FOIA Number: 2013-0661-F
(3)

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Americorps

Series/Staff Member: General Files

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 24235

FolderID:

Folder Title:
USDA [Department of Agriculture]/Americorps - Forest Service 1

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	66	1	7	3

United States Department of Agriculture | Forest Service | Washington Office | 14th & Independence SW
P.O. Box 96090
Washington, DC 20090-6090

Reply to: 1800

Date: July 27, 1994

File

Subject: AmeriCorps Team

To: Regional Foresters, Station Directors, Area Director, IITF Director and WO Staff

This letter is to advise you that an AmeriCorps Team has been established to work full time on this project. This team consists of four members and a team leader. The team leader is Lou Woltering (L.Woltering:W01C) and the other members are: John Sebelius (J.Sebelius:W01C), Bernie Weingardt (B.Weingardt:W01C), Don Hansen (D.Hansen:W01B) and Joe Rios (J.Rios:W01C).

If you have any questions or comments please, contact Lou at (202) 205-1784.

/s/ David A. Heerwagen for

J. LAMAR BEASLEY
Deputy Chief for Administration

S&PF AmeriCorps
Recruitment Plan

Summary/Briefing:

Objective: To provide a diverse group of highly qualified individuals to assist rural communities.

Job Description:

Engineers for timber bridge program
Rural Sociologists (leadership training)
Community Planners
Urban Foresters
Forestry Technicians
Environmental Educators
Tourism and Recreation
Environmental Sciences (recycling and wood waste)

Locations:

Mississippi Delta (total participants=20)

MS:	10
LA:	3
AR:	5
Timber Bridge:	2

Appalachia (total participants=15

KY:	3
TN:	5
VA:	4
NC:	2
GA:	1

South Carolina: Statewide total participants =5

Method:

Background information on AmeriCorps projects in these locations will be distributed to colleges, universities, trade schools, and 1890 universities with application forms. A package of recruitment materials is needed and a specific due date. Local recruitment and outreach efforts will be done near project locations.

Personal visits to some selected colleges and universities will be done. The following is a list of possible schools to be contacted:

Dr. Chinella Henderson
Associate Dean
Cooperative Extension Service
Dawson Bldg.
P.O. Box 967
Alabama A&M University
Normal, AL 851-5840
205-851-5711
FAX 205-851-5840

Dr. Velma Blackwell
Associate Provost, Director and
Extension Administrator
Extension Bldg.
Tuskegee University
Tuskegee, AL 36088
205-727-8799
FAX 205-727-8812

Dr. Mazo Price
Dean
School of Agriculture and Home
Economics
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
Pine Bluff, AR 71601
501-543-8130
FAX 501-543-8033

Dr. Lawrence Carter
Administrator
Cooperative Extension Program
215 Perry-Paige Hall
Florida A&M Unitersity
Tallahassee, FL 32307
904-599-3546
FAX 904-561-2151

Dr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
Administrator
Cooperative Extension Program
C.W. Pettigrew Farm & Community
Life Center
Fort Valley State College
Fort Valley, GA 31030-3546
912-825-6296
FAX 912-825-6299

Dr. Harold Benson
Director of Land-Grant Programs
Atwood Research Facility
Kentucky State University
Frankfort, KY 40401
502-227-6311
FAX 502-227-5933

Dr. Adell Brown, Jr.
Acting Administator
Cooperative Extension Program
J.S. Clark Administration Bldg
P.O. Box 10010
Southern University & A&M College
Baton Rouge, LA 70813
504-771-2242
FAX 504-771-2861

Dr. Jerome Burton
Associate Director of Areas for Extension
New Administration Bldg.
Alcorn State University
Lorman, MS 39096
601-877-6125
FAX 601-6219

Dr. Daniel Godfrey
Administrator
Cooperative Extension Program
Coltrane Hall
North Carolina A&T State University
Greensbore, NC 27411
919-334-7956
FAX 919-334-7077

Dr. Ocleris Simpson
Dean of Research and Extension
P.O. Box 730
Langston University
Langston, OK 73050
405-466-3205
FAX 405-466-3138

Dr. Oscar P. Butler, Jr.
Executive Director of 1890 Extension & Research
Box 8103
300 College St NE
Orangeburg, SC 29117
803-536-8229
FAX 803-536-7102

Dr. Richard Winston
Cooperative Extension Program
School of Agriculture and Home Economics
Office of the Administrator
Elliott Hall, RM 105
Tennessee State University
Nashville, TN 37209-1561
615-320-3429
FAX 615-320-3632

Hoover Carden
Administrator
Cooperative Extension & Research
P.O. Drawer B
Prairie View A&M University
Prairie View, TX 77446
409-857-2030
FAX 409-857-2004

Dr. Lorenzo Lyons
Associate Vice President
Agruculture & Extension
Owens Hall
Virginia State University
Petersburg, VA 23803
804-524-5961
FAX 804-524-5967

Efforts will be made to use local NF personnel and special emphasis coordinators to do local recruitment. Also liason positions at land grant and other schools, Extension Service, SCS, and other agencies will be utilized to enhance recruitment outreach efforts.

October 25, 1995

To: Reviewers of Draft Forest Service AmeriCorps Re-Programming Letter
(Brian Burke, Stephanie Hague, NRE; Dennis Kaplan, OPBA, Michael Kiely, OGC)

From: Joel Berg JB

Unfortunately, the Forest Service chose **not** to provide me with a draft of the attached reprogramming letter prior to submitting it through controlled correspondence.

Therefore, I would suggest that, while you review their attached draft, you also concurrently review my major suggested changes and additions.

Despite the fact the Forest Service took nearly a month to prepare the page and a half letter, the agency did not significantly address major concerns about AmeriCorps raised by the report language in the Omnibus Appropriations Bill (H.R. 3610) and raised in previous correspondence from Senators Gorton and Byrd and Congressman Regula.

After the fourth paragraph, I suggest including the following lengthy addition:

> "Recent history demonstrates that on-the-ground-managers *will* determine that AmeriCorps can be used in FY1997 in a cost-efficient manner beneficial to the agency; this is precisely how the program functioned in FY 1995, when the Forest Service last sponsored an AmeriCorps program. Thus, the Forest Service AmeriCorps program already has a proven track record of allowing each forest to meet each local area's most pressing needs utilizing low cost methods.
>
> In the FY 1995 program, AmeriCorps service projects were designed and proposed by each forest, *not* in Washington, D.C. The Forest Service empowered on-the-ground managers to use their best professional and scientific judgments to fill urgent work backlogs of their own forests and their own surrounding communities. AmeriCorps members performed only service that was determined most vital by the forest supervisors, district rangers, and work project coordinators of each individual forest. As a consequence, the service projects ultimately performed by AmeriCorps members varied greatly by forest and by region. As clarified by the attached document, the FY 1997 process will place even more emphasis on meeting individual forest needs.

Throughout the nation, community leaders representing all political backgrounds expressed wide-spread support for FY 1995 Forest Service AmeriCorps projects, precisely because such projects met critical local needs. In an editorial in support of the program entitled, "AmeriCorps forest project shows what can be done," the Ashland, Oregon *Tidings* wrote: "Last week a crew of young people in the AmeriCorps program braved wet, steep slops and wrestled with downed logs, dying trees, and poison oak to help make the area less of a fire danger... The clean-up does illustrate the value of this national service program... In addition to watershed work, the crews protect wetlands, restore recreation areas, increase handicapped accessibility, and much more.... Important work is being done and the long-range benefits are great in learned job skills and educational incentives..."

Wrote the bi-partisan Co-Chairs of the New Hampshire National and Community Service Board, which is appointed by the Governor: "The White Mountain National Forest AmeriCorps program, the state's largest AmeriCorps program, not only helps preserve our natural resources but enhances economic growth as well."

In an editorial in support of the Forest Service AmeriCorps program, the Medford, Oregon Mail *Tribune* wrote: "The last time we wrote defending AmeriCorps... volunteers were up in Butte Falls, hammering away on improvements on the Butte Falls community hall. ... Earlier, they maintained national forest trails, planted tress, and worked on erosion-control projects ... AmeriCorps crews are now helping improve the popular but heavily worn trail on Upper Table Rock. Literally, your tax dollars at work."

Wrote the Mayor of Port Townsend, Washington: "It is a beneficial use of Federal tax dollars in support of communities. Our local program was very ably administered by the USDA Forest Service ... AmeriCorps was made available to fill some specific project needs within our city. The projects were accomplished by a hard-working, energetic group of young people."

Regarding the cost-effectiveness of the program, the facts show that the FY 1995 Forest Service AmeriCorps program actually performed service far more valuable than the entire cost of those projects. In that year, AmeriCorps members serving on forest service land performed at least $1.51 --- and as much as $2.30 --- worth of service for each $1.00 that the American taxpayer spent to support such service.

Although it is difficult to blend costs and benefits from different Forest Service regions around the country, the cost-benefit figures are based on an average of the combined cost savings of all projects completed. These costs included all Federal

spending, including the AmeriCorps stipends and educational awards.

Furthermore, the Clinch-Powell RC& D Council in Rutledge, Tennessee calculated that -- in the first four months of the program year --- the four USDA AmeriCorps members who are managed by the RC&D Council performed approximately $2.73 worth of service on rural community development projects for each $1.00 that the American taxpayer spent to support such service. These AmeriCorps members were sponsored jointly by the Forest Service and the Natural Resources Conservation service. The Council calculated that, if purchased on the "open market," one service project performed by one Member would have cost an estimated $23,975 while another service project performed by three Members would have cost an estimated $50,400, bringing the total value of the service performed to $74,375. The cost of the AmeriCorps Members, pro-rated to the four month period in which they performed the projects, was $27,272. Dividing the $74,375 benefit by the $27,272 cost equals the $2.72 cost/benefit ratio.

Thus, the facts demonstrate that the FY 1995 Forest Service AmeriCorps program was extremely cost-effective. We expect the FY 1997 program to be even more cost-effective.

In addition, I believe it is important to respond to concerns raised by recent letters from the committees in both houses:

Concern 1: *The Committee is concerned that the AmeriCorps staff may not have the required professional expertise to do the work.*

Response: AmeriCorps members utilized by the Forest Service have educational backgrounds and training that equals --- and often exceeds --- the backgrounds and experience of individuals otherwise utilized by the Forest Service to perform similar tasks. There is no documented instance of which I am aware in which a Forest Service AmeriCorps member was asked to perform a task for which that member did not have the proper training and expertise. To the contrary, Forest Service professional project managers repeatedly reported that AmeriCorps members performed work a higher level of quality --- and more rapidly --- than traditional Forest Service work crews.

Concern 2: *AmeriCorps centers may not be appropriately located so that priority projects are tackled with the available funds.*

Response: All Forest Service AmeriCorps projects are placed in precisely the

areas of greatest need and utility as determined by the on-the-ground managers. Furthermore, in many instances, AmeriCorps members endured difficult living conditions in tents in "spike camps" just so that they could reduce travel time by being closer to daily work sites.

Concern 3: *Due to the delay of the FY 1996 appropriations bill, many of the program tasks have been accomplished outside of the AmeriCorps program and much of the work that would have been performed by enrollees is completed."*

Response: Very few of the projects planned for FY 1996 AmeriCorps program were accomplished by other means during FY 1996. The AmeriCorps projects were requested by individual forests precisely because those forests did **not** have viable alternative means to perform the work proposed."

In addition, I note that the Forest Service is now proposing to eliminate their involvement in AmeriCorps rural development projects. **If this request is upheld by the Department, is likely that the Forest Service will no longer have AmeriCorps projects in such states as West Virginia, Minnesota, Louisiana, Virginia, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arkansas.**

In reviewing attachment 2, I must note that the Forest Service has again sent a communication to the field on AmeriCorps without allowing me to review it before distribution. Such an action is contrary to previous requests from both OSEC and NRE that the Forest Service work cooperatively with my office in preparing and distributing such documents

Moreover, I question why the Forest Service even needs to engage in another competition and review process. All the agency needs to de is re-approve the projects proposed, but never funded, last year.

This communication to the field it may be intended to once again attempt to destroy the program through delay. Full responses are not due until the end of November, even though the national office **already** has virtually every piece of information it needs from the field. Even worse, the communication includes the totally unsubstantiated claim that the Department is unlikely to obtain approval for the program from Congress until after January 1, 1997.

The attachment also implies that is it only USDA "regulations" which prohibit displacement of permanent employees. This prohibition is not simply USDA policy --- it is the law; this should be made clear in any communication to the field.

Hopefully, we can resolve these issues rapidly, get OMB to approve the letter quickly, and get the letter sent to the committees ASAP. Many of our supporters on the Hill are anxiously awaiting us to send it.

OPTIONAL FORM 99 (7-90)

FAX TRANSMITTAL # of pages ► 4

To J. Borg	From S. Hayne
Dept./Agency	Phone #
Fax # 720-4614	Fax #

NSN 7540-01-317-7368 5099-101 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Honorable Robert C. Byrd
Ranking Democratic Member
Subcommittee on Interior
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20515-6023

Dear Robert:

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) proposes to reprogram Forest Service (FS) funds in fiscal year (FY) 1997 for the AmeriCorps program. Section 312 of the 1997 Omnibus Spending Bill (H.R. 3610) prohibits the use of such funds for AmeriCorps programs unless the relevant agencies of the Department of the Interior and the USDA follow "appropriate reprogramming guidelines." Further, Section 312 prohibits the use of such funds for the AmeriCorps program "if no funds are provided for the AmeriCorps program by the Department of Veteran Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and the Independent Agencies 1997 appropriations (VA-HUD). Public Law 104-204 does provide funding for AmeriCorps under VA-HUD.

In accordance with Section 312, we are proposing to reprogram $8.9 million of National Forest System funds (see enclosure) to carry out authorized FS work projects through the AmeriCorps national service program in FY 1997.

I am also enclosing a copy of the Chief's letter to field units outlining the development of Concept Papers and the Selection and Ranking criteria that will be used to evaluate proposed AmeriCorps projects. Cost-effectiveness and benefit to the agency are key criteria in the selection process.

We believe the resulting program will meet the committees' and the agencies' objectives of an AmeriCorp program that is both cost-effective and supportive of the accomplishment of our

1997 planned program. This program will benefit not only the AmeriCorps enrollees themselves, but will accomplish important work on our national forests.

The funding provided in the enclosure is our best estimate of the budget line item funding mix. We will not exceed $8.9 million although the final funding mix will vary. We will promptly advise the committees of the adjustments in the funding mix, a listing of the final projects selected and the number of AmeriCorps members enrolled.

This letter is being submitted in accordance with the arrangements and understanding that the Department has with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with respect to reprogramming procedures.

Similar letters are being sent to Congressmen Regula and Yates and Senator Gorton.

