practically identical to the conditions necessary for maximum timber production as evidenced by the fine stands of Douglas fir originally cover-

ing Clatsop and Columbia counties. Since it may be expected that the most productive areas (Site I for Douglas fir) will be allocated to grazing use, to make a comparison of the returns from grazing use and timber growing, timber growth statistics from Site I areas are used exclusively.

In actual practise, young stands of timber would be growing in value each year as a basis for taxable wealth to bring ever-increasing returns to the county until harvested. But as a basis for study under comparable conditions, in the following computations it is assumed that timber land and grazing land will continue to be assessed and taxed the same.

YIELD TABLE FOR DOUGLAS FIR ON FULLY STOCKED ACRE
TREES 12" DIAMETER AND LARGER (13)

| AGE- years | SITE IV | M.A.G. bd.ft. | SITE III | M.A.G. bd.ft. | SITE II | M.A.G. bd.ft. | SITE I | M.A.G. bd.ft. |
|---------------|---------|------------------|----------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------|------------------|
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 10 | 2,600 | 87 | 8,000 | 267 |
| 40 | 200 | 5 | 4,500 | 112 | 11,900 | 298 | 24,400 | 610 |
| 50 | 3,300 | 66 | 12,400 | 248 | 27,400 | 558 | 44,100 | 882 |
| 60 | 8,100 | 135 | 23,800 | 397 | 42,800 | 713 | 62,000 | 1,034 |
| 70 | 14,000 | 200 | 35,200 | 503 | 57,200 | 817 | 78,200 | 1,117 |
| 80 | 20,100 | 252 | 45,700 | 571 | 70,000 | 875 | 92,500 | 1,156 |
| 90 | 26,000 | 289 | 55,000 | 611 | 81,000 | 900 | 104,800 | 1,165 |
| 100 | 31,400 | 314 | 62,800 | 628 | 98,900 | 989 | 115,100 | 1,151 |

RETURNS FROM DOUGLAS FIR PER ACRE BY SITE CLASS
EIGHTY YEAR ROTATION

| SITE | M.A.G. bd.ft. | ANNUAL RETURN @\$1.50 M. | ANNUAL RETURN @\$2.00 M. | ANNUAL RETURN @\$2.50 M. | ANNUAL RETURN @\$3.00 M. |
|------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| I | 1156 | \$1.73 | \$2.31 | \$2.89 | \$3.47 |
| II | 875 | \$1.31 | \$1.75 | \$2.19 | \$2.62 |
| III | 571 | \$.86 | \$1.14 | \$1.43 | \$1.71 |
| IV | 250 | \$.38 | \$.50 | \$.63 | \$.76 |
| V | 107 | \$.15 | \$.21 | \$.27 | \$.30 |

EXPECTATION VALUE DOUGLAS FIR PLANTATION IN EIGHTY YEARS
CLASSIFIED AS REFORESTATION LAND

Interest 2% 80 year rotation Site I

EXPENSES

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Initial investment \$1.00 per acre for land and \$10.00 planting cost @ 2% for 80 years | \$ 53.62 |
| Equal annual expenses | |
| forest fee tax \$.05 per acre | |
| fire patrol tax .05 " " | |
| total \$ <u>.10</u> " " | |
| value \$.10 yearly, 80 years | |
| \$.10 ÷ .02 x 3.875 = | <u>19.38</u> |
| Total cost growing timber 80 years | \$ 73.00 |

RETURNS

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Gross timber value, 80 yrs., Site I @\$3.00x92.5 M | \$277.50 |
| less expense for growing timber | 73.00 |
| Expectation value in 80 years | <u>\$204.50</u> |
| less 12½ % yield tax | <u>25.56</u> |
| Net return to owner | \$178.94 |

Discounting net per acre return by 2%
compound interest, formula $V_n = \frac{r(1.0p^n - 1)}{.0p}$

then $\$178.94 = \frac{r(3.875)}{.02} =$ \$.92

NET EQUAL ANNUAL PER ACRE PROFIT \$.92

RETURN TO COUNTY BY CEDING LAND TO STATE
DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY (14)

| <u>EXPENSES</u> | SITE IV | SITE III | SITE II | SITE I |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Planting cost \$10.00 x 1.02 ⁸⁰ | \$ 48.75 | \$ 48.75 | \$ 48.75 | \$ 48.75 |
| Fire insurance \$.22 yearly Vn = $\frac{.22(3.875)}{.02}$ | 42.63 | 42.63 | 42.63 | 42.63 |
| Fire patrol expense \$.05 per acre Vn = $\frac{r(1.0p^{80}-1)}{.0p}$ | <u>9.69</u> | <u>9.69</u> | <u>9.69</u> | <u>9.69</u> |
| TOTAL EXPENSE | \$101.07 | \$101.07 | \$101.07 | \$101.07 |

RETURNS

| | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Stumpage value per acre (bd.ft. growth at 80 years x \$3.00) | \$ 60.30 | \$137.10 | \$210.00 | \$277.50 |
| Less expense | <u>101.07</u> | <u>101.07</u> | <u>101.07</u> | <u>101.07</u> |
| Net return to state treasurer | \$-40.76 | \$ 36.04 | \$108.94 | \$176.44 |
| Minus 10% to State Board of Forestry | | <u>3.60</u> | <u>10.89</u> | <u>17.64</u> |
| Net return to county in 80 years | | \$ 32.44 | \$ 98.05 | \$158.80 |
| <u>NET ANNUAL PER ACRE PROFIT</u> discounted @ 2% | | \$.17 | \$.56 | \$.82 |

RETURN TO COUNTY BY CEDING LAND TO U.S.
GOVERNMENT FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

| \$3.00 stumpage value | 80 year rotation | | | |
|---|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Stumpage returns to forest service | \$ 60.30 | \$137.10 | \$210.00 | \$277.50 |
| 25% return to county (15) | 15.07 | 34.27 | 52.50 | 69.40 |
| 10% for construction roads & trails, county (16) | <u>6.03</u> | <u>13.71</u> | <u>21.00</u> | <u>27.75</u> |
| Net return to county | \$ 21.10 | \$ 47.98 | \$ 73.50 | \$ 97.15 |
| <u>NET ANNUAL PER ACRE</u> <u>PROFIT (discounted 2%)</u> | \$.11 | \$.25 | \$.38 | \$.50 |

DISTRIBUTION OF SITE CLASSES BY PERCENTAGE OF FOREST AREA
WESTERN OREGON (17)

| SITE | CLATSOP | COLUMBIA | COOS | CURRY | TILLAMOOK |
|------|---------|----------|-------|-------|-----------|
| I | 6.9 | 1.6 | 5.26 | .1 | 1.6 |
| II | 55.0 | 44.2 | 64.64 | 6.5 | 53.3 |
| III | 35.9 | 31.4 | 22.00 | 81.8 | 26.8 |
| IV | 1.0 | 1.5 | 8.00 | 10.2 | 3.9 |
| V | 1.2 | 21.3 | .10 | 1.4 | 14.4 |

RETURNS ON DOUGLAS FIR BASED ON AVERAGE OF SITE CLASSES
CLATSOP COUNTY
Stumpage value \$3.00 per M. 80 year rotation

| SITE | PERCENTAGE FOREST AREA | ANNUAL RETURN PER ACRE | PERCENTAGE VALUE RETURN PER ACRE |
|------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| I | 6.9% | \$3.47 | \$.24 |
| II | 55.0 | 2.62 | 1.44 |
| III | 35.9 | 1.71 | .62 |
| IV | 1.0 | .76 | .08 |
| V | 1.2 | .30 | <u>.03</u> |

Gross average value per acre return, all sites \$2.41

EXPENSES

Depreciation on investment, \$10.00
planting charge, over 80 years \$..125

Interest on investment, \$10.00
planting and \$1.00 land @ 2% .22

Fire insurance, 2% on investment .22

Taxes \$2.00 assessed valuation x 50 mills .10

Fire patrol charge .05

| | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------|
| | TOTAL PER ACRE COST | \$.715 |
| Gross average value per acre return, all sites | | 2.41 |
| | Less total expense | -.72 |
| | NET RETURN PER ACRE | <u>\$1.69</u> |

COSTS AND RETURNS TO COUNTY LEASING GRAZING LAND

EXPENSES, based on intensive development

| | |
|---|------------|
| Grass seeding cost, \$2.00 per acre | |
| Fencing cost, \$2.00 per acre | |
| Depreciation on seeding and fencing, \$4.00 for twenty years | \$.20 |
| Interest on investment, land @ \$1.00, fencing and seeding \$4.00; \$5.00 x 2% | <u>.10</u> |
| TOTAL EXPENSE | \$.30 |

RETURNS, based on intensive development

| | |
|---|------------|
| Sheep @ \$.04 month, carrying capacity 2 sheep per acre ; 2 sheep x .04 x 8 months | \$.64 |
| Less total expense | <u>.30</u> |
| NET ANNUAL RETURN PER ACRE - SHEEP | \$.34 |
| Cattle @ \$.06 month, carrying capacity 2½ A. per cow; \$.16 ÷ 2½ = \$.064 per A. x 8 months | \$.512 |
| Less total expense | <u>.30</u> |
| NET ANNUAL RETURN PER ACRE - CATTLE | \$.212 |