I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DAN GLICKMAN
Secretary

Enclosures (2)

DRAFT:FS:PD&B:R.Thompson:rlt:205-0987:10/09/96:09-3114772

10/23

10/23/96

FY 1997 FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROGRAM

The following reprogramming of FY 1997 Forest Service funds to the AmeriCorps program is requested:

	Thousands $
National Forest System and Related Funds:	
Recreation Management	4,489
Wilderness Management	195
Wildlife Habitat Management	788
Inland Fish Habitat Management	331
Anadromous Fish Habitat Management	380
Threatened and Endangered Sensitive Species Habitat Management	579
Grazing Management	103
Rangeland Vegetation Management	84
Forestland Vegetation Management	815
Watershed Improvement	275
Land Line Location	24
Road Maintenance	79
Forest Trail Construction	594
Recreation Facility Construction	15
Brush Disposal	7
Cooperative Work	142
Total	8,900

OPTIONAL FORM 99 (7-90)

FAX TRANSMITTAL # of pages ► 4

To J. Borg	From S. Hagle
Dept./Agency	Phone #
Fax # 720-4614	Fax #

NSN 7540-01-317-7368 5099-101 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

United States Department of Agriculture — Forest Service

File Code: 1800/6520
Route To :

Date: October 23, 1996

Subject: Request for Initial Summaries and Concept Papers for 1997 AmeriCorps Program

To: Regional Foresters, Station Directors, Area Director, and IITF Director

REPLIES DUE OCTOBER 31 AND NOVEMBER 29, 1996

The 1997 Omnibus Appropriations Bill, H.R. 3610, Section 312 includes the following language relative to AmeriCorps:

> None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for the AmeriCorps program, unless the relevant agencies of the Department of the Interior and/or Agriculture follow appropriate reprogramming guidelines: Provided, That if no funds are provided for the AmeriCorps program by the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies fiscal year 1997 appropriations bill, then none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for the AmeriCorps programs.

Also, report language accompanying the Bill reads as follows:

> Section 312 continues language carried in the fiscal year 1996 appropriations act regarding AmeriCorps activities of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture subject to established reprogramming guidelines. Timely consideration will be given to any request that is submitted. If AmeriCorps members can be used in a manner that on-the-ground land managers determine will be cost-effective and beneficial to the agency, those types of efforts should be considered via a reprogramming request.

In order to be responsive to both the Bill and Report language and to begin our agency competitive process, you need to submit a **Initial Summary of Proposed Projects by October 31, 1996**, and **Concept Papers by November 29, 1996**. The projects submitted may be identified in the reprogramming request to demonstrate how AmeriCorps members will be used in a manner that on-the-ground managers have determined will be cost-effective and beneficial to the agency. For those units that participated in the competitive process over the last 2 years, it will be very much the same this year, except for the addition of the Initial Summary. The Initial Summary should be very brief and must address the area of quality and cost effectiveness/benefits. Also include the following information:

1. Name and location of the project;
2. Specify renewal or new project proposal;
3. Number of full-time/part-time members;
4. Project start and end dates;
5. Estimate of Federal resources--by EBLI;
6. Name, telephone number, and DG address of contact person; and
7. Brief description of proposed project.

Enclosure 2

SELECTION AND RANKING CRITERIA FOR FY 1997 FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROPOSALS

1. QUALITY AND COST EFFECTIVENESS/BENEFITS

a. Show the linkage(s) between the importance to the Members, the experience it provides to the Members, and the FS mission through a service or improvement, that otherwise would not be provided with existing funds, volunteers, and per USDA AmeriCorps regulations, does not duplicate the routine functions of workers or displace paid workers.

b. Relate the scope and benefit of the project to strengthening communities, institutions, the public and the Forest Service.

c. As a measure of support and commitment, indicate the number of non-federal partnerships and contributions, interagency agreements, and broad-based local input.

d. The cultural diversity in members and staff should reflect the diversity of the community.

e. Projects will be given priority which develop an awareness of natural resources through worthwhile service, education, citizenship building, and training.

f. Highlight the accomplishment of forest plan goals and desired future conditions, especially in ecosystem restoration and sustainability.

g. Projects will be given priority if they occur in any of the following CNCS priority areas: Empowerment zones/Enterprise Communities, areas that are affected by military downsizing, and areas of high poverty, cities with urban resource partnerships. Priority will also be given to projects proposed in disaster areas.

2. SUSTAINABILITY

a. The cost effectiveness of the overall project to include the number of interagency agreements, partnerships and non-federal contributions.

b. Evidence of community support, networking, and sustainability of funding and relationships after Corporate cooperative agreements expires.

3. INNOVATION AND REPLICABILITY

a. Creative or distinctive approaches to achieve project goals.

b. Adaptability by other units, agencies, or organizations.

downsizing, and areas of high poverty.
g. Project Start Date.
h. Project Completion Date.
i. Number of Full-Time Members.
j. Number of Part-Time Members.
k. Name of person(s) submitting proposal.
l. Address.
m. Telephone number, fax number, and DG Address.

2. OBJECTIVE STATEMENT. This statement shall address the following elements (quantify where possible):

a. Brief narrative of proposed project.

b. Components of the objective statement, as follows:

(1). What work will be done? What service will your members engage in?

(2). What is the hoped result of the activities described above?

(3). How will you measure the quality of these activities?

(4). How will you determine cost effectiveness of accomplishing through AmeriCorps project?

(5). By what standard will you gauge success?

(6). How many individuals will receive the benefit of the work your members perform?

3. PROSPECTIVE RECIPIENTS (THIRD PARTIES), OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES, AND OTHER PARTNERS. This subheading should include a listing of the recipients and other partners projected for involvement in the proposed project(s), including their names and type of recipients, i.e., State, nonprofit, Federal agency, and their anticipated contributions.

4. INITIAL BUDGET BREAKDOWN:

PARTNER(S) MATCHING FUNDS	PARTNER(S) MATCHING IN-KIND	FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED (BY EBLI)	TOTAL

[illegible].

f. Highlight the accomplishment of forest plan goals and desired future conditions, especially in ecosystem restoration and sustainability.

g. Projects will be given priority if they occur in any of the following CNCS priority areas: Empowerment zones/Enterprise Communities, areas that are affected by military downsizing, and areas of high poverty, cities with urban resource partnerships. Priority will also be given to projects proposed in disaster areas.

2. SUSTAINABILITY

a. The cost effectiveness of the overall project to include the number of interagency agreements, partnerships and non-federal contributions.

b. Evidence of community support, networking, and sustainability of funding and relationships after Corporate cooperative agreements expires.

3. INNOVATION AND REPLICABILITY

a. Creative or distinctive approaches to achieve project goals.

b. Adaptability by other units, agencies, or organizations.

Please give special attention to the criteria, which details the qualities we are seeking, particularly in the area of cost-effectiveness. The outline for the Concept Paper (Enclosure 1), along with the Criteria (Enclosure 2) that will be used in ranking and selection are enclosed. Your papers will be reviewed and ranked by a team composed of Washington Office (WO) and field staff. We will obtain initial feedback from the National Service Office on the proposals selected by the Team and notify units of the initial selections. However, final decisions will not be released until we receive a response from Congress regarding our reprogramming request. It is not likely that approval will be received prior to January 1, 1997, and it could be later. Please do not provide any firm commitments to partners or cooperative agreement recipients prior to notification to you by the WO.

A total of $8.9 million has been set aside in the fiscal year 1997 National Commitments listing to support the selected projects for Public Land and Environment Corps. The budget line item distribution of the $8.9 million will be updated based upon the final projects selected.

Questions on the above information may be directed to Guanda Veney-Fitch, Human Resource Program Staff, at (703) 235-8843 or via DG at G.Fitch:WO1B.

/s/ David G. Unger for

JACK WARD THOMAS
Chief

Enclosures (2)

Enclosure 1

CONCEPT PAPER FORMAT - AMERICORPS - FY 1997
Due November 8, 1996

1. COVER PAGE. The cover page shall include the following headings:

   a. Project Title.
   b. Address/Location.
   c. Congressional District of central project site.
   d. Additional Congressional Districts in which service will be performed.
   e. Whether project is urban, rural, or other.
   f. If the project will occur in any of the following CNCS priority areas: Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities, areas affected by military

FAX COVER PAGE

Date: Thu Mar 7 00:01:48 GMT 1996

Destination Fax: 1 202 720 4614

From: E.CRANE

Subject: Forwarded: 3610/Allocation of Rural Community Assistance Funds

Number of pages: 4
(including cover page(s))

UA-Message ID: BHF-RNOROS

Addressed To:

fax!202-720-4614
JOEL BERG

This document was transmitted by AT&T EasyLink Services
Call 1-800-MAIL672 in the USA or +1 314 770 1610
outside of the USA for information on AT&T MailFax

Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 00000000963

From: Elizabeth Crane:R8
Date: ## 03/06/96 19:01 ##

Previous comments:
From: Alan Pigg:R8
Date: ## 03/05/96 07:21 ##
IN OUR EFFORTS TO OBTAIN MORE FUNDING FOR R8 IN THE RCA PROGRAM, THIS LETTER RESPONSE WAS SENT TO OUR REGIONAL FORESTER. LOOKS LIKE ECONOMIC RECOVERY WILL BE OUR ONLY SOURCE OF GRANTS THIS YEAR -- THAT IS, IF WE CAN EVER GET STARTED. THERE ARE SOME CARRY OVER FUNDS SHOWING UP, BUT WE CAN'T BELIEVE THEY ARE REAL AND MAY GO AWAY ONCE THE CORRECT MANAGEMENT CODES ARE FIGURED OUT. SHARE THIS LETTER WITH YOUR FOREST SUPERVISORS. I KNOW SOME OF YOU ARE PARTIALLY FUNDED ETC. AND OVERWORKED. HOPEFULLY, SOMEDAY OUR GREAT WORK WILL BE REWARDED/RECOGNIZED AND WE CAN OPERATE LIKE WE ARE SUPPOSE TO.

Previous comments:
From: George Brooks:R8
Date: ## 02/20/96 15:49 ##

Previous comments:
From: Regional Forester:R8
Date: ## 02/20/96 10:22 ##

Previous comments:
From: DIRECTOR, CF:WO
Date: ## 02/20/96 10:02 ##
No Hardcopy will follow.

Content-Type: ForwardedIPmessage
Content-Length: 00000005985

Message-Version: 2
UA-Content-ID: <BHG-RNOROT>
End-of-Header:
EMail-Version: 2
UA-Message-ID: <BHG-RNOROT>
End-of-Protocol:
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 5817

United States Department of Agriculture | Forest Service | Washington Office | 14th & Independence SW
P.O. Box 96090
Washington, DC 20090-6090

File Code: 3610 Date: February 20, 1996
Route To :

Subject: Allocation of Rural Community Assistance Funds

To: Regional Forester, Region 8

During the recently completed National Leadership Team meeting, you stated that the Southern Region was not receiving its "fair" share of Rural Community Assistance funds (RCA), specifically the Rural Development dollars available through the Economic Action Programs (EAP). After having my staff outline the fund allocation process and the FY 1996 appropriations, earmarks, and resultant field allocations, I understand your concerns.

In the FY 1996 Conference Marks, Congress allocated S4.8 million for the Rural Development element of RCA; of that total, they earmarked S2.88 million for the Northeastern Area (NA). After subtracting the National Commitments, Americorps, and the WO-Cooperative Forestry Operating Plan, the "Net Available" to be allocated to the rest of the regions was S0.983 million. Of this amount, Region 8 was allocated S0.189 million, plus Americorps at S0.262 for a total of S0.451 million or 46 percent of available funds.

The available funds were distributed according to the fund allocation process which was initiated in FY 1993 (see following explanation of the basic process and any specific modifications for this fiscal year). The Rural Development program uses a two-step fund allocation process. The first step calculates an amount to support the basic program and the second step uses resource and demographic data to calculate a "needs-based" share of the funds available above the basic program. Through this "needs-based" portion of the process, Rural Development funds are focused on non-metropolitan counties with high forest cover/natural resources and long-term, low per capita income. In other words, the intent is to target funding above the basic program to increase technical and financial assistance to regions of the country with higher needs in rural communities. If more funds were available nationwide, the allocation process actually targets FS resources to the South and Southwest.

Modifications to the standard process for FY 1996 include: (1) maximizing the amount for Rural Development distribution to the rest of the country by reducing the amounts allocated to the Pacific Northwest (PNW) and Pacific Southwest Regions since they receive separate funding for the President's Plan for PNW; and (2) including the national Americorps Rural Development allocation in the Southern Region's allocation.

Therefore, based on the available funds, the Southern Region did get its full Rural Development share, plus additional funds for the Americorps Program in FY 1996.

The following information provides a comparison of what your Region would get under different scenarios, based on different amounts of national funding, should the original Conference Marks be modified for the final FY 1996 appropriations:

- Rural Development funds distributed in the standard process without Americorps or NA Earmark would provide the Southern Region with S977,695 and NA with S719,201.

- If the Americorps funding for the Rural Development program in the Southern Region was included, and no earmarks existed, all Regions would be assessed; and the Southern Region would have a total of S1.17 million.

- If the earmark for NA were to continue, but Americorps not be funded Region 8 would not receive the Americorps "add on" and would be allocated only S272,000.

We have spread the impacts of the earmarks and initiatives across the regions. The intensity of the reductions is most obvious in the Southern Region, which should not be surprising when another unit (NA) is designated by Congress to receive an earmark that adds up to 75 percent of the net available national Rural Development funds.

Taking this opportunity to analyze this situation from another perspective, we can gauge what Congress thinks is a "minimal acceptable level" of funding for the NA Rural Development effort, with which they have some familiarity. To extrapolate what the Rural Development portion of the national appropriation would need to be for all regions to have a staff and grant program comparable to the NA, this program element would need to grow to S18.3 million from the current S4.8 million. This does not include the funding for the other EAP components. At that theoretical S18.3 million national level, the Southern Region would be allocated S4.13 million, plus amounts for the other EAP components.

Growing the national EAP is not at all unrealistic, since we are working with the Department to gradually transfer funds that are currently going to the Pacific Northwest in a "regional initiative" to the national RCA effort. Should the EAP budget increase, some portion of that increase would be devoted to the Rural Development element. However, growing the national program also depends on Congress knowing about the community-based benefits of the programs across all rural America, not just the PNW or the Midwest and Northeast. The success of partnerships with states and other organizations in the Southern Region is a story worth telling -- showing the outreach and diversity of assistance through the RCA effort.

/s/William L. McCleese
for
JOAN M. COMANOR
Deputy Chief for
State and Private Forestry

MAJORITY MEMBERS
BOB LIVINGSTON, LOUISIANA, CHAIRMAN
JOSEPH M. McDADE, PENNSYLVANIA
JOHN T. MYERS, INDIANA
C.W. BILL YOUNG, FLORIDA
RALPH REGULA, OHIO
JERRY LEWIS, CALIFORNIA
JOHN EDWARD PORTER, ILLINOIS
HAROLD ROGERS, KENTUCKY
JOE SKEEN, NEW MEXICO
R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
LAY, TEXAS
BE, ARIZONA
RA F. VUCANOVICH, NEVADA
LIGHTFOOT, IOWA
RON PACKARD, CALIFORNIA
SONNY CALLAHAN, ALABAMA
JAMES T. WALSH, NEW YORK
CHARLES H. TAYLOR, NORTH CAROLINA
DAVID L. HOBSON, OHIO
ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR., OKLAHOMA
HENRY BONILLA, TEXAS
JOE KNOLLENBERG, MICHIGAN
DAN MILLER, FLORIDA
JAY DICKEY, ARKANSAS
JACK KINGSTON, GEORGIA
FRANK RIGGS, CALIFORNIA
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, NEW JERSEY
ROGER F. WICKER, MISSISSIPPI
MICHAEL P. FORBES, NEW YORK
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR., WASHINGTON
JIM BUNN, OREGON
MARK W. NEUMANN, WISCONSIN

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives
Committee on Appropriations
Washington, DC 20515–6015

DAVID R. OBEY, WISCONSIN
SIDNEY R. YATES, ILLINOIS
LOUIS STOKES, OHIO
TOM BEVILL, ALABAMA
JOHN P. MURTHA, PENNSYLVANIA
CHARLES WILSON, TEXAS
NORMAN D. DICKS, WASHINGTON
MARTIN OLAV SABO, MINNESOTA
JULIAN C. DIXON, CALIFORNIA
VIC FAZIO, CALIFORNIA
W.G. (BILL) HEFNER, NORTH CAROLINA
STENY H. HOYER, MARYLAND
RICHARD J. DURBIN, ILLINOIS
RONALD D. COLEMAN, TEXAS
ALAN B. MOLLOHAN, WEST VIRGINIA
JIM CHAPMAN, TEXAS
MARCY KAPTUR, OHIO
DAVID E. SKAGGS, COLORADO
NANCY PELOSI, CALIFORNIA
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, INDIANA
THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA, PENNSYLVANIA
ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES, CALIFORNIA
NITA M. LOWEY, NEW YORK
RAY THORNTON, ARKANSAS

CLERK AND STAFF DIRECTOR
JAMES W. DYER

TELEPHONE:
(202) 225–2771

March 6, 1996

Honorable Dan Glickman
Secretary
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This letter is in response to your letter of February 16, 1996 regarding your intentions to use $9.4 million, primarily from National Forest System (NFS) accounts, to carry out Forest Service work projects through the AmeriCorps national service program in FY 1996. As you state, funding for AmeriCorps is ~~contingent on action in both the VA-HUD and Interior appropriations bills.~~ As it is premature to make this request, we are not willing to approve a prospective reprogramming request.