RETURNS TO COUNTY LEASING UNDEVELOPED GRAZING LAND

| | |
|---|------------|
| Sheep; carrying capacity 4/5 sheep per acre @ \$.04; \$.032 x 8 months | \$.26 |
| Less 2% interest on \$1.00 per acre land investment | <u>.02</u> |
| NET ANNUAL RETURN PER ACRE - SHEEP | \$.24 |
| Cattle; carrying capacity 1 cow per 6 acres 1/6 x \$.16 = \$.025 per acre x 8 months | \$.20 |
| Less 2% interest on \$1.00 per acre land investment | <u>.02</u> |
| NET ANNUAL RETURN PER ACRE - CATTLE | \$.18 |

COSTS AND RETURNS FROM SHEEP ON DEVELOPED GRAZING LANDS
BASED ON ONE BAND OF 1200

EXPENSES

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Herd tender @ \$100 month | \$1200 |
| Extra help at lambing (2 men, 2 mo. @ \$90) | 360 |
| Shearing and packing wool | 300 |
| Cost of range - 600 A. @ \$1.00 | |
| interest \$600 x .02 | 12 |
| taxes \$200 x .05 | 60 |
| Cost of range development: seeding \$2.00 | |
| fencing \$2.00 | |
| 600 A. x \$4.00 = \$2400 | |
| Depreciation on fencing and seeding \$2400 ÷ 20 - | 120 |
| Interest on investment \$2400 x .02 | 48 |
| Depreciation on feeding sheds \$4000 ÷ 20 | 200 |
| Interest on shed investment \$4000 x .02 | 80 |
| Hay, 250 lbs. per head @ \$10.00 ton | 1500 |
| Taxes on sheep, 1200 x \$5.00 x .05 | 300 |
| Interest investment on sheep 2% on \$5 x 1200 | 120 |
| Mortality expectancy, 6%, 72 loss @ \$5.00 | 360 |
| Flock depreciation (average life 6 years) | 846 |
| yearling ewe worth \$7.00, end of 6th yr., \$2.50 | |
| depreciation, \$4.50 ÷ 6 yrs. = \$.75 on 1128 sheep | |
| Hauling expense - inbound 1200 x \$.30 | 360 |
| Hauling expense - outbound 2220 x \$.30 | 666 |
| <u>TOTAL EXPENSE</u> | <u>\$6,632</u> |
| Returns | |
| 1020 lambs weighing 75 lbs. @ \$7.00 cwt | \$5,355 |
| 9600 lbs. wool @ \$.30 | <u>2,880</u> |
| <u>TOTAL RETURNS</u> | <u>\$8,235</u> |
| NET RETURNS | \$1,603 |
| NET PER ACRE RETURN | 2.67 |

COSTS AND RETURNS FROM SHEEP ON UNDEVELOPED GRAZING LANDS
BASED ON ONE BAND OF 1200

EXPENSES

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Herd tender @ \$100 month | \$1200 |
| Extra help at lambing (2 men, 2 months @ \$90) | 360 |
| Shearing and packing wool | 300 |
| Cost of range, 1500 A. @ \$1.00 | |
| interest \$1500 x .02 | 30 |
| taxes \$3000 x .05 | 150 |
| Depreciation on feeding shed \$4000 ÷ 20 | 200 |
| Interest on shed investment \$4000 x .02 | 80 |
| Hay, 250 lbs. per head @\$10.00 per ton | 1500 |
| Taxes on sheep 1200 x \$5.00 x .05 | 300 |
| Interest on sheep investment 2% x \$5.00 x 1200 | 120 |
| Mortality expectancy, 6%, 72 head @ \$5.00 | 360 |
| Flock depreciation (breeding life 6 yrs.) | 846 |
| Hauling expense, inbound , 1200 x \$.30 | 360 |
| Hauling expense, outbound 2220 x \$.30 | 666 |
| <u>Total Expense</u> | <u>\$6,472</u> |

RETURNS

| | |
|--|----------------|
| 1020 lambs weighing 70 lbs. @ \$6.50 cwt (price difference due to lower quality lambs from inferior pasture) | \$4,641 |
| 9600 lbs. wool @ \$.30 | 2,880 |
| <u>Total Returns</u> | <u>\$7,521</u> |
| NET RETURN ON 1500 A. | \$1,049 |
| NET RETURN PER ACRE | \$.61 |

SUMMARY

FINDINGS

After examining the causes and extent of tax delinquency, the problem of utilization and development of these lands was in this study evaluated on the basis of four major classifications. The results, as worked out in the problem and preceding tables, can be summarized as follows to show the average annual net return per acre under various land uses:

- | | |
|---|--------|
| A. County ownership and development | |
| 1. leasing grazing land after intensive development | |
| a. net return on sheep grazing | \$.34 |
| b. net return on cattle grazing | .212 |
| 2. leasing grazing land, undeveloped | |
| a. net return on sheep grazing | .24 |
| b. net return on cattle grazing | .18 |
| B. Private ownership | |
| 1. timber growing under reforestation classification | .92 |
| 2. timber growing under general land tax classification | .79 |
| 3. sheep raising, undeveloped grazing land | .61 |
| 4. sheep raising, intensively developed land | 2.67 |
| 5. tax return to county under forest or grazing use | .10 |
| C. State ownership | |
| 1. returns to county when land is turned over to state board of forestry | .82 |
| D. Forest Service ownership | |
| 1. returns to county when land is turned over to United States Forest Service | .50 |

Greatest net annual profit per acre accrues to the county when land is turned over to and developed by the state depart-

ment of forestry, whereas the highest annual net per acre profit is received by the individual from grazing use. If we accept the premise that watershed protection and recreation with tourist attraction are equal in value to timber production, then the computed value of forest land is increased three times; and the county's net return from land turned over to the state department of forestry would reach a figure of \$2.46.

Similarly, the county would net a greater amount per acre annually from private forestry undertakings because of the value to the public of watershed protection and recreation.

CONCLUSIONS

Although it would seem that grazing development of land might prove a profitable undertaking, it has been the purpose of this paper to take into consideration the numerous factors which must determine any policy. Only a small proportion of the tax delinquent lands are in a condition for seeding to grass without costly clearing of brush and logs, have sufficient water for drinking purposes, and optimum site conditions for carrying two animal units per acre after seeding.

In the problem set up for study, the assumption was made that development for grazing would be made immediately following the slash burn of logging, as was the case on the Northrup Creek Grazing Experiment, and the seeding of sod-forming grasses which help retain soil moisture. Except under the most favorable conditions, in actual practise, the grazing capacity of seeded land may prove to be much less

than two animal units per acre.

In spite of such limitations, this study does bring out the fact that money spent developing land, whether for timber production or grazing, increases the value of the investment many times.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since exactly comparable conditions rarely exist in any two counties or unit areas, there can be no set rule for the determination of a policy of land use. While conditions of domestic market, hence financial returns, are applicable generally, the problem to be overcome by each county is the proper correlation of these factors with local physical, social, and economic conditions to formulate the best policy for the utilization and development of tax delinquent lands.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Speech, Mr. Rogers, Society of American Foresters,
Meeting January 26, 1940
2. Land Use Study of Coos County, Oregon
U.S.D.A. Resettlement Administration 1936
3. Land Utilization and Planning, L.F. Kneipp
Journal of Forestry v. 34, 1936
4. National Plan for American Forestry
Forest Service 1934
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Soil Erosion and Its Control, Q.C. Ayres 1936
8. Foreign Commerce Yearbook , U.S. Department Commerce 1937
9. Imports and Exports of Agricultural Products 1938
Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.
10. Proceedings of Fifth Pacific Northwest Regional 1939
Planning Conference, PAC. N.W. Reg. Planning Comm.
11. Management of Tax Reverted Lands in Oregon 1938
Oregon State Planning Board
12. Report Clatsop County Agricultural Outlook 1935
Conference, Oregon State College Extension Service
13. The Yield of Douglas Fir in the Pacific Northwest
U.S.D.A. Technical Bulletin, #201.
14. Oregon Laws, Chapter 478 1939
15. Agricultural Appropriation Bill 1908
16. Agricultural Appropriation Bill 1912
17. Forest Statistics, Western Oregon
Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Experiment Station

OTHER REFERENCES

- Economics of Private Forestry , R.W. Marquis 1939
- Public Expenditures in Oregon, W.F. Dreesen,
Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin #346
- Grazing as a Fire Prevention Measure for Douglas
Fir Cutover Land , D.C. Ingram, Journal of Forestry
v. 26, December, 1928
- Report on the Feasibility of Grazing Livestock on
the Cutover Timber Lands of Columbia and Clatsop
Counties, Oregon, H.A. Lindgren 1935
- Special Agricultural Investigations
Oregon State College Experiment Station Circular #130 1938
- Statistics of Tax Reverted Lands in Oregon
Oregon State Planning Board , December 1936
- Forest Statistics for Columbia County, Oregon
Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range
Experiment Station, December 1938
- Grazing experiments on Cutover Douglas Fir Lands in
the State of Oregon, Homer Lyon May 1938
- Wood or Wool? A Land Use Problem in the Cutover
Douglas Fir Regions on the West Side of the Coast
Range, Homer Lyon 1938
- Forest Fire Statistics for Oregon, U.S.D.A. Bulletin 1938
- Forest Fire Insurance in Pacific Coast States
H.B. Shepard, Journal of Forestry , February 1935
- Standing Timber Insurance, W.R. Brown, TIMBERMAN, April 1926
- Financing Real Estate, R.F. Bingham & E.L. Andrews 1924
- Oregon Sheep on Logged-off Areas, F.L. Ballard
"National Wool Grower" v. 25 (9) pp.32-34 1935
- Forest Land Economics, the New Public Domain, Forest
Service, Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station 1936
- Plant Succession on Cutover, Burned, and Grazed Douglas
Fir Area, N.W. Forest Experiment Station, Research 1938
- Oregon Looks Ahead, Oregon State Planning Board 1936
- Oregon's Forest Problems, Oregon State Planning Board 1936