We will be happy to consider a reprogramming request at the appropriate time, following bill passage. I am, however, concerned that you may be intending to use NFS project funds to support the AmeriCorps program.

To assist a subsequent reprogramming request, please ask the Forest Service to answer some questions regarding the use of NFS and State and Private Forestry funds for AmeriCorps:

1. What work will be done by the Americorps?
2. Does the AmeriCorps staff have the required professional expertise to do the work?
3. Who has done this type of work in the past? If contracts were used, why not continue to use competitive bids and get professional quality work with appropriate oversight?
4. Are the AmeriCorps centers appropriately located so that the priority projects are tackled for each of the many programs listed?

It is appropriate for you to seek reprogramming authority before spending NFS and State and Private Forestry funds on the AmeriCorps program. Rather than "giving notice to the Congress of our intent to use $9.4 million..." and "writing to inform you of the USDA intentions regarding the use of Forest Service funds in FY 1996 for AmeriCorps programs ...", you should request reprogramming at the appropriate time, following the published guidelines. We want to avoid another occurrence where the Forest Service expends funds on the AmeriCorps program before receiving reprogramming authority from the Committee on Appropriations. We look forward to a continued collaborative relationship between the USDA and the Appropriations Committee so that reprogramming requests can be handled in a timely fashion.

Sincerely,

Ralph Regula
Chairman
Subcommittee on Interior
and Related Agencies

Americorp Reprogramming

FAX TRANSMISSION

SENDER: HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

TELEPHONE: 202-225-3081
FAX: 202-225-9069

1 of 3 pages

2050936

TO: Steve Sattefield or Robin Th.

FROM: Chris Topik

FYI
as discussed

MR. KAPLAN

Calendar No. 498

F5

103D CONGRESS
2d Session
SENATE
REPORT
103–294

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1995

JUNE 28 (legislative day, JUNE 7), 1994.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 4602]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 4602) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

AMOUNTS IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Amount of bill passed by House	$13,186,734,000
Amount of decrease by Senate	−122,705,000
Total of bill as reported to Senate	13,064,029,000
Estimates considered by House	13,424,299,000
Estimates considered by Senate	13,424,299,000
Below the budget estimate, 1995	−360,270,000
Below appropriations, 1994	−324,411,000

SUMMARY OF BILL

For this bill, estimates totaling $13,424,299,000 in new obligational authority were considered by the Committee for the programs and activities of the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior, except the Bureau of Reclamation, and the following related agencies:

Department of Agriculture:
Forest Service.
Department of Energy:
Clean coal technology.
Fossil energy.
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.
Conservation (except energy storage systems).
Economic Regulatory Administration.
Emergency preparedness.
Strategic petroleum reserve.
SPR petroleum account.
Energy Information Administration.
Department of Health and Human Services:
Indian Health Service.
Department of Education:
Indian education.
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation.
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development.
Smithsonian Institution.
National Gallery of Art.
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities:
National Endowment for the Arts.
National Endowment for the Humanities.
Institute of Museum Services.
Commission of Fine Arts.
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.
National Capital Planning Commission.
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.
Holocaust Memorial Council.

REVENUE GENERATED BY AGENCIES IN BILL

Oil and gas leasing and other mineral leasing activities, the timber and range programs, and oil production from the naval petroleum reserves will generate income to the Government in excess of $8,132,000,000 in fiscal year 1995. These estimated receipts, for

agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction, are tabulated below:

Item	Fiscal year—		
	1993	1994	1995
Department of the Interior	$5,424,546,000	$5,401,159,000	$6,708,666,000
Forest Service	1,024,206,000	1,044,175,000	1,013,655,000
Naval petroleum reserves	442,700,000	427,700,000	410,546,000
Total receipts	6,891,452,000	6,873,034,000	8,132,867,000

REPROGRAMMING PROCEDURES

The Committee has revised its threshold for reprogrammings from $250,000, or 10 percent, to $500,000, or 10 percent, and provided exceptions for certain programs in the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Forest Service (see item 3 below).

The following are revised procedures governing reprogramming actions for programs and activities funded in the Interior Appropriations Act:

1. *Definition.*—Reprogramming, as defined in these procedures, includes the reallocation of funds from one budget activity to another. In cases where either Committee report displays an allocation of an appropriation below the activity level, that more detailed level shall be the basis for reprogramming. For construction accounts, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project identified in the justifications to another. A reprogramming shall also consist of any significant departure from the program described in the agency's budget justifications. This includes proposed reorganizations even without a change in funding.

2. *Guidelines for reprogramming.*—(a) A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises; and then only if postponement of the project or the activity until the next appropriation year would result in actual loss or damage. Mere convenience or desire should not be factors for consideration.

(b) Any project or activity which may be deferred through reprogramming shall not later be accomplished by means of further reprogramming; but, instead, funds should again be sought for the deferred project or activity through the regular appropriations process.

(c) Reprogramming should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by the Congress in the act or the report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee, regardless of amounts involved, and be fully explained and justified.

(d) Reprogramming proposals submitted to the Committee for prior approval shall be considered approved after 30 calendar days if the Committee has posed no objection. However, agencies will be expected to extend the approval deadline if specifically requested by either Committee.

3. *Criteria and exceptions.*—Any proposed reprogramming must be submitted to the Committee in writing prior to implementation if it exceeds $500,000 annually or results in an increase or decrease of more than 10 percent annually in affected programs, with the following exceptions:

(a) With regard to the tribal priority allocations activity of the Bureau of Indian Affairs "Operations of Indian programs" account, there is no restriction on reprogrammings among the programs within this activity. However, the Bureau shall report on all reprogrammings made during the first 6 months of the fiscal year by no later than May 1 of each year, and shall provide a final report of all reprogrammings for the previous fiscal year by no later than November 1 of each year.

(b) With regard to the "Management of lands and resources" account of the Bureau of Land Management, and the "Forest research, State and private forestry", and "National Forest System" accounts of the Forest Service, the reprogramming control level will be at the budget line item level (for example, land resources, wildlife and fisheries, and recreation management for BLM, and ecosystem planning, recreation use, and wildlife and fish management for the National Forest System). A reprogramming will be triggered if these line items are proposed to be changed by $3,000,000, or 10 percent, whichever is less.

The BLM and Forest Service are to maintain all specific congressional designations, in any amount, or to submit a reprogramming request if any such designation is proposed for a change, even if it falls below the reprogramming levels specified above.

With regard to the extended budget line items [EBLI's] (for example, soil, water and air management, wildlife management, and wilderness management for BLM, and recreation management, wildlife habitat management, and timber sales management for the National Forest System), the BLM and Forest Service are to submit a series of reports to the Appropriations Committees, on the following schedule:

(1) A report due by November 1, or 30 days after the appropriations bill is enacted into law if enacted after October 1, reflecting congressional action and showing any other revisions at the EBLI level since the budget was submitted the previous February. This will become the baseline for reporting throughout the year;

(2) A midyear report of actual costs by EBLI as of March 31, with a projection for the remainder of the year, due no later than May 1;

(3) An update of actual costs by EBLI as of July 31, with updated yearend projections if necessary, due no later than September 1;

(4) An end of the year report by EBLI, incorporated into the next fiscal year's baseline report, due by November 1.

4. *Quarterly reports.*—(a) All reprogrammings shall be reported to the Committee quarterly and shall include cumulative totals.

(b) Any significant shifts of funding among object classifications also should be reported to the Committee.

5. *Administrative overhead accounts.*—For all appropriations where costs of overhead administrative expenses are funded in part from assessments of various budget activities within an appropriation, the assessments shall be shown in justifications under the discussion of administrative expenses.

6. *Contingency accounts.*—For all appropriations where assessments are made against various budget activities or allocations for contingencies, the Committee expects a full explanation, separate from the justifications. The explanation shall show the amount of the assessment, the activities assessed, and the purpose of the fund. The Committee expects reports each year detailing the use of these funds. In no case shall such a fund be used to finance projects and activities disapproved or limited by Congress or to finance new permanent positions or to finance programs or activities that could be foreseen and included in the normal budget review process. Contingency funds shall not be used to initiate new programs.

7. *Declarations of taking.*—The Committee directs the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the Forest Service to seek Committee approval in advance of filing declarations of taking.

8. *Report language.*—Any limitation, directive, or earmarking contained in either the House or Senate report which is not contradicted by the other report nor specifically denied in the conference report shall be considered as having been approved by both Houses of Congress.

9. *Forest Service.*—The following procedures shall apply to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture:

(a) The Forest Service shall not change the boundaries of any region, abolish any region, move or close any regional office for research, State and private forestry, or National Forest System administration, without the consent of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and the House Committee on Agriculture, in compliance with these reprogramming procedures.

(b) The appropriation structure for the Forest Service shall not be altered without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

(c) Provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) and of 7 U.S.C. 147b shall apply to appropriations available to the Forest Service only to the extent that the proposed transfer is approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with these reprogramming procedures.

10. *Assessments.*—No assessments shall be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity, or project funded by the Interior Appropriations Act unless such assessments and the basis, therefore, are presented to the Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such committees, in compliance with these procedures.

11. *Land acquisitions.*—Lands shall not be acquired for more than the approved appraised value (as addressed in section 301(3) of Public Law 91–646) except for condemnations and declarations of taking, unless such acquisitions are submitted to the Committees on Appropriations for approval in compliance with these procedures.

103D CONGRESS
2d Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
103–551

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1995

JUNE 17, 1994.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. YATES, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 4602]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, the bill provides regular annual appropriations for the Department of the Interior (except the Bureau of Reclamation) and for other related agencies, including the Forest Service, the Department of Energy, the Indian Health Service, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

CONTENTS

	Page Bill	Page Report
Department of the Interior:		
Bureau of Land Management	2	9
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	9	17
National Biological Survey	14	26
National Park Service	15	29
U.S. Geological Survey	18	40

Item	Fiscal year—		
	1993	1994	1995
New obligational authority	$12,524,207,000	$13,388,440,000	$13,193,894,000
Receipts:			
Department of the Interior	5,424,546,000	5,401,159,000	6,708,666,000
Forest Service	1,024,206,000	1,044,175,000	1,013,655,000
Naval petroleum reserves	442,700,000	427,700,000	410,546,000
Total receipts	6,891,452,000	6,873,034,000	8,132,867,000

REPROGRAMMING PROCEDURES

The Committee has revised its threshold for reprogrammings from $250,000 or 10 percent to $500,000 or 10 percent and provided exceptions for certain programs in the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Forest Service (see item 3 below).

The following are revised procedures governing reprogramming actions for programs and activities funded in the Interior Appropriations Act:

1. *Definition.*—"Reprogramming," as defined in these procedures, includes the reallocation of funds from one budget activity to another. In cases where either Committee report displays an allocation of an appropriation below the activity level, that more detailed level shall be the basis for reprogramming. For construction accounts, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project identified in the justifications to another. A reprogramming shall also consist of any significant departure from the program described in the agency's budget justifications. This includes proposed reorganizations even without a change in funding.

2. *Guidelines for reprogramming.*—(a) A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises; and then only if postponement of the project or the activity until the next appropriation year would result in actual loss or damage. Mere convenience or desire should not be factors for consideration.

(b) Any project or activity which may be deferred through reprogramming shall not later be accomplished by means of further reprogramming; but, instead, funds should again be sought for the deferred project or activity through the regular appropriations process.

(c) Reprogramming should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change allocations specifically denied, limited or increased by the Congress in the Act or the report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee, regardless of amounts involved, and be fully explained and justified.

(d) Reprogramming proposals submitted to the Committee for prior approval shall be considered approved after 30 calendar days if the Committee has posed no objection. However, agencies will be expected to extend the approval deadline if specifically requested by either Committee.

3. *Criteria and exceptions.*—Any proposed reprogramming must be submitted to the Committee in writing prior to implementation

if it exceeds $500,000 annually or results in an increase or decrease of more than 10 percent annually in affected programs, with the following exceptions:

(a) With regard to the Tribal Priority Allocations activity of the Bureau of Indian Affairs Operations of Indian Programs account, there is no restriction on reprogrammings among the programs within this activity. However, the Bureau shall report on all reprogrammings made during the first six months of the fiscal year by no later than May 1 of each year, and shall provide a final report of all reprogrammings for the previous fiscal year by no later than November 1 of each year.

(b) With regard to the Management of Lands and Resources account of the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Research, State and Private Forestry, and National Forest System accounts of the Forest Service, the reprogramming control level will be at the budget line item level (for example, land resources, wildlife and fisheries, and recreation management for BLM, and ecosystem planning, recreation use and wildlife and fish management for the National Forest System). A reprogramming will be triggered if these line items are proposed to be changed by $3,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less.

The BLM and Forest Service are to maintain all specific Congressional designations, in any amount, or to submit a reprogramming request if any such designation is proposed for a change, even if it falls below the reprogramming levels specified above.

With regard to the extended budget line items (EBLIS's) (for example, soil, water and air management, wildlife management, and wilderness management for BLM, and recreation management, wildlife habitat management, and timber sales management for the National Forest System), the BLM and Forest Service are to submit a series of reports to the Appropriations Committees, on the following schedule:

(1) A report due by November 1, or 30 days after the appropriations bill is enacted into law if enacted after October 1, reflecting Congressional action and showing any other revisions at the EBLI level since the budget was submitted the previous February. This will become the baseline for reporting throughout the year;

(2) A mid-year report of actual costs by EBLI as of March 31, with a projection for the remainder of the year, due no later than May 1;

(3) An update of actual costs by EBLI as of July 31, with updated year end projections if necessary, due no later than September 1;

(4) An end of the year report by EBLI, incorporated into the next fiscal year's baseline report, due by November 1.

4. *Quarterly reports.*—(a) All reprogrammings shall be reported to the Committee quarterly and shall include cumulative totals.

(b) Any significant shifts of funding among object classifications also should be reported to the Committee.