45 Park Terrace
Corvallis, Oregon
March 8, 1940

copy

Herbert Howell, Superintendent
John Jacob Astor Experiment Station
Astoria, Oregon

Dear Mr. Howell:

As basic information needed in preparation of my senior thesis on "The Utilization of Tax-delinquent Land in Western Oregon", I would appreciate any information you could send me on the results of the Northrup Creek Grazing Experiment during the summer of 1939. I am particularly interested in the following questions:

- (1) How many sheep and cattle were grazed on this area in 1939 ?
- (2) What average gain was made per animal ?
- (3) How is the pasture holding up under the grazing practice ?
- (4) Are any Douglas fir seedlings coming up on the grazed area? If so, about what proportion of stocking ?
- (5) Is the objective of this experiment to keep the area in perpetual pasture or to let the trees take over as the canopy closes ?
- (6) Has the experiment shown the grazing to be injurious to the Douglas fir seedlings or to retard their growth ?
- (7) About how many years could this logged-off land be depended upon for pasture ?
- (8) What grazing plan would be needed to make grazing a permanent industry in western Oregon ?
- (9) How many acres are needed to set up an economic working unit for one operator ?

Any of this information which you may be able to provide will be most helpful to me, and I wish to thank you for any cooperation you extend in the matter. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in reply.

Yours very truly,

(signed)
Fremont W. Merewether

mm
encl.

OREGON STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE EXPERIMENT STATION
EXTENSION SERVICE

JOHN JACOB ASTOR
BRANCH EXPERIMENT STATION
ASTORIA, OREGON


March 12, 1940

Mr. Fremont W. Merewether
45 Park Terrace
Corvallis, Oregon

Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of your letter of March 8, and regret very much that it is impossible for me to devote the time required to answer in detail the various questions that you have asked. I am enclosing, however, a mimeographed circular from which you may be able to get some information.

Yours very truly,


H. B. Howell
Superintendent

HBH:mb

Enclosure

45 Park Terrace
Corvallis, Oregon
March 12, 1940

Afton Zundell
Clatsop County Agent
Astoria, Oregon

Dear Mr. Zundell:

I am interested in the possibilities of grazing cut-over forest land in western Oregon and would appreciate any information you may give me in providing the following information:

- (1) What are the grazing fees charged per head for sheep ?
- (2) What fees are charged for cattle ?
- (3) How much tax-delinquent land suitable for grazing is available in Clatsop county ?
- (4) Can grazing be made a permanent industry on these lands according to your experience ?
- (5) What were the results of the Northrup Creek grazing experiment in 1939; that is, how many sheep and cattle grazed and approximate gains ?

I will very much appreciate any of this information you may be able to supply. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in replying.

Yours very truly,

encl.
mm

(signed)

Fremont W. Merewether

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF OREGON

OREGON STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND
CLATSOP COUNTY, COOPERATING

EXTENSION SERVICE
COUNTY AGENT WORK

ASTORIA, OREGON
March 16, 1940

Fremont W. Merewether
45 Park Terrace
Corvallis, Oregon

Dear Mr. Merewether:

I have your letter of March 12 and will endeavor to answer the questions you have asked concerning grazing of outover land.

Concerning your first two questions on grazing fees on per head basis for sheep and cattle, I will say in this county that that is done in only a very limited way. We have however, set up charge schedules and kept these in line with the fees charged by Columbia County, so that stock men, especially those coming from Eastern Oregon can find equal opportunities in either county. These fees are 4¢ per head for ewes, the lamb of course, included. For cattle the grazing fees are 16¢ for mature cattle and 12¢ for yearlings.

May I state before answering your third question, that all the lands suitable for grazing in this county are not county-owned, or tax delinquent land. Much good land is owned by private timber companies, some of which can be purchased. However, at present, I would estimate that the County has from twenty to thirty thousand acres which might be developed for grazing purposes, that is land that is County-owned.

In answer to your fourth question, I can only tell you the experience in the eastern part of the County, where this development is going on, of private interest. One who developed some range twelve years ago and another one who developed some range twenty two years ago. On both of these ranges, only simple seed mixtures were used and no special attention given to management. On the one that has been used for twelve years, seeded only to timothy in the first place, has developed a good range and white clover has come in in abundance. The other area, 160 acres seeded twenty-two years ago, with a little better seeding including the sod former, such as blue grass. This produces considerable pasture yet. A few evergreen trees have started, some firs, but on the whole, it is a fair range at the present. As I say, little attention has been given to management.


I believe the difficulty of this latter range is the lack of enough livestock to use it properly.

As to the Northrup Creek Range, operations for 1939, I can give you only approximately the number of livestock grazed on this area. The area consists of

from 600 to 650 acres. About 265 head of mature sheep and lambs were ranged there until the wether lambs were marketed, and approximately 65 head of cattle.

In all cases where men were interested in this area, I have advised that they make a visit to this area and see for themselves what is being done and see some of the land that is available before becoming too much concerned about it. I am enclosing material which may be of help on this question.

Very truly yours,



A. Zundel
County Agent

AZ:mk
Encl:

USE COPIES
OLD BEHAVIOR BOND
Community

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF OREGON
ST. HELENS

OREGON STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND
COLUMBIA COUNTY, COOPERATING

EXTENSION SERVICE
COUNTY AGENT WORK

March 16, 1940


Mr. Fremont W. Merewether
45 Park Terrace
Corvallis, Oregon

Dear Sir:

I have your letter of March 12 in regard to the grazing possibilities in Columbia county and cost.

- (1) The grazing fees that have been charged in the past for sheep have been four cents per head per ewe and lamb per month. The rate for 1940 has not been set by the Grazing Board as yet.
- (2) The rate for cattle has been 16¢ per head per cow and calf per month.
- (3) There are perhaps about 60,000 acres of county land in Columbia county, part of which is suitable for grazing and part of which is covered with second growth timber.
- (4) Grazing can be carried on this land until it grows up to timber which usually takes from 10 to 20 years.
- (5) As to the results of the Northrup Creek grazing experiment in 1939, I will say that Mr. H. B. Howell, Superintendent of the Experiment Station at Astoria, can give you the information in regard to these results if you will write him.

Yours very truly,


Geo. A. Nelson
County Agricultural Agent

GAN:FS

COPY

(see note below)

45 Park Terrace
Corvallis, Oregon
February 20, 1940

Honorable Guy Boyington
Clatsop County Judge
Astoria, Oregon

Dear Judge Boyington:

I am interested in the opportunity for investments in logged-off tax delinquent land. Since there seem to be opportunities both from the standpoint of grazing and of timber production on a large scale, I am making a survey of several western counties to determine what opportunities are available. Would you be able to provide the following information concerning your county ?

- (1) How much logged-off land does Clatsop county have to sell ?
- (2) What is the average price per acre of this land when sold in large acreages ? (several thousand acres)
- (3) What will the assessed valuation and tax rate be ?
- (4) What forest or brush cover is on the land now ?

Any of this information you may be able to provide will be most helpful to me. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience, and I wish to thank you for your cooperation.

Yours very sincerely,

encl.
mm

(signed)
Fremont W. Merewether

Note:

Copy of letter sent to : Judge J.B. Wilkerson, Columbia County
Judge Hugh Mc Lean, Coos County
Judge A.H. Boice, Curry County
Judge Harlan Woods, Tillamook County

Tillamook County

HARLAND M. WOODS, County Judge

Tillamook, Oregon
March 16, 1940

Mr. Fremont W. Merewether
45 Park Terrance
Corvallis, Oregon


Dear Sir:

I have your letter of February 20.

The Court has discussed this on several meetings and we have come to the conclusion, since our problem is so big here concerning the logged off and burned over lands, it is well to keep all of these lands together in one solid block in order to give it the best protection so far as fire is concerned, and it also will have a tendency to give the state or the Federal Government a better opportunity to protect these lands in case of fire. They would also prefer that these lands be kept in large blocks rather than have them sold out in small parcels.

It would be quite a research to give you the amount of logged off land in this county and to fix a price on the same. Most of this land is covered by the brush or tar weed depending entirely on how recent the land was burned over. At the present time, however, we are not interested in selling any of our logged off and burned over timber land.

Yours very truly,



Harland M. Woods
County Judge

HMW/vd

COOS COUNTY

Coquille, Oregon

Feb. 26, 1940

Fremont W. Merewether,
45 Park Terrace,
Corvallis, Oregon.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of the 20th addressed to Judge McLain at hand.


The information you ask is very pertinent to the future of most timbered counties of Oregon. We feel here that our interests can best be served by getting such lands back on the tax rolls, either as grazing or timber reproduction areas.