5. *Administrative Overhead Accounts.*—For all appropriations where costs of overhead administrative expenses are funded in part from "assessments" of various budget activities within an appro-

priation, the assessments shall be shown in justifications under the discussion of administrative expenses.

6. *Contingency Accounts.*—For all appropriations where assessments are made against various budget activities or allocations for contingencies, the Committee expects a full explanation, separate from the justifications. The explanation shall show the amount of the assessment, the activities assessed, and the purpose of the fund. The committee expects reports each year detailing the use of these funds. In no case shall such a fund be used to finance projects and activities disapproved or limited by Congress or to finance new permanent positions or to finance programs or activities that could be foreseen and included in the normal budget review process. Contingency funds shall not be used to initiate new programs.

7. *Declarations of taking.*—The Committee directs the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the Forest Service to seek Committee approval in advance of filing declarations of taking.

8. *Report language.*—Any limitation, directive, or earmarking contained in either the House or Senate report which is not contradicted by the other report nor specifically denied in the conference report shall be considered as having been approved by both Houses of Congress.

9. *Forest Service.*—The following procedures shall apply to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture:

(a) The Forest Service shall not change the boundaries of any region, abolish any region, move or close any regional office for research, State and private forestry, or National Forest System administration, without the consent of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and the House Committee on Agriculture, in compliance with these reprogramming procedures.

(b) The appropriation structure for the Forest Service shall not be altered without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

(c) Provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) and of 7 U.S.C. 147b shall apply to appropriations available to the Forest Service only to the extent that the proposed transfer is approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with these reprogramming procedures.

10. *Assessments.*—No assessments shall be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity, or project funded by the Interior Appropriations Act unless such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such committees, in compliance with these procedures.

11. *Land acquisitions.*—Lands shall not be acquired for more than the approved appraised value (as addressed in section 301(3) of Public Law 91–646) except for condemnations and declarations of taking, unless such acquisitions are submitted to the Committees on Appropriations for approval in compliance with these procedures.

12. *Land exchanges.*—Land exchanges shall not be consummated until the Committees on Appropriations have had a 30 day period in which to examine the proposed exchange.

Application of General Reductions

The level at which sequestration reductions shall be taken pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, if such reductions are required in fiscal year 1995, is defined by the Committee as follows:

As provided for by section 256(l)(2) of Public Law 99–177, as amended, and for the purpose of a Presidential Order issued pursuant to section 254 of said Act, the term "program, project, and activity" for items under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the House of Representatives and the Senate is defined as (1) any item specifically identified in tables or written material set forth in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, or accompanying committee reports or the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference; (2) any Government-owned or Government-operated facility; and (3) management units, such as national parks, national forests, fish hatcheries, wildlife refuges, research units, regional, state and other administrative units and the like, for which funds are provided in fiscal year 1995.

The Committee emphasizes that any item for which a specific dollar amount is mentioned in any accompanying report, including all increases over the budget estimate approved by the Committee, shall be subject to a percentage reduction no greater or less than the percentage reduction applied to all domestic discretionary accounts.

Land and Water Conservation Fund

Following is a comparison of the Land and Water Conservation Fund by agency. More specific information can be found in each agency's land acquisition account.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted fiscal year 1994	Estimated fiscal year 1995	Recommended	Changes from estimate
Assistance to States:				
Matching grants	24,750	24,750	26,250	+1,500
Administrative expenses	3,303	3,250	3,250	.....
Subtotal, assistance to States	28,053	28,000	29,500	+1,500
Federal programs:				
Bureau of Land Management	12,122	21,173	17,060	−4,113
Fish and Wildlife Service	82,655	86,162	62,300	−23,862
National Park Service	67,197	54,696	59,096	+4,400
Forest Service	64,250	64,241	62,131	−2,110
Subtotal, Federal programs	226,224	226,272	200,587	−25,685
Total L&WCF	254,277	254,272	230,087	−24,185

United States Department of Agriculture
Office of the Secretary
Office of Budget and Program Analysis
Washington, D.C. 20250

AG (NOT FS)

MAY 07 1987

SUBJECT: Reprogramming Requests
Chapter 14, Part II USDA Budget Manual

TO: Agency Budget Officers

Attached are revised copies of Chapter 14, Part II of the USDA Budget Manual. This Chapter establishes procedures for Reprogramming Requests. Please insert this copy in your manual and discard the previously issued Chapter 14.

Dennis Kaplan

DENNIS KAPLAN
Chief, Budget Control
and Analysis Division

Attachments

Chapter 14

REPROGRAMMING REQUESTS: GUIDANCE TO AGENCIES ON THE INTERCHANGE OF FUNDS BETWEEN PROGRAMS AND APPROPRIATIONS (EXCEPT FOREST SERVICE)

1 PURPOSE

This directive identifies the procedures that a USDA agency must follow to reprogram funds from one program to another. It addresses USDA's general reprogramming authority which allows the Department to reprogram funds between programs within a budget account. Also it addresses additional authority which allows the Secretary to transfer funds between accounts within the same agency.

2 DEFINITION OF REPROGRAMMING

There are three basic approaches to changing the amount of funds available for program activities without getting supplemental appropriations. Reprogramming is one of them. The other two, appropriation transfer and restructuring, are defined following the definition of reprogramming, to show how they differ from reprogramming.

a Reprogramming. This occurs when funds are shifted within an appropriation account for purposes other than those contemplated at the time of appropriation. There are also special authorities that may be invoked in emergencies which permit reprogramming of funds between appropriation accounts.

b Appropriation Transfer. Funds appropriated to one account are transferred to another account by the Congress on an annual or permanent basis. Transfers must be for authorized activities. Transfers cause a decrease in budget authority (BA) in the transferring account and an increase in BA in the receiving account.

c Restructuring. An action that involves using the funds as originally intended in the agency's congressional budget justification and the Explanatory Notes but reporting the funds differently from the form and detail in which the funds were proposed by the President and appropriated by Congress. Reorganizations often must be followed by restructuring when such changes involve two or more agencies. For example, the breakout of the Economic Research Service and the Statistical Reporting Service (currently named the National Agricultural Statistics Service), which were at one time part of the Economics and Statistics Service, required a restructuring.

3 BACKGROUND

A reprogramming of funds typically occurs when funds must be shifted from one program to another where both programs are funded by the same appropriation account.

In emergency situations, the Secretary may also exercise authority under 7 U.S.C. 2257 to transfer funds between appropriation accounts within the agency. This is more commonly known as the "Secretary's seven percent interchange authority". There are no specific criteria defining "emergency" in this context except that it must be an unexpected situation which was not foreseen at the time that the appropriation for the agency was enacted. Examples of an emergency include fire, water system failure, and outbreaks of insects, pests, or plant disease.

Certain less significant reprogrammings can be handled within the agency with notification to the Director, OBPA. However, actions meeting any of the criteria in Section 4 below, must be submitted to OBPA for review, approval, and transmittal to the appropriate House and Senate Appropriation Subcommittees. In this situation the agency must prepare a package explaining why the reprogramming is needed, exactly what it entails, letters to the appropriate Appropriation Subcommittees, etc. This material must be submitted to the Director, OBPA, who will coordinate Department level review of reprogramming proposals including review with policy officials, clearance with OMB, arrangement for signature by the Deputy Secretary or the Secretary and disposition of responses from the Subcommittees.

4 WHEN A REQUEST FOR REPROGRAMMING IS SUBMITTED

Requests for reprogramming of funds must be submitted by OBPA for review, clearance and distribution to the Appropriation Subcommittees, if they meet any of the following criteria:

a Required when a shift of funds from one program to another program equals 10 percent or $50,000, whichever is lower.

b Required for any shift of funds which will be of significant interest to the Appropriations Committees including any transaction affecting a program for which the Committees increased or reduced the appropriations request in the fiscal year of concern.

c Required if the purpose of the funding shift is to implement a new program not previously justified through the appropriations process.

d Required for any shift of funds made under the Secretary's interchange authority (7 U.S.C. 2257).

In any of the these circumstances, reprogramming letters signed by the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Agriculture are sent to the Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members of the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees which handle USDA appropriations. These letters are for the purpose of notification. If there is no response from the committees within 14 days, the Department will assume there is no objection and will proceed with the reprogramming. If objection is made by either or both Committees, the reprogramming is not completed until policy officials have reviewed the matter with the appropriate Senators and/or Congressmen. If after such review there is still disagreement, the Department must decide whether to proceed with the reprogramming. This is a policy decision not a legal decision.

The contents of the reprogramming request package to be submitted are described in Section 5 through 8 below.

OBPA must also be notified of all reprogrammings that do not meet these criteria. Such notifications shall include items 5a and 5c below and should reach OBPA no later than five work days after agency approval.

5 CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS REQUIRED TO MAKE A REQUEST FOR REPROGRAMMING

The reprogramming request packages submitted to OBPA must include the following:

a Transmittal memorandum from the Agency Head to the Director, OBPA (see Section 6 for content requirements);

b Letters to House and Senate Appropriation Subcommittees including required courtesy copies (cc's) (see Section 7 for content requirements); and

c Explanation of Program Revisions for enclosure with each letter (see Section 8 for content requirements).

6 CONTENTS OF THE TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDUM TO THE DIRECTOR, OBPA

An example transmittal memorandum from the Agency Head to the Director, OBPA and all necessary attachments are included in Appendix A on pages 14A-1 through 14A-3. The transmittal memorandum (example on Page 14A-1) must contain the items listed below:

a Agency and name of the programs affected;

b Dollar amount of the reprogramming request;

c Statement of agency needs and intentions for use of the money; and

d Enumeration of the materials attached to the transmittal.

7 CONTENTS OF LETTERS TO THE APPROPRIATE HOUSE AND SENATE SUBCOMMITTEES

An example of the letters and enclosures from the Secretary of Agriculture to the House and Senate Appropriation Subcommittees is included in Appendix A on pages 14A-2 and 14A-3. In addition, Appendix B provides a guide for addressing and sending cc's of these letters.

The letters must include:

a Addresses as shown in Appendix B,

b Name of the program agency,

c Dollar amount of the funding needs,

d Purpose and reason for the request,

e Statement of the benefits expected from the change,

f Statement of why funds are available from the affected programs,

g Appropriate cc's as shown in Appendix B, and

h Copy of the "Explanation of Program Revisions" as described in Section 8, below.

8 CONTENTS OF THE "EXPLANATION OF PROGRAM REVISIONS"

An example of an "Explanation of Program Revisions" is provided in Appendix A on page 14A-3. The "Explanation of Program Revisions" consists of two basic sections as follows:

a Summary of Program Revisions. In this section, the dollar amounts of the program changes are summarized. Increases will be identified for programs receiving reprogrammed funds and decreases will show for the program(s) from which the funds were shifted.

d Narrative Explanation of Program Revisions. For each increase identified in the Summary of Program Revisions, provide sufficient background information and justification to show why the increase in necessary. For each decrease, explain why the money is available at this time, e.g., it is being deferred intentionally; it could not be used; estimates of requirements were revised; etc.

9 INQUIRIES

Direct inquiries to the Chief of the Budget Control and Analysis Division (BCAD), 447-6176.

EXAMPLE TRANSMITTAL PACKAGE: MEMORANDUM FROM THE AGENCY HEAD TO THE DIRECTOR, OBPA

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Agricultural Engineering Service

SUBJECT: Reprogramming of Funds

TO: Stephen B. Dewhurst, Director
Office of Budget and Program Analysis

This is to inform you of a proposal to reprogram $5.5 million in FY 19CY from construction funds to the inspection program. This $5.5 million will be used to fund an unexpectedly large number of inspection requests we are receiving as a result of the Blake Dam accident and subsequent disclosure of structural and maintenance failures as its cause. This money is available because of an unexpected delay in construction on the Ohio Valley Research Center. The State so far has been unable to match federal funds and, until it is able to do so, the project will be idle. To date, approximately $5.5 million has been saved in operational and support costs.

---Signed----
Administrator

Attachments:

Letter to Honorable Quentin N. Burdick and enclosure
Letter to Honorable Thad Cochran and enclosure
Letter to Honorable Jamie L. Whitten and enclosure
Letter to Honorable Virginia Smith and enclosure

EXAMPLE OF TRANSMITTAL PACKAGE: LETTER TO HOUSE AND SENATE SUBCOMMITTEES

Honorable Quentin N. Burdick
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture,
Rural Development and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On May 25, 19CY, the Blake Dam in Fletcher, Montana, gave way. Total damage is not yet assessed but a federal investigation has established the basic cause to be structural. The investigative committee also has faulted the Agricultural Engineering Service (AES) for reducing the number of dam inspections over the past five years from five to the present two inspections annually.

As a direct result of our shrinking budget over the past five years, AES has had to curtail its inspection activities. Because of the recent Blake Dam accident, however, we have submitted proposed changes to our program plan for the next fiscal year. For the remainder of this fiscal year, we are planning to shift $5.5 million from our contruction to our inspection program and immediately increase dam inspections performed annually to five.

The $5.5 million is available because the State of Ohio has been unable to match federal funds for construction of the new Ohio Valley Research Center. Savings to date on related operational and support activities are $5.5 million. As this project continues to be postponed, its completion date is pushed into the next fiscal year. We will continue to keep you advised on the status of the Ohio Valley Research Center project.

We have enclosed explanations of these program changes and will be pleased to provide additional information as needed.

A similar letter is being sent to Senator Cochran, Congressman Whitten and Congresswoman Smith.

Sincerely,

Enclosure

EXAMPLE OF TRANSMITTAL PACKAGE: EXPLANATION OF PROGRAM REVISIONS

EXPLANATION OF PROGRAM REVISIONS

Agricultural Engineering Service

Summary of Program Revisions

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	Current Estimate	Proposed Program Revision	Revised Total Program
Inspection Services	$15,800	+$5,500	$ 21,300
Construction	75,000	-5,500	69,500
All Other	117,300	- -	117,300
TOTAL, AES	208,100	- -	208,100

1/ The current estimate should be the latest amount approved by the Congress including all previous reprogrammings.

Explanation of Program Revisions

Inspection Services (+$5,500,000)

Over the past five years, increasing budget constraints have made continuing this program at its previous level of five inspections annually impossible. Our present rate of two annual inspections has, over the last two years, appeared to be satisfactory, to both AES and the states. However, with the collaspe of the Blake Dam in Montana now directly attributed to structural defects, AES is under a great deal of public, as well as Congressional pressure to again perform five annual inspections. This $5.5 million reprogramming will enable us to do that during the remainder of this fiscal year.

Construction (-$5,500,000)

For this fiscal year, $25,000,000 was appropriated for the construction of the Ohio Valley Research Center. These funds were to be matched by the State of Ohio before ground could be broken. The State, however, due to unforeseen disaster flooding, has been unable to raise the money. The project, therefore, remains idle. For this reason, $5,500,000 has been saved to date and is available for reprogramming.

ADDRESSING INFORMATION FOR USE ON REPROGRAMMING LETTERS GOING TO HOUSE AND SENATE SUBCOMMITTEES ON APPROPRIATION
All USDA Agencies Except Forest Service

1. Honorable Quentin N. Burdick
Chairman, Subcommittee in Agriculture, Rural
Development and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

~~Last paragraph~~: A similar letter is being sent to Senator Cochran, Congressman Whitten and Congresswoman Smith.

Copies of this letter should go to Rocky Kuhn and Stephen B. Dewhurst.

2. Honorable Thad Cochran
Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural
Development and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Cochran:

~~Last paragraph~~: A similar letter to being sent to Senator Burdick and Congressman Whitten and Congresswoman Smith.