We would have several thousand areas suitable for both grazing and timber. As to approximate amount we could not determine until our present tax sale is completed. We would probably demand from \$1 to \$2. per acre for such tracts according to location, etc. The assessed valuation would likely be about the same. Most of this land is now covered with brush or young timber, depends mostly upon length or time since logged off. Much of this land could be profitably grazed if parties with some capital and experience had charge of them. Other lands situated within timber classified areas should only be used for timber reproduction.

Hoping this will supply information of value to you,
we are

Very truly yours,
Coos County Court

by


R. H. Lawhorn,
County Commissioner.

/w

COLUMBIA COUNTY COURT

J. B. WILKERSON, COUNTY JUDGE

ST. HELENS, OREGON


February 21, 1940

Mr. Fremont W. Merewether,
Corvallis, Oregon

My dear Mr. Merewether:

The commissioners will be in St. Helens next Friday, the 23rd. At that time, we will consider your letter, and later, I will endeavor to give you the information you wish about logged-off county land.

Very truly yours,


J. B. Wilkerson
County Judge

COLUMBIA COUNTY COURT

J. B. WILKERSON, COUNTY JUDGE

ST. HELENS, OREGON

February 24, 1940


Mr. Fremont W. Merewether,
Corvallis, Oregon

My dear Mr. Merewether:

Columbia County has a great many acres of logged-of land but it might be difficult for you find as many acres as would interest you in one body. Some of the county land is in re-forestation and some of it lies in between privately owned land.

If you are interested sufficiently, you should come to St. Helens and make an investigation of county land through the tax collecting department of the sheriff's office. They have a map showing all county land.

Very truly yours,



J. B. Wilkerson
County Judge

45 Park Terrace
Corvallis, Oregon
February 20, 1940

Honorable A.H. Boice
Curry County Judge
Gold Beach, Oregon

Dear Judge Boice:

I am interested in the opportunity for investments in logged-off tax delinquent land. Since there seem to be opportunities both from the standpoint of grazing and of timber production on a large scale, I am making a survey of several western counties to determine what opportunities are available. Would you be able to provide the following information concerning your county?

(1) How much logged-off land does Curry county have to sell?

(2) What is the average price per acre of this land when sold in large acreages? (several thousand acres)

(3) What will the assessed valuation and tax rate be?

(4) What forest or brush cover is on the land now?

Any of this information you may be able to provide will be most helpful to me. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience, and I wish to thank you for your cooperation.

Yours very sincerely,


Fremont W. Merewether

encl.

mm

Have little logged off land- sold mostly at \$1.00 per acre. Cover crop mostly brush. Total acreage about 30,000 acres. Assessed valuation depends on particular tract of land. Am enclosing tax information from assessor.

Very truly yours,


County Judge

copy

45 Park Terrace
Corvallis, Oregon
March 12, 1940

Benneth Miller
Agricultural and Livestock Agent
S. P. & S. Railway Company
American Bank Building
Portland, Oregon

Dear Mr. Miller:

Could you provide me with the following information as to the possibilities of grazing cut-over forest lands in western Oregon :

- (1) What grazing plan would be needed to make grazing a permanent industry on cut-over lands according to your experience ?
- (2) What are the railroad rates inbound and outbound for sheep and lambs from eastern Oregon to Columbia and Clatsop counties ?
- (3) What grazing fees are charged per head for sheep in Columbia and Clatsop counties?
- (4) What grazing fees are charged for cattle ?


I will be very appreciative of your cooperation in providing any of the above information .

Yours very truly,

(signed)

mm

Fremont W. Merewether



Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Company

OREGON TRUNK RAILWAY
 OREGON ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY
 GALES CREEK & WILSON RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY
 UNITED RAILWAYS COMPANY

1101 AMERICAN BANK BUILDING

PORTLAND, OREGON March 15, 1940.

KENNETH C. MILLER
 AGRICULTURAL AND LIVESTOCK AGENT
 LAND SETTLEMENT

Mr. Fremont W. Merewether,
 45 Park Terrace,
 Corvallis, Ore.

Dear Fremont:

Glad to hear from you again, and will attempt to answer the questions which you have asked.

1. Those who are going into permanent grazing in the Lower Columbia are obtaining cutover land that is suitable for grazing when developed. In some cases they have been able to get land just burned, and then seeding grass in the ashes. In other cases they are getting land that has started to grow back to brush, and in this case they are handling it in two different ways, some are burning it and seeding, and others are pasturing it first then seeding it and tramping it in with sheep. Clatsop county has been selling selected areas of this land for \$1.00 per acre.

The grasses that are successful have been pretty thoroughly developed on the experimental grazing section. They have determined pretty well the proper grass mixture that will have - 1st. A grass that comes early in the spring. 2nd. One that lasts well into the fall season. 3rd. One that forms a good sod. 4th. A successful growing legume which will put fat on the stock, and of course a selection of the grasses that are most palatable to the stock.