Copies of this letter should go to Irma Hanneman and Stephen B. Dewhurst.

3. Honorable Jamie L. Whitten
Chairman, Subcommittee on Rural
Development, Agriculture and
Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

~~Last paragraph~~: A similar letter is being sent to Congresswoman Smith and Senators Burdick and Cochran.

Copies of this letter should go to Robert B. Foster and Stephen B. Dewhurst.

4. Honorable Virginia Smith
Subcommittee on Rural Development
Agriculture and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congresswoman Smith:

~~Last paragraph~~: A similar letter is being sent to Congressman Whitten and Senators Burdick and Cochran.

A copy of this letter should go to Stephen Dewhurst.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

February 16, 1996

Honorable Robert C. Byrd
Ranking Democratic Member
Subcommittee on Interior
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20515-6023

Dear Robert:

I am writing to inform you of the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) intentions regarding the use of Forest Service (FS) funds in fiscal year (FY) 1996 for the AmeriCorps programs in the event that funding for AmeriCorps is continued and the FY 1996 Interior and Related Agencies appropriations bill (H.R. 1977), as presently adopted by the Conferees, is enacted. Section 312 of the bill prohibits the use of FS funds for AmeriCorps programs unless "appropriate reprogramming guidelines" are followed. Further, section 312 prohibits the use of such funds for AmeriCorps programs "if no funds are provided for the AmeriCorps program by the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (VA-HUD), and Independent Agencies' fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill."

In accordance with section 312 and in anticipation of continued funding for AmeriCorps, we are giving notice to the Congress of our intent to use $9.4 million from various National Forest System (NFS) and related funds and State and Private Forestry (S&PF) funds to carry out authorized FS work projects through the AmeriCorps national service program in FY 1996.

The FS ran a Public Lands Corps in FY 1995 through which 297 AmeriCorps members on national forest land in eight States performed rehabilitation and watershed protection work, reforested fire-damaged lands, and constructed and maintained trails for hiking and horseback riding. Additionally, the members planted cuttings for riparian and wildlife restorations, maintained and rehabilitated campgrounds, made campgrounds accessible for people with disabilities, completed timber stand improvements, restored historic sites, removed and installed fences, improved wildlife habitats, and hung erosion control netting on roads.

The FS also ran a Rural Development Team in FY 1995 through which 86 AmeriCorps members in 16 States worked on projects related to areas such as running water and indoor plumbing, emergency response and prevention, and relocation of residents of flood plains. They also worked on alternative uses of natural resources, environmental education facilities, tourism promotion, water quality protection, recycling promotion, and cultural resource preservation.

FS AmeriCorps members are getting things done and providing vital services, while strengthening communities, expanding educational opportunities, and encouraging personal responsibility.

Under current law, Federal agencies may receive limited grants from the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), which is funded by the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for FY 1995, although much of the CNCS appropriations is available not for FY 1995, but for the period September 1, 1995, through August 31, 1996. The final size of the appropriations for CNCS in the FY 1995 Appropriations Act was determined when the President signed the rescissions bill, Public Law Number 104-19. Thus, CNCS has determined that it does indeed have enough funding from the FY 1995 Appropriations Act to provide a grant to the Forest Service to match the FS's FY 1996 funding of AmeriCorps.

The FS is planning a $9.4 million AmeriCorps program for FY 1996 that provides for enrolling 470 members in 23 states. This would include 434 members in the Public Lands Corps through the NFS program and 36 members in the Rural Development Team through the S&PF program.

The FS 1996 AmeriCorps program consists of two parts. The first is a $8.9 million program to be funded with NFS and related funds. While additional funding was not provided in FY 1995 and is not expected in 1996, the FS will redirect work to the AmeriCorps program which would have been accomplished by other means. The second part is a $500,000 Rural Development Team program to be funded with S&PF funds. (See enclosure for detailed source of funds.)

The FS is using AmeriCorps as a delivery mechanism to perform authorized functions of the FS. Since AmeriCorps members perform far more work per dollar than the same work performed through routine means, the FS is able to complete a greater volume of work. After the first 6 months of operation, USDA FS AmeriCorps members performed at least $1.51 worth of service for each $1 spent on the program.

By increasing funding from non-FS partners, reducing overhead costs, and transferring AmeriCorps slots to the project type in which members earn a lower living stipend, a 1996 FS AmeriCorps program can fund more AmeriCorps members for the same level of spending.

Similar letters are being sent to Congressmen Regula and Yates and Senator Gorton.

I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DAN GLICKMAN
Secretary

Enclosure

FY 1996 FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROGRAM

The following reprogramming of FY 1996 Forest Service funds to the AmeriCorps program is requested:

	Thousands $
National Forest System and Related Funds:	
Recreation Management (NFRM)	4,076
Wilderness Management (NFWM)	419
Wildlife Habitat Management (NFWL)	784
Inland Fish Habitat Management (NFIF)	273
Anadromous Fish Habitat Management (NFAF)	387
Threatened and Endangered Sensitive Species Habitat Management (NFTE)	663
Grazing Management (NFRG)	41
Rangeland Vegetation Management (NFRV)	65
Forestland Vegetation Management (NFFV)	712
Watershed Improvement (NFSI)	71
Land Line Location (NFLL)	24
Road Maintenance (NFRD)	63
Forest Trail Construction (CNTR)	583
Brush Disposal (BDBD)	129
Cooperative Work (CWKV)	604
Subtotal	$ 8,894
Rural Development Team Program:	
Economic Action (SPEP)	500
Total, AmeriCorps Program	**$ 9,394**

Under the FY 1996 reprogramming for AmeriCorps, trail construction funds would still be used only to build trails; fish habitat management funds would only be used to manage fish habitat; recreation management funds only be used on recreation projects; watershed improvement funds would only be used on watershed work; etc. The only change would be that AmeriCorps members would perform the work rather than using other methods or allowing for a work backlog.

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

United States Department of Agriculture | Forest Service | Washington Office | 14th & Independence SW
P.O. Box 96090
Washington, DC 20090-6090

DECISION MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY

THROUGH: James R. Lyons
Under Secretary, NRE

FROM: Jack Ward Thomas
Chief

MAY 0 2 1996

SUBJECT: Reprogramming for the AmeriCorps National Service Program

ISSUE:

The Forest Service (FS) is proposing to reprogram $4.88 million in National Forest System (NFS) and related funds and $0.36 million in State and Private Forestry (S&PF) funds to carry out an AmeriCorps National Service program in fiscal year (FY) 1996.

The FS originally proposed to reprogram $9.4 million for a 1996 AmeriCorps program. The current proposal of $5.2 million is based on our field units' assessment of their ability to utilize AmeriCorps members during the remaining field season.

BACKGROUND:

Section 312 of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-134), prohibits the use of such funds for AmeriCorps programs unless the relevant agencies of the Department of the Interior and/or Agriculture follows "appropriate reprogramming guidelines." Further, section 312 prohibits the use of such funds for AmeriCorps programs "if no funds are provided for the AmeriCorps program by the Department of Veteran Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (VA-HUD), and Independent Agencies' FY 1996 appropriations bill." Public Law 104-134 does provide funding for AmeriCorps under VA-HUD.

AmeriCorps is authorized by the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82). The Act further establishes a "Public Lands Corps" in the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior.

The FS ran a Public Lands Corps in FY 1995 through which 297 AmeriCorps members on national forest land in eight states performed rehabilitation and watershed protection work, reforested fire-damaged lands, constructed and maintained trails for hiking and horseback riding, planted cuttings for riparian and wildlife restorations, maintained and rehabilitated campgrounds, made campgrounds accessible for people with disabilities, completed timber stand improvements, restored historic sites, removed and installed fences, improved wildlife habitats, and hung erosion control netting on roads.

Printed on Recycled Paper
FS-6200-28b (12/93)

The FS also ran a Rural Development Team in FY 1995 through which 86 AmeriCorps members in 16 States worked on projects related to areas such as running water and indoor plumbing, emergency response and prevention, alternative uses of natural resources, environmental education facilities, tourism promotion, water quality protection, recycling promotion, cultural resource preservation, and relocation of residents of flood plains.

The FS is proposing to carry out a program very similar to the 1995 program, but at a reduced level. The program level is based on our field units' assessment of their ability to utilize AmeriCorps members during the remaining field season. The FS is using AmeriCorps as a delivery mechanism to perform work. While additional funding was not provided in FY 1995 and is not expected in 1996, the FS will redirect work to the AmeriCorps program which would have been accomplished by other means.

The FS is planning a $5.2 million AmeriCorps program for FY 1996 that provides for enrolling 410 members. This would include 385 members in the Public Lands Corps through the NFS program and 25 members in the Rural Development Team through the S&PF program. Most members would be enrolled in part-time slots.

The following reprogramming of FY 1996 Forest Service funds to the AmeriCorps program is requested:

	Thousands $
National Forest System and Related Funds:	
Recreation Management	2,486
Wilderness Management	97
Wildlife Habitat Management	435
Inland Fish Habitat Management	179
Anadromous Fish Habitat Management	127
Threatened and Endangered Sensitive Species Habitat Management	251
Grazing Management	46
Rangeland Vegetation Management	70
Timber Sales Administration	16
Forestland Vegetation Management	420
Watershed Improvement	81
Real Estate Management	16
Land Line Location	8
Road Maintenance	63
Facility Maintenance	66
Forest Trail Construction	174
Brush Disposal	15
Cooperative Work-KV	338
Subtotal	4,888
Rural Development Team Program:	
Economic Action	355
Total, AmeriCorps Program	5,243

OPTIONS:

1. Approve and forward the reprogramming proposal as submitted.
2. Modify or adjust the reprogramming proposal and submit accordingly.
3. Disapprove the reprogramming proposal in total.

RECOMMENDATION:

Option 1 is recommended.

DECISION BY THE SECRETARY

Approve _____ Date _____

Disapprove _____

Discuss with me _____

Enclosures

Reviewed by: _____

FY 1996 AMERICORPS PROGRAM

	1996 Pres Budget			June 1 Startup		
	FT	PT		FT	PT	
NFS	Slots		Funding	Slots		Funding
Region 1	10	20	207.7	0	0	0.0
Region 2	2	20	207.7	0	0	0.0
Region 4	0	40	487.3	0	40	414.0
Greater Yellowstone	12	80	902.7	0	40	414.0
Region 3						
NF in Arizona	20	0	533.5	0	20	266.0
Region 4						
Ashley	10	10	266.8	0	14	180.0
Region 5						
Six Rivers	37	0	638.8	0	27	320.0
Sequoia	18	0	280.0	0	20	280.0
San Bernardino	105	0	1,512.0	0	105	1,106.0
TOTAL	160	0	2,430.8	0	152	1,706.0
Region 6						
Olympic	35	0	772.1	0	0	0.0
Rogue River	35	0	756.8	0	22	250.0
Two Mountain (NWSA)	34	0	371.0	34	0	371.0
TOTAL	104	0	1,899.9	34	22	621.0
Region 8						
Daniel Boone	20	0	366.0	0	7	121.0
Chattahhoochee-Oconee	25	0	540.6	0	8	178.0
Greater Jackson MS	20	0	381.4	0	7	126.0
NF in North Carolina	30	0	631.9	0	10	209.0
TOTAL	95	0	1,919.9	0	32	634.0
Region 9						
Green Mountain	20	0	390.0	0	35	390.0
White Mountain	0	36	427.2	0	36	427.2
WO Administration	0	0	129.2	0	0	129.2
Total NFS	**421**	**126**	**8,900.0**	**34**	**351**	**4,767.4**
STATE & PRIVATE						
Northeastern Area						
West Virginia	4	0	56.7	4	0	56.7
Minnesota	7	0	99.2	7	0	99.2
4-Corners						
R2 (CO)	3	0	30.0	0	2	30.0
R3 (AZ, NM)	2	0	20.0	2	0	20.0
R4 (UT)	3	0	30.0	3	0	30.0
Total	8	0	80.0	5	2	80.0
Southern	17	0	264.1	0	7	110.9
Total, S&PF	**36**	**0**	**500.0**	**16**	**9**	**346.8**
USDA Admin						128.4
Total FS	**457**	**126**	**9,400.0**	**50**	**360**	**5,242.6**

Honorable Sidney R. Yates
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
2109 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-6023

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Department of Agriculture's (USDA) proposes to reprogram Forest Service (FS) funds in fiscal year (FY) 1996 for the AmeriCorps programs. Section 312 of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-134), prohibits the use of such funds for AmeriCorps programs unless the relevant agencies of the Department of the Interior and/or Agriculture follows "appropriate reprogramming guidelines." Further, section 312 prohibits the use of such funds for AmeriCorps programs "if no funds are provided for the AmeriCorps program by the Department of Veteran Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (VA-HUD), and Independent Agencies' FY 1996 appropriations bill." Public Law 104-134 does provide funding for AmeriCorps under VA-HUD.

In accordance with section 312, we are proposing to reprogram $5.42 million from various National Forest System (NFS) and related funds and State and Private Forestry (S&PF) funds to carry out authorized FS work projects through the AmeriCorps national service program in FY 1996.

The FS ran a Public Lands Corps in FY 1995 through which 297 AmeriCorps members on national forest land in eight states performed rehabilitation and watershed protection work, reforested fire-damaged lands, constructed and maintained trails for hiking and horseback riding, planted cuttings for riparian and wildlife restorations, maintained and rehabilitated campgrounds, made campgrounds accessible for people with disabilities, completed timber stand improvements, restored historic sites, removed and installed fences, improved wildlife habitats, and hung erosion control netting on roads.

The FS also ran a Rural Development Team in FY 1995 through which 86 AmeriCorps members in 16 States worked on projects related to areas such as running water and indoor plumbing, emergency response and prevention, alternative uses of natural resources, environmental education facilities, tourism promotion, water quality protection, recycling promotion, cultural resource preservation, and relocation of residents of flood plains.

FS AmeriCorps members are getting things done and providing vital services, while strengthening communities, expanding educational opportunities, and encouraging personal responsibility.

The FS is proposing to carry out a program very similar to the 1995 program, but at a reduced level. The program level is based upon field units' assessment of their ability to utilize AmeriCorps members during the remaining

DRAFT

field season. The FS is using AmeriCorps as a delivery mechanism to perform work. While additional funding was not provided in FY 1996, the FS will re-direct work to the AmeriCorps program which would have been accomplished by other means. or would otherwise Not be Performed.

The FS is planning a $5.2 million AmeriCorps program for FY 1996 that provides for enrolling 410 members. This would include 385 members in the Public Lands Corps through the NFS program and 25 members in the Rural Development Team through the State and Private Forestry program. Most members would be enrolled in part-time slots. (See enclosure for detailed source of funds.)

I am also enclosing responses to questions asked by Congressman Regula to assist in the review of the reprogramming request.

This letter is being submitted in accordance with the arrangements and understanding that the Department has with the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations with respect to reprogramming procedures.

Similar letters are being sent to Senators Byrd and Gorton, and Congressmen Regula.