It costs about \$2.00 per acre for a proper grass seed mixture, and about 50¢ per acre for cost of seeding. The area seeded in the fall can be pastured the next year with sheep beginning in May or June, according to the season.

Your question No. 2 as to rates: They will, of course, vary according to the distance from the Eastern Oregon point to the point in the Lower Columbia. These

rates are based on mileage, and are the same as all livestock mileage rates throughout the Pacific Northwest. The sheep that this company has handled from Eastern Oregon to Lower Columbia points have varied from a rate of 26 to 32 cents per hundred for a minimum carload of 20,000 lbs.

Your question No. 3: The rates for grazing sheep on the cutover land which, of course, is not seeded, have been 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ per ewe per month, with no charge for the lamb.

Your question No. 4: Grazing fees for cattle have been 17¢ per head per month. That is the customary spread between sheep and cattle grazing per head.

Stock can be grazed in that area according to the season, from April until November. In fact, the stock raised on the experimental grazing section, being both sheep and cattle, are allowed to run out thru the entire year, being given some supplemental feed during the winter months.

Please do not hesitate to write and ask me any further questions that you may have, and I will be glad to be of what assistance I can to you.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Yours truly,

KCM:B



45 Park Terrace
Corvallis, Oregon
February 20, 1940

Floyd Parman
Condon, Oregon

Dear Mr. Parman:

We students at Oregon State College are intensely interested in the advances and developments being made by progressive farmers and civic leaders, especially as regards the utilization of large areas of tax delinquent land.

I understand you have done much to secure a return to production of a large amount of previously worthless land in Clatsop county. Pioneering efforts in any field are watched with interest, and the use of logged-off land for grazing may certainly be the answer to this land use problem.

In making a study of the utilization of tax delinquent land in Oregon, we constantly run into a blank wall due to the scarcity of factual information. Considering the growing importance of this problem to all of the people in this state, I have undertaken to make a study of the subject in preparation of my senior thesis. Any information you would care to give regarding the management problem involved in grazing these cut-over lands would indeed be helpful to me. Specific information which I am seeking is suggested by the following points:

- (1) average cost of the cut-over land - ~~\$1.00~~ ^{\$1.00} an acre
- (2) average annual tax charge - $7\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ an acre.
- (3) cost of herding or fencing - herder $\frac{1}{4}$ ¢ per band - fencing $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ an acre.
- (4) length of grazing season - at present 6 mo, but expect it to be 12.
- (5) cost of transportation from eastern to western Oregon - $\frac{1}{5}$ - a car and can haul 250 in a double deck car - ⁴⁵⁰ even grown
- (6) method of transportation (truck, railroad, etc)
- (7) species of grass to be seeded - *Asteria Bent, English Ry grass, western rye grass, orchard grass, Cheering fescue, Timothy, White clover, alsike clover.*
- (8) method of establishing grass - Broadcast - haul seedling in the Fall
- (9) average gain of sheep on western Oregon pasture as compared to eastern Oregon range - 50% more gain on both ewes and lambs.

I will be most appreciate of the assistance you may give in answering the above questions. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Thank you so much for any cooperation you may care to extend.

Yours very sincerely,

Fremont W. Merewether

encl.

Candon, Oregon
February 26, 1940

Lemont W. Merewether;
Conocoallis, Oregon -

This is just a rough estimate as we have just recently bought, and have not done any planting or fencing - We have had sheep in and around there for the past three years - In 1939 from May until Sept; all sheep (ewes and lambs) went on the market as fat sheep, with no tail ends.

This is very meager information that I have to offer; but I sincerely hope that you get some benefit from it.

yours truly,

L. G. PARMAN & SONS

By -

Mayville, Ore. Feb. 27, 1940.

Mr Fremont Merewether

Corvallis, Ore.

Dear Mr Merewether

I just purchased this land in Jan. and have never had any experience with stock in the Coast country so can't give you very much information. I bought this grazing land on the information of a neighbor that has had his sheep there for the past three years.

(1) They are selling this land at \$1.00 per acre at the present time, but (2) They consider this land worth \$2.00 per acre and tax accordingly (3) Can't answer this question at this time. (4) grazing time according to Experiment Station year around. (5) Transportation by truck 60¢ per hundred lbs. (6) Have never inquired what the cost will be by rail (7) The Station seeds about 8 different grasses 2 sods 3 for nutrition and 3 clovers (8) Seed these grasses on the bed grounds of the sheep and sometimes you have to burn the ground before seeding

(9) I cannot answer this question without experience.

.. Mr Loyd Parnan is the man that interested me in that land and what I know about it I learned from him and Mr Herb Howell of the Experiment Station. You could write Mr Howell and get any information you might wish on the logged off land.

Yours very truly,