I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dan Glickman
Secretary

DRAFT

FY 1996 FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROGRAM

The following reprogramming of FY 1996 Forest Service funds to the AmeriCorps program is requested:

	Thousands $
National Forest System and Related Funds:	
Recreation Management	2,486
Wilderness Management	97
Wildlife Habitat Management	435
Inland Fish Habitat Management	179
Anadromous Fish Habitat Management	127
Threatened and Endangered Sensitive Species Habitat Management	251
Grazing Management	46
Rangeland Vegetation Management	70
Timber Sales Administration	16
Forestland Vegetation Management	420
Watershed Improvement	81
Real Estate Management	16
Land Line Location	8
Road Maintenance	63
Facility Maintenance	66
Forest Trail Construction	174
Brush Disposal	15
Cooperative Work-KV	338
Subtotal	4,888
State and Private Forestry Funds:	
Economic Action	355
Total, AmeriCorps Program	**5,243**

DRAFT

1996 AmeriCorp Program

Question: What work will be done by AmeriCorps?

Answer: While the delay in funding has hampered our ability to plan the final details of what service each AmeriCorps project will provide this year, the service is likely to be similar to that provided in FY 1995.

Members funded through the National Forest System performed the following service and accomplishments:

- Constructed, maintained, and improved 682 miles of trail.
- Achieved 2,569 acres of wildlife habitat improvement; built 133 structures to shelter or protect wildlife; built 296 nesting boxes; and constructed a threatened and endangered plant greenhouse.
- Improved 668 acres of timber stand.
- Built or completely rehabilitated 446 campground sites.
- Reforested 638 acres of land.
- Prepared 42 campsites for accessibility to people with disabilities.
- Improved 760 acres of fisheries habitat.
- Constructed 86 miles of new fence.
- Maintained 18 miles of vehicle trails to keep them free of obstructive growth and slides.
- Improved watershed damaged by fire by cutting and planting 92,500 willows in riparian areas.
- Built 11 flood fences to prevent future flooding.
- Improved Forest Service road and safety conditions--by "day lighting" 50 curves.
- Released 775,000 salmon fry in a fish stocking operation.
- Constructed a major visitor information center.
- Provided conservation education to 88,373 students, grades K-12.

DRAFT

Members funded through State and Private Forestry performed the following service and accomplishments:

Arkansas - Members worked to promote alternative energy sources which are environmentally safe, to select appropriate sites for installation of dry fire hydrants, to facilitate implementation and coordination of demonstration projects for five poultry litter spreaders. They also helped to promote alternative wood products and value-added manufacturing technologies, resulting in local people obtaining job training and higher paying employment while maintaining the quality of the rural environment. Tons of industrial wood waste is now being processed into energy in the form of wood pellets. The Members also helped the Community of Holly Grove facilitate the FEMA buy out of homes in the 100-year flood plain.

Georgia - A member created of Recreation Opportunity Guides for the Forests; assist in developing series of videos entitled "America's Great Outdoors, working with the Environmental Education Coordinator to present environmental education programs and fire prevention programs, worked with the Wilderness Ranger on the Brasstown Ranger District doing trail maintenance and doing presentations to local groups on wilderness management. The Recreation opportunity Guides that the Member produced will also be of value to thousands of Forest visitors expected to visit the Forest during the 1996 Olympics.

Kentucky - A Member worked with the McCreary County Fiscal Court, primarily with the County Road Supervisory, to take help create a (911) emergency response system and to start a road inventory and management system for the county.

Louisiana - One Member assisted grant development for a successful application to use timber bridge technology and materials for recreation tourism project in Lake Providence, LA. He continues to assist Humphreys County, MS in their timber bridge construction efforts. Two members assisted in the first stage of the Shiitake Mushroom forestry-related project.

Mississippi - One Member helped develop a recycling program in Leflore County. One Member organized construction of an outdoor classroom and implemented a plan to improve science test scores by 25 percent. A Member worked to start a community recreation and education program.

North Carolina - One Member developed a 5-year Master Plan for the development of a Parks and Recreation Department on the Cherokee Reservation. In addition, he established a Mountain Bike Trail on the Qualla Boundary for public use and special biking events. Another Member assisted in the identification and renovation of parks and other recreation facilities which did not comply with ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements.

South Carolina - Two Members worked a dry fire hydrant project to improve rural fire protection, lower fire insurance rates, reduce losses from fire, and stimulate rural development. A member worked to create a nature trail at an elementary school. One Member provided technical assistance in solid waste management and recycling to communities in Claiborne, Grainger, Hancock, Hawkins, and Union Counties.

Tennessee - One Member assisted the Shady Valley Ruritan Club (non-profit) in organizing native cranberry restoration Action plan. The purpose of the cranberry restoration project is to stimulate economic development through tourism and educate the public about the uniqueness of the native cranberry and the Shady Valley community. One Member sponsored household hazardous waste collections held in 6 counties in July with participation increasing by 23%.

DRAFT

Virginia - A Member researched and wrote a Tree Identification Teachers manual and completed tree identification plaques for the Marion Riverwalk. Another Member completed timber bridge design for 2 species of lumber, 3 lumber grades for each species, and 6 different bridge spans for each species and lumber grade. He also developed and received funding for designing and constructing 2 nail-laminated pedestrian timber bridges in the towns of Teasel and Marion. They also contacted over 100 volunteers and municipal fire departments pertaining to interest in installing dry fire hydrants.

Minnesota - Members completed major analysis of the current situation in the development of hybrid poplar as an alternative crop. Members also completed analysis and documentation of a survey of primary and secondary forest products manufacturers to determine barriers they face in engaging in more value-added production.

West Virginia - AmeriCorps Members have helped implement Hayfield-McCoy Trail System by identifying trail heads, as well as conducting inventories of service providers such as gas stations, motels, and restaurants. AmeriCorps Members also completed field work and analysis of current amounts of residues left in the forests after logging has been completed. This survey, covering the central counties of West Virginia has been used as a template for other areas of West Virginia and surrounding states. In West Virginia, probably the most meaningful project was the Braxton County project; development a trail system for environmental education. The project included clearing and constructing interpretive nature trails, building a large wooden foot bridge over a river, hanging bird and bat boxes, and identifying and labeling plants and trees along the way.

Colorado - Members completed draft of the San Juan Skyway Corridor Management Plan, completed conceptual master plan for a Petting Zoo, completed conceptual plan for Mangos Watchable Wildlife Wetland Park, developed GIS base map of political boundaries and wildlife corridors on the San Juan Skyway, initiated Ponderosa Pine Partnership, which allowed a timber contract to bought and delivered to Montezuma County (first time in history this has occurred), and completed the Mangos Riverwalk, which received Governor Roamer's Smart Growth and Development Award for 1995.

Utah - Members completed a site inventory of 23 sites for inclusion in the Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway, completed signing project for Scenic Byways project in San Juan County, completed Urban Forestry project in Moab and in Huntington, and completed work with College of Eastern Utah Prehistoric Museum on sorting and cataloging artifacts collected in 1987.

New Mexico - A Member worked with the non-profit Castile Arts and Crafts Guild to find work for people who were under-employed because of the closure of a lumber mill. AmeriCorps provided technical assistance to develop a plan for the second year of operation of the Sangria De Crista Wood Workers. Working the Carson National Forest engineer, AmeriCorps helped the people of the village of Velocities figure out how to improve their situation of a contaminated and insufficient water supply. AmeriCorps worked with the non-profit organization Gannets Del Vale and La Madeira Cooperative to develop a long range plan for economic development in the village of Velocities, using forest products and locally produced arts and crafts. In addition, because of the efforts of AmeriCorps, the 2,000 residents of the village of El Rico is one year closer to having safe drinking water. In Coyote, AmeriCorps is assisting the Volunteer Fire Department in locating a building the house the fire engine and to serve as a fire house. Trees in Taos County: AmeriCorps also assisted in the development of a group who will provide a long range plan for tree planting in Taos County.

DRAFT

Arizona - Members assisted distressed Arizona communities to retain or expand businesses. AmeriCorps members implemented the Econ DB, an economic data base profile in 8 communities. Area Developers as well as the Arizona Department of Commerce's National Marketing Team will use the Econ DB. Public and private enterprises alike consider the Econ DB beneficial in attracting, developing and retaining businesses. Members also assisted multi-community action teams to have the Four Corners Heritage Council adopt the "Trail of Many Tracks" into the Four Corners Heritage Trail System. The Trail of Many Tracks is a heritage auto-touring route covering approximately 260 miles located in north central Arizona. The touring route passes through all communities adjacent to the Apache Sitgraves National Forest.

Oregon - The University of Oregon's Learn and Serve AmeriCorps Members are working and living in fourteen rural communities, five of which are USDA Forest Service supported. These participants are providing assistance in the areas of 1) Economic Development; 2) Environmental Preservation, Restoration, and Education; 3) Community Empowerment and Development.

Question: Does the AmeriCorps staff have the required professional experience to do the work?

Answer: All AmeriCorps members receive extensive technical training before they start their service and ongoing professional supervision during their service.

Question: Who has done this type of work in the past? If contracts were used, why not continue to use competitive bids and get professional quality work with appropriate oversight?

By law AmeriCorps Members can not displace existing employees or duplicate existing work. AmeriCorp provides a way to accomplish needed work and also meet a social objective of helped young people obtain a higher education.

The benefits of using AmeriCorps members to perform work are not limited to just the work (hours or volume) performed by the members themselves. Because of the nature of the AmeriCorps program and its legislation, projects utilizing AmeriCorps members can form partnerships with other government and non-government entities, wherein these entities can provide money, tools, supplies, volunteers and other support that could not and is not provided when other means such as private contractors are used to perform the work.

Question: Are the AmeriCorps centers appropriately located so the priority projects are tackled for each of the main program areas listed?

Answer: All Forest Service projects, developed at the ground level, are selected after an intense internal competition and then a highly competitive external competition run by the Corporation for National Service. The projects are designed to contribute to the planned program accomplishments of each unit.

DRAFT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

To: Jeff Shockley, Office of Congressman Lewis 225-6498

From: Joel Berg, Director of National Service, USDA

11 PAGES, including this cover

As we discussed last week, now that we have an Interior Appropriations Bill, we hope we can reach a rapid agreement with Congress on starting the second year of the Forest Service AmeriCorps program, including our large and successful program on the San Bernadino National Forest. We are working on a revised reprogramming letter, but I hope we can reach an agreement to proceed even before the letter is sent.

For your information, attached are three relevant documents. Document #1 is Secretary Glickman's original reprogramming letter. Document #2 is Congressman Regula's response. Document #3 are draft responses to some of the questions raised by the Regula letter.

This week, I will be visiting existing, non-Forest Service, USDA AmeriCorps sites throughout California, including a NRCS-sponsored site in Redlands. I will attempt to meet with your district office staff while I am there.

If you have any questions, please contact Liz Jones on my staff at 690-3507. I thank you in advance for your help.

****
*** ACTIVITY REPORT ***
****

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO.	3373
CONNECTION TEL	97204614
CONNECTION ID	USDA NAT SER OFF
START TIME	05/06 13:00
USAGE TIME	11'10
PAGES	12
RESULT	OK

Patti Deutsche
Senator Burns
Fax 202-224-8594
Ph 224-8702

06 (Reports

Hill Complaint - Katrina

97 Funding

Program

To: Jeff Shockey, Office of Congressman Lewis

From: Joel Berg, Director of National Service, USDA

11 PAGES, including this cover

As we discussed last week, now that we have an Interior Appropriations Bill, we hope we can reach a rapid agreement with Congress on starting the second year of the Forest Service AmeriCorps program, including our large and successful program on the San Bernadino National Forest. We are working on a revised reprogramming letter, but I hope we can reach an agreement to proceed even before the letter is sent.

For your information, attached are three relevant documents. Document #1 is Secretary Glickman's original reprogramming letter. Document #2 is Congressman Regula's response. Document #3 are draft responses to some of the questions raised by the Regula letter.

This week, I will be visiting existing, non-Forest Service, USDA AmeriCorps sites throughout California, including a NRCS-sponsored site in Redlands. I will attempt to meet with your district office staff while I am there.

If you have any questions, please contact Liz Jones on my staff at 690-3507. I thank you in advance for your help.

ATTACHMENT #1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

February 16, 1996

Honorable Ralph Regula
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
B-308 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-6023

Dear Ralph:

I am writing to inform you of the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) intentions regarding the use of Forest Service (FS) funds in fiscal year (FY) 1996 for the AmeriCorps programs in the event that funding for AmeriCorps is continued and the FY 1996 Interior and Related Agencies appropriations bill (H.R. 1977), as presently adopted by the Conferees, is enacted. Section 312 of the bill prohibits the use of FS funds for AmeriCorps programs unless "appropriate reprogramming guidelines" are followed. Further, section 312 prohibits the use of such funds for AmeriCorps programs "if no funds are provided for the AmeriCorps program by the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (VA-HUD), and Independent Agencies' fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill."

In accordance with section 312 and in anticipation of continued funding for AmeriCorps, we are giving notice to the Congress of our intent to use $9.4 million from various National Forest System (NFS) and related funds and State and Private Forestry (S&PF) funds to carry out authorized FS work projects through the AmeriCorps national service program in FY 1996.

The FS ran a Public Lands Corps in FY 1995 through which 297 AmeriCorps members on national forest land in eight States performed rehabilitation and watershed protection work, reforested fire-damaged lands, and constructed and maintained trails for hiking and horseback riding. Additionally, the members planted cuttings for riparian and wildlife restorations, maintained and rehabilitated campgrounds, made campgrounds accessible for people with disabilities, completed timber stand improvements, restored historic sites, removed and installed fences, improved wildlife habitats, and hung erosion control netting on roads.

The FS also ran a Rural Development Team in FY 1995 through which 86 AmeriCorps members in 16 States worked on projects related to areas such as running water and indoor plumbing, emergency response and prevention, and relocation of residents of flood plains. They also worked on alternative uses of natural resources, environmental education facilities, tourism promotion, water quality protection, recycling promotion, and cultural resource preservation.

FS AmeriCorps members are getting things done and providing vital services, while strengthening communities, expanding educational opportunities, and encouraging personal responsibility.

Under current law, Federal agencies may receive limited grants from the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), which is funded by the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for FY 1995, although much of the CNCS appropriations is available not for FY 1995, but for the period September 1, 1995, through August 31, 1996. The final size of the appropriations for CNCS in the FY 1995 Appropriations Act was determined when the President signed the rescissions bill, Public Law Number 104-19. Thus, CNCS has determined that it does indeed have enough funding from the FY 1995 Appropriations Act to provide a grant to the Forest Service to match the FS's FY 1996 funding of AmeriCorps.

The FS is planning a $9.4 million AmeriCorps program for FY 1996 that provides for enrolling 470 members in 23 states. This would include 434 members in the Public Lands Corps through the NFS program and 36 members in the Rural Development Team through the S&PF program.

The FS 1996 AmeriCorps program consists of two parts. The first is a $8.9 million program to be funded with NFS and related funds. While additional funding was not provided in FY 1995 and is not expected in 1996, the FS will redirect work to the AmeriCorps program which would have been accomplished by other means. The second part is a $500,000 Rural Development Team program to be funded with S&PF funds. (See enclosure for detailed source of funds.)

The FS is using AmeriCorps as a delivery mechanism to perform authorized functions of the FS. Since AmeriCorps members perform far more work per dollar than the same work performed through routine means, the FS is able to complete a greater volume of work. After the first 6 months of operation, USDA FS AmeriCorps members performed at least $1.51 worth of service for each $1 spent on the program.

By increasing funding from non-FS partners, reducing overhead costs, and transferring AmeriCorps slots to the project type in which members earn a lower living stipend, a 1996 FS AmeriCorps program can fund more AmeriCorps members for the same level of spending.

Similar letters are being sent to Congressman Yates and Senators Byrd and Gorton.

I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DAN GLICKMAN
Secretary

Enclosure

FY 1996 FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROGRAM

The following reprogramming of FY 1996 Forest Service funds to the AmeriCorps program is requested:

	Thousands $
National Forest System and Related Funds:	
Recreation Management (NFRM)	4,076
Wilderness Management (NFWM)	419
Wildlife Habitat Management (NFWL)	784
Inland Fish Habitat Management (NFIF)	273
Anadromous Fish Habitat Management (NFAF)	387
Threatened and Endangered Sensitive Species Habitat Management (NFTE)	663
Grazing Management (NFRG)	41
Rangeland Vegetation Management (NFRV)	65
Forestland Vegetation Management (NFFV)	712
Watershed Improvement (NFSI)	71
Land Line Location (NFLL)	24
Road Maintenance (NFRD)	63
Forest Trail Construction (CNTR)	583
Brush Disposal (BDBD)	129
Cooperative Work (CWKV)	604
Subtotal	$ 8,894
Rural Development Team Program:	
Economic Action (SPEP)	500
Total, AmeriCorps Program	**$ 9,394**

Under the FY 1996 reprogramming for AmeriCorps, trail construction funds would still be used only to build trails; fish habitat management funds would only be used to manage fish habitat; recreation management funds only be used on recreation projects; watershed improvement funds would only be used on watershed work; etc. The only change would be that AmeriCorps members would perform the work rather than using other methods or allowing for a work backlog.

BOB[illegible]INGSTON, LOUISIANA, CHAIRMAN
JOSEPH M. McDADE, PENNSYLVANIA
JOHN T. MYERS, INDIANA
C.W. BILL YOUNG, FLORIDA
RALPH REGULA, OHIO
JERRY LEWIS, CALIFORNIA
JOHN EDWARD PORTER, ILLINOIS
HAROLD ROGERS, KENTUCKY
JOE SKEEN, NEW MEXICO
[illegible] R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
[illegible] LAY, TEXAS
[illegible]DE, ARIZONA
JIM F. VUCANOVICH, NEVADA
[illegible] LIGHTFOOT, IOWA
RON PACKARD, CALIFORNIA
SONNY CALLAHAN, ALABAMA
JAMES T. WALSH, NEW YORK
CHARLES H. TAYLOR, NORTH CAROLINA
DAVID L. HOBSON, OHIO
ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR., OKLAHOMA
HENRY BONILLA, TEXAS
JOE KNOLLENBERG, MICHIGAN
DAN MILLER, FLORIDA
JAY DICKEY, ARKANSAS
JACK KINGSTON, GEORGIA
FRANK RIGGS, CALIFORNIA
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, NEW JERSEY
ROGER F. WICKER, MISSISSIPPI
MICHAEL P. FORBES, NEW YORK
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR., WASHINGTON
JIM BUNN, OREGON
MARK W. NEUMANN, WISCONSIN

ATTACHMENT #2

Congre[illegible]

House of Representatives
Committee on Appropriations
Washington, DC 20515-6015

DAVID R. OBEY, WISCONSIN
[illegible]NEY R. YATES, ILLINOIS
LOUIS STOKES, OHIO
[illegible]M BEVILL, ALABAMA
JOHN P. MURTHA, PENNSYLVANIA
[illegible]ARLES WILSON, TEXAS
[illegible]OMAN D. DICKS, WASHINGTON
MARTIN OLAV SABO, MINNESOTA
JULIAN C. DIXON, CALIFORNIA
VIC FAZIO, CALIFORNIA
W.G. (BILL) HEFNER, NORTH CAROLINA
STENY H. HOYER, MARYLAND
RICHARD J. DURBIN, ILLINOIS
RONALD D. COLEMAN, TEXAS
ALAN B. MOLLOHAN, WEST VIRGINIA
JIM CHAPMAN, TEXAS
MARCY KAPTUR, OHIO
DAVID E. SKAGGS, COLORADO
NANCY PELOSI, CALIFORNIA
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, INDIANA
THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA, PENNSYLVANIA
ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES, CALIFORNIA
NITA M. LOWEY, NEW YORK
RAY THORNTON, ARKANSAS

CLERK AND STAFF DIRECTOR
JAMES W. DYER

TELEPHONE
(202) 225-2771

March 6, 1996

Honorable Dan Glickman
Secretary
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This letter is in response to your letter of February 16, 1996 regarding your intentions to use $9.4 million, primarily from National Forest System (NFS) accounts, to carry out Forest Service work projects through the AmeriCorps national service program in FY 1996. As you state, funding for AmeriCorps is ~~contingent on action in both the VA-HUD~~ and Interior ~~appropriations bills.~~ As it is premature to make this request, we are not willing to approve a ~~prospective reprogramming request.~~

We will be happy to consider a reprogramming request at the appropriate time, following bill passage. I am, however, concerned that you may be intending to use NFS project funds to support the AmeriCorps program.

To assist a subsequent reprogramming request, please ask the Forest Service to answer some questions regarding the use of NFS and State and Private Forestry funds for AmeriCorps:

1. What work will be done by the Americorps?
2. Does the AmeriCorps staff have the required professional expertise to do the work?
3. Who has done this type of work in the past? If contracts were used, why not continue to use competitive bids and get professional quality work with appropriate oversight?
4. Are the AmeriCorps centers appropriately located so that the priority projects are tackled for each of the many programs listed?

It is appropriate for you to seek reprogramming authority before spending NFS and State and Private Forestry funds on the AmeriCorps program. Rather than "giving notice to the Congress of our intent to use $9.4 million..." and "writing to inform you of the USDA intentions regarding the use of Forest Service funds in FY 1996 for AmeriCorps programs ...", you should request reprogramming at the appropriate time, following the published guidelines. We want to avoid another occurrence where the Forest Service expends funds on the AmeriCorps program before receiving reprogramming authority from the Committee on Appropriations. We look forward to a continued collaborative relationship between the USDA and the Appropriations Committee so that reprogramming requests can be handled in a timely fashion.

Sincerely,

Ralph Regula
Chairman
Subcommittee on Interior
and Related Agencies

Attachment #3

DRAFT RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY CONGRESSMAN REGULA

Question 1: What work will be done by AmeriCorps?

While the delay in funding has hampered our ability to plan the final details of what service each Forest Service AmeriCorps project will provide this year, the service is likely to be similar to that provided last year.

Last year, Members in projects funded through the National Forest System performed the following service:

* Constructed, maintained, and improved 682 miles of trail.

* Achieved 2,569 acres of wildlife habitat improvement; built 133 structures to shelter or protect wildlife; built 296 nesting boxes; and constructed a threatened and endangered plant greenhouse.

* Improved 668 acres of timber stand.

* Built or completely rehabilitated 446 campground sites.

* Reforested 638 acres of land.

* Prepared 42 campsites for accessibility to people with disabilities.

* Improved 760 acres of fisheries habitat.

* Constructed 86 miles of new fence.

* Maintained 18 miles of vehicle trails to keep them free of obstructive growth and slides.

* Improved watersheds damaged by fire by cutting and planting 92,500 willows in riparian areas.

* Built I I flood fences to prevent future flooding.

* Improved Forest Service road and safety conditions ---- by "day lighting" 50 curves.

* Released 775,000 salmon fry in a fish stocking operation.

* Constructed a major visitor information center.

* Provided conservation education to 8 8,3 7 3 students K- 1 2.

Last year, Members in projects funded through State and Private Forestry performed the following service:

Arkansas - Members worked to promote alternative energy sources which are environmentally safe, to select appropriate sites for installation of dry fire hydrants, to facilitate implementation and coordination of demonstration projects for five poultry litter spreaders. They also helped to promote alternative wood products and value-added manufacturing technologies, resulting in local people obtaining job training and higher paying employment while maintaining the quality of the rural environment. Tons of industrial wood waste is now being processed into energy in the form of wood pellets. The Members also helped the Community of Holly Grove facilitate the FEMA buy out of homes in the 1 00-year flood plain.

Georgia - A Member created of Recreation Opportunity Guides for the Forests, assist in developing the series of videos entitled "America's Great Outdoors", working with the Environmental Education Coordinator to present environmental education programs and fire prevention programs, worked with the Wilderness Ranger on the Brasstown Ranger District doing trail maintenance and doing presentations to local groups on wilderness management. The Recreation opportunity Guides that the Member produced will also be of value to the thousands of Forest visitors expected to visit the Forest during the 1996 Olympics.

Kentucky - Member worked with the McCreary County Fiscal Court, primarily with the County Road Supervisor, to take help create a (91 1) emergency response system and to start a road inventory and management system for the county.

Louisiana - One Member assisted grant development for a successful application to use timber bridge technology and materials for recreation tourism project in Lake Providence LA. He continues to assist Humpheys County, MS, in their timber bridge construction efforts. Two members assisted in the first stage of the Shiitake Mushroom forestry-related project.

Mississippi- One Member helped develop a recycling program in Leflore County. One Member organized construction of an outdoor classroom and implemented a plan to improve science test scores by 25 percent. A Member worked to start a community recreation and education program.

North Carolina - One Member developed a 5-year Master Plan for the development of a Parks and Recreation Department on the Cherokee Reservation. In addition, he established a Mountain Bike Trail on the Qualla Boundary for public use and special biking events. Another Member assisted in the identification and renovation of parks and other recreational facilities which do not comply with ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements.

South Carolina - Two Members worked a dry fire hydrant project improve rural fire protection, lower fire insurance rates, reduce losses from fire, and stimulate rural development. a Member worked to create a nature trail at an elementary school. One Member provide technical assistance in solid waste management and recycling to communities in Claiborne, Grainger, Hancock, Hawkins, and Union Counties.

Tennessee - One Member assisted the Shady Valley Ruritan Club (non-profit) in organizing native cranberry restoration Action plan. The purpose of the cranberry restoration project is to stimulate economic development through tourism and educate the public about the uniqueness of the native cranberry and the Shady Valley community. One Member sponsored household hazardous Waste collections held in 6 counties in July with participation increasing by 23%.

Virginia - Member researched and wrote a Tree Identification Teachers manual and completed tree identification plaques for the Marion Riverwalk. Another Member completed timber bridge design for 2 species of lumber, 3 lumber grades for each species, and 6 different bridge spans for each species and lumber grade. He also developed and received funding for designing and constructing 2 nail-laminated pedestrian timber bridges in the towns of Teasel and Marion. They also contacted over 1 00 volunteers and municipal fire departments pertaining to interest in installing dry fire hydrants.

Minnesota - Members completed major analysis of the current situation in the development of hybrid poplar as an alternative crop. Members also completed analysis and documentation of a survey of primary and secondary forest products manufacturers to determine barriers they face in engaging in more value-added production..

West Virginia - AmeriCorps Members have helped implement Hayfield-McCoy Trail System by identifying trail heads, as well as conducting inventories of service providers such as gas stations, motels, and restaurants. AmeriCorps Members also completed field work and analysis of current amounts of residues left in the forests after logging has been completed. This survey, covering the central counties of West Virginia, has been used as a template for other areas of West Virginia and surrounding states. In West Virginia, probably the most meaningful project was the Braxton County project; developing a trail system for environmental education. The project included clearing and constructing interpretive nature trails, building a large wooden foot bridge over a river, hanging bird and bat boxes, and identifying and labeling plants/trees along the way.

Colorado - Members completed draft of San Juan Skyway Corridor Management Plan, Completed conceptual master plan for a Petting Zoo, completed conceptual plan for Mangos Watch able Wildlife Wetland Park, developed GIS base map of political boundaries and wildlife corridors on the San Juan Skyway, initiated Ponderosa Pine Partnership, which allowed a timber contract to bought and delivered to Montezuma County (first time in history this has occurred), and completed the Mangos Riverwalk, which received Governor Roamer's Smart Growth and Development Award for 1995.

Utah - Members completed a site inventory of 23 sites for inclusion in the Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway, completed signing project for Scenic Byways project in San Juan County, completed Urban Forestry project in Moab and in Huntington, and completed work with College of Eastern Utah Prehistoric Museum on sorting and cataloging artifacts collected in 1987.

New Mexico - Member worked with the non-profit Castile Arts and Crafts Guild to **find** work for people who were unemployed because of the closure of a lumber mill, AmeriCorps provided technical assistance to develop a plan for the second year of operation for the Sangria De Crista Wood Workers. Working with Carson National Forest Engineer, AmeriCorps helped the people of the village of Velocities figure out how to improve their situation of a contaminated and insufficient water supply. AmeriCorps worked with the non-profit organization Gannets Del Vale and La Madeira Cooperative to develop a long range plan for economic development in the village of Velocities, using forest products and locally produced arts and crafts. In addition, because of the efforts of AmeriCorps, the 2,000 residents of the village of El Rico is one year closer to having safe drinking water. In Coyote, AmeriCorps is assisting the Volunteer Fire Department in locating a building to house the fire engine and to serve as a fire house. Trees in Taos County: AmeriCorps is also assisting the development of a group who will provide a long range plan for tree planting in Taos County.

Arizona -Members assisted distressed Arizona communities to retain or expand businesses. AmeriCorps Members implemented the Econ DB, an economic data base profile, in 8 communities. Area Developers as well as the Arizona Department of Commerce's National Marketing Team will use the Econ DB. Public and private enterprises alike consider the Econ DB beneficial in attracting, developing and retaining businesses. Members also assisted multi-community action teams to have the Four Comers Heritage Council adopt the "Trail of Many Tracks" into the Four Comers Heritage Trail System. The Trail of Many Tracks is a heritage auto-touring route covering approximately 260 miles located in north central Arizona. The touring route passes through all communities adjacent to the Apache Sitgraves National Forest.

Oregon - The University of Oregon's Learn and Serve AmeriCorps Members are working and living in fourteen rural communities, five of which are USDA Forest Service supported. These participants are providing assistance in the areas of- 1) Economic Development; 2) Environmental Preservation, Restoration and Education; 3) Community Empowerment and Development.

Question 2: Does the AmeriCorps staff have the required professional experience to do the work?

All AmeriCorps Members receive extensive technical training before they start their service and ongoing professional supervision during their service. Forest Service managers and community leaders alike have repeatedly praised AmeriCorps Members for the high quality of their service.

Question 3: Who has done this type of work in the past? If contracts were used, why not continue to use competitive bids and get professional quality work with appropriate oversight?

By law, AmeriCorps Members can not displace existing employees or duplicate existing work. However, they are performing service far more cost-effectively than would be performed under more traditional staffing or contracting methods.

Forest Service project managers for Public Lands and Environment Team Members have calculated the exact cost savings to the Forest Service for each of their projects. For each dollar spent on these by the Federal government --- the AmeriCorps Members performed service that, if funded by Forest Service "force account," would have cost no less than $1.15 and as much as $1.51. If the same work were contracted out, it would have cost the no less than $1.50 and as much as $2.30 to perform the same work that was performed with one dollar of AmeriCorps funding.

The Clinch Powell RC&D Council in Rutledge Tennessee calculated that the Forest Service Rural Development Team Member supervised by the Council --- who spent the service year creating a county-wide recycling plan --- performed fully $3.29 worth of service for each dollar spent by the Forest Service.

Question 4: Are the AmeriCorps centers appropriately located so the priority projects are tackled for each of the main program areas listed?

All Forest Service projects --- selected after an intense internal competition and then a highly competitive external competition run by the Corporation for National Service --- are specifically designed to meet each regions' most pressing environmental and human needs. Rather than using a top-down approach in which Forest Service officials in Washington dictate to the forests, the AmeriCorps program empowers each forest and each region to determine their own priorities and their own strategies to meet those priorities.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

Honorable Ralph Regula
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
B-308 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-6023

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) proposes to reprogram Forest Service (FS) funds in fiscal year (FY) 1996 for the AmeriCorps programs. Section 312 of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-134) prohibits the use of such funds for AmeriCorps programs unless the relevant agencies of the Department of the Interior and/or Agriculture follows "appropriate reprogramming guidelines." Further, section 312 prohibits the use of such funds for AmeriCorps programs "if no funds are provided for the AmeriCorps program by the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (VA-HUD), and Independent Agencies' FY 1996 appropriations bill." Public Law 104-134 does provide funding for AmeriCorps under VA-HUD.

In accordance with section 312, we are proposing to reprogram $5.24 million from various National Forest System (NFS), ~~and related funds and~~ State and Private Forestry (S&PF), and other funds to carry out authorized FS work projects through the AmeriCorps national service program in FY 1996.

The FS ~~ran~~ operated a Public Lands Corps in FY 1995 through which 297 AmeriCorps members on national forest land in 8 States performed rehabilitation and watershed protection work, reforested fire-damaged lands, constructed and maintained trails for hiking and horseback riding, planted cuttings for riparian and wildlife restorations, maintained and rehabilitated campgrounds, made campgrounds accessible for people with disabilities, completed timber stand improvements, restored historic sites, removed and installed fences, improved wildlife habitats, and hung erosion control netting on roads.

The FS also ~~ran~~ operated a Rural Development Team in FY 1995 through which 86 AmeriCorps members in 16 States worked on projects related to areas such as running water and indoor plumbing, emergency response and prevention, alternative uses of natural resources, environmental education facilities, tourism promotion, water quality protection, recycling promotion, cultural resource preservation, and relocation of residents of flood plains.

FS AmeriCorps members are getting things done and providing vital services, while strengthening communities, expanding educational opportunities, and encouraging personal responsibility.

The FS is proposing to carry out a program very similar to the 1995 program, but at a reduced level. The program level is based upon field units' assessments of their ability to utilize AmeriCorps members during the remaining field season. The FS is using

AmeriCorps as a delivery mechanism to perform work. While additional funding was not provided in FY 1996, the FS will redirect work to the AmeriCorps program which would have been accomplished by other means.

The FS is planning a $5.2 million AmeriCorps program for FY 1996 that provides for enrolling 410 members. This includes 385 members in the Public Lands Corps through the NFS program and 25 members in the Rural Development Team through the State and Private Forestry program. Most members will be enrolled in part-time slots. (See enclosure for detailed source of funds.)

I am also enclosing responses to your questions to assist in the review of the reprogramming request.

This letter is being submitted in accordance with the arrangements and understanding that the Department has with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with respect to reprogramming procedures.

Similar letters are being sent to Senators Byrd and Gorton and to Congressman Yates.

I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DAN GLICKMAN
Secretary

Enclosures

FY 1996 FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROGRAM

The following reprogramming of FY 1996 Forest Service funds to the AmeriCorps program is requested:

	Thousands $
National Forest System and Related Funds:	
Recreation Management	2,486
Wilderness Management	97
Wildlife Habitat Management	435
Inland Fish Habitat Management	179
Anadromous Fish Habitat Management	127
Threatened and Endangered Sensitive Species Habitat Management	251
Grazing Management	46
Rangeland Vegetation Management	70
Timber Sales Administration	16
Forestland Vegetation Management	420
Watershed Improvement	81
Real Estate Management	16
Land Line Location	8
Road Maintenance	63
Facility Maintenance	66
Forest Trail Construction	174
Brush Disposal	15
Cooperative Work-KV	338
Subtotal	4,888
State and Private Forestry Funds:	
Economic Action	355
Total, AmeriCorps Program	**5,243**

DRAFT

1996 AmeriCorp Program

Question: What work will be done by AmeriCorps?

Answer: ~~While the delay in funding has hampered our ability to plan the final details of what service each AmeriCorps project will provide this year,~~ the service is likely to be similar to that provided in FY 1995.
↳ provided by AmeriCorps in FY 1996

Members funded through the National Forest System performed the following service and accomplishments:

- Constructed, maintained, and improved 682 miles of trail.
- Achieved 2,569 acres of wildlife habitat improvement; built 133 structures to shelter or protect wildlife; built 296 nesting boxes; and constructed a threatened and endangered plant greenhouse.
- Improved 668 acres of timber stand.
- Built or completely rehabilitated 446 campground sites.
- Reforested 638 acres of land.
- Prepared 42 campsites for accessibility to people with disabilities.
- Improved 760 acres of fisheries habitat.
- Constructed 86 miles of new fence.
- Maintained 18 miles of vehicle trails to keep them free of obstructive growth and slides.
- Improved watershed damaged by fire by cutting and planting 92,500 willows in riparian areas.
- Built 11 flood fences to prevent future flooding.
- Improved Forest Service road and safety conditions--by "day lighting" 50 curves.
- Released 775,000 salmon fry in a fish stocking operation.
- Constructed a major visitor information center.
- Provided conservation education to 88,373 students, grades K-12.

Members funded through State and Private Forestry performed the following service and accomplishments:

Arkansas - Members worked to promote alternative energy sources which are environmentally safe, to select appropriate sites for installation of dry fire hydrants, to facilitate implementation and coordination of demonstration projects for five poultry litter spreaders. They also helped to promote alternative wood products and value-added manufacturing technologies, resulting in local people obtaining job training and higher paying employment while maintaining the quality of the rural environment. Tons of industrial wood waste is now being processed into energy in the form of wood pellets. The Members also helped the Community of Holly Grove facilitate the FEMA buy out of homes in the 100-year flood plain.

Georgia - A member created ~~of~~ Recreation Opportunity Guides for the Forests and assisted in developing a series of videos entitled "America's Great Outdoors", working with the Environmental Education Coordinator to present environmental education programs and fire prevention programs; worked with the Wilderness Ranger on the Brasstown Ranger District doing trail maintenance and doing presentations to local groups on wilderness management. The Recreation opportunity Guides that ~~the Member~~ they produced will also be of value to thousands of Forest visitors expected to visit the Forest during the 1996 Olympics.

Kentucky - A Member worked with the McCreary County Fiscal Court, primarily with the County Road Supervisory, to take help create a (911) emergency response system and to start a road inventory and management system for the county.

Louisiana - One Member assisted grant development for a successful application to use timber bridge technology and materials for recreation tourism project in Lake Providence, LA. He continues to assist Humphreys County, MS in their timber bridge construction efforts. Two members assisted in the first stage of the Shiitake Mushroom forestry-related project.

Mississippi - One Member helped develop a recycling program in Leflore County. One Member organized construction of an outdoor classroom and implemented a plan to improve science test scores by 25 percent. A Member worked to start a community recreation and education program.

North Carolina - One Member developed a 5-year Master Plan for the development of a Parks and Recreation Department on the Cherokee Reservation. In addition, he established a Mountain Bike Trail on the Qualla Boundary for public use and special biking events. Another Member assisted in the identification and renovation of parks and other recreation facilities which did not comply with ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements.

South Carolina - Two Members worked ~~a dry fire hydrant~~ on a project to improve rural fire protection, lower fire insurance rates, reduce losses from fire, and stimulate rural development. A member worked to create a nature trail at an elementary school. One Member provided technical assistance in solid waste management and recycling to communities in Claiborne, Grainger, Hancock, Hawkins, and Union Counties.

Tennessee - One Member assisted the Shady Valley Ruritan Club (non-profit) in organizing a native cranberry restoration Action plan. The purpose of the cranberry restoration project is to stimulate economic development through tourism and educate the public about the uniqueness of the native cranberry and the Shady Valley community. One Member sponsored household hazardous waste collections held in 6 counties in July with participation increasing by 23%.

Virginia - A Member researched and wrote a Tree Identification Teachers manual and completed tree identification plaques for the Marion Riverwalk. Another Member completed timber bridge design for 2 species of lumber, 3 lumber grades for each species, and 6 different bridge spans for each species and lumber grade. He also developed and received funding for designing and constructing 2 nail-laminated pedestrian timber bridges in the towns of Teasel and Marion. ~~They~~ also contacted over 100 volunteers and municipal fire departments pertaining to interest in installing dry fire hydrants.

Minnesota - Members completed major analysis of the current situation in the development of hybrid poplar as an alternative crop. Members also completed analysis and documentation of a survey of primary and secondary forest products manufacturers to determine barriers they face in engaging in more value-added production.

West Virginia - AmeriCorps Members have helped implement the Hayfield-McCoy Trail System by identifying trail heads, as well as conducting inventories of service providers such as gas stations, motels, and restaurants. AmeriCorps Members also completed field work and analysis of current amounts of residues left in the forests after logging has been completed. This survey, covering the central counties of West Virginia has been used as a template for other areas of West Virginia and surrounding states. In West Virginia, ~~probably the most meaningful~~ another project was the Braxton County project; development of a trail system for environmental education. The project included clearing and constructing interpretive nature trails, building a large wooden foot bridge over a river, hanging bird and bat boxes, and identifying and labeling plants and trees along the way.

Colorado - Members completed draft of the San Juan Skyway Corridor Management Plan, completed conceptual master plan for a Petting Zoo, completed conceptual plan for Mangos Watchable Wildlife Wetland Park, developed GIS base map of political boundaries and wildlife corridors on the San Juan Skyway, initiated the Ponderosa Pine Partnership, which allowed a timber contract to be bought and delivered to Montezuma County (first time in history this has occurred), and completed the Mangos Riverwalk, which received Governor Roamer's Smart Growth and Development Award for 1995.

Utah - Members completed a site inventory of 23 sites for inclusion in the Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway, completed a signing project for Scenic Byways project in San Juan County, completed Urban Forestry project in Moab and in Huntington, and completed work with the College of Eastern Utah Prehistoric Museum on sorting and cataloging artifacts collected in 1987.

New Mexico - A Member worked with the non-profit Castile Arts and Crafts Guild to find work for people who were under-employed because of the closure of a lumber mill. AmeriCorps provided ~~technical assistance~~ to develop a plan for the second year of operation of the Sangria De Cristá Wood Workers. Working the Carson National Forest engineer, ~~AmeriCorps~~ helped the people of the village of Velocities figure out how to improve their ~~situation of a~~ contaminated and insufficient water supply. AmeriCorps worked with the non-profit organization Gannets Del Vale and La Madeira Cooperative to develop a long range plan for economic development in the village of Velocities, using forest products and locally produced arts and crafts. In addition, because of the efforts of AmeriCorps, the 2,000 residents of the village of El Rico is one year closer to having safe drinking water. In Coyote, AmeriCorps is assisting the Volunteer Fire Department in locating a building the house the fire engine and to serve as a fire house. ~~Trying to develop~~ AmeriCorps also assisted in the development of a group ~~who~~ which will provide a long range plan for tree planting in Taos County.

Arizona - Members assisted distressed Arizona communities to retain or expand businesses. AmeriCorps members implemented the Econ DB, an economic data base profile in 8 communities. Area Developers as well as the Arizona Department of Commerce's National Marketing Team will use the Econ DB. Public and private enterprises alike consider the Econ DB beneficial in attracting, developing and retaining businesses. Members also assisted multi-community action teams to have the Four Corners Heritage Council adopt the "Trail of Many Tracks" into the Four Corners Heritage Trail System. The Trail of Many Tracks is a heritage auto-touring route covering approximately 260 miles located in north central Arizona. The touring route passes through all communities adjacent to the Apache Sitgraves National Forest.

Oregon - The University of Oregon's Learn and Serve AmeriCorps Members are working and living in fourteen rural communities, five of which are USDA Forest Service supported. These participants are providing assistance in the areas of 1) Economic Development; 2) Environmental Preservation, Restoration, and Education; 3) Community Empowerment and Development.

Question: Does the AmeriCorps staff have the required professional experience to do the work?

Answer: All AmeriCorps members receive extensive technical training before they start their service and ongoing professional supervision during their service.

Question: Who has done this type of work in the past? If contracts were used, why not continue to use competitive bids and get professional quality work with appropriate oversight?

By law AmeriCorps Members can not displace existing employees or duplicate existing work. AmeriCorps provides a way to accomplish needed work and also meet a social objective of helping young people obtain a higher education.

The benefits of using AmeriCorps members to perform work are not limited to just the work (hours or volume) performed by the members themselves. Because of the nature of the AmeriCorps program and its legislation, projects utilizing AmeriCorps members can form partnerships with other government and non-government entities, wherein these entities can provide money, tools, supplies, volunteers and other support that could not and is not provided when other means such as private contractors are used to perform the work.

Question: Are the AmeriCorps centers appropriately located so the priority projects are tackled for each of the main program areas listed?

Answer: All Forest Service projects, developed at the ground level, are selected after an intense internal competition and then a highly competitive external competition run by the Corporation for National Service. The projects are designed to contribute to the planned program accomplishments of each unit.

DRAFT

April 4, 1996

To: Greg Frazier, Charlie Rawls

From: Joel Berg

Subject: **AmeriCorps Call from the Secretary to Congressman Regula and Senator Gorton**

After discussing the matter with both Martha Phipps and Brian Burke, I am writing to suggest that the Secretary call both Senator Gorton and Congressman Regula --- the chairs of the Senate and House Interior Appropriations sub-committees --- to reach agreement on the Forest Service's ability to start its second year of AmeriCorps immediately.

None of the AmeriCorps sites sponsorted by the Forest Service --- comprising nearly half of the Department's entire AmeriCorps program --- have been able to start their second year because of the continuing conflict over reprogramming authority. If the projects do not start extremely soon, they all may have to be canceled, thereby permanently shutting down projects in 23 states, including California, Oregon, Washington, Kentucky, North Carolina, West Virginia, Minnesota, Colorado, New Hampshire, and Vermont.

As you will recall, the Secretary sent letters to Gorton and Regula on February 16 (Attachment 1) --- as well as to ranking members Byrd and Yates --- informing them of the Forest Service's intention to start an AmeriCorps program as soon as Interior Appropriations is passed. On March 6, Regula sent a letter (attachment 2) that made two basic point about his views: it is premature for us to ask for reprogramming before an appropriations is passed and we should ask for *permission* to spend the money, not just notify him our intention to send the money. Regula's letter also asked four substantive questions, to which I have drafted suggested answers (Attachment 4). To my knowledge, we have received no response form the Senate.

Despite the fact that Regula temporarily "turned down" the programming request, OGC has stated that the Secretary *does* have the legal authority to proceed with spending Forest Service money on AmeriCorps under the current CR. However, given the likely negative Congressional reaction to such an action, I believe the wisest course of action would be for the Secretary to call Regula and Gorton to discuss the matter. The Secretary could promise them that we would send a formal reprogramming letter as soon as an appropriations passes in exchange for them agreeing to allow us to go ahead with our program immediately. Gorton, who is aware of a highly successful Forest Service AmeriCorps project in his home state of Washington, is much more likely to be supportive than Regula, who has no national forests in his district. Perhaps the Secretary could ask Gorton to persuade Regula.

Please call me at 720-5746 if you have any questions about this matter.

cc: Martha Phipps, Brian Burke, Stephen Dewhurst, David Carlin

Suggested USDA Response to Congressman Regula's Four Questions About Forest Service AmeriCorps Projects

Question 1: What work will be done by AmeriCorps?

While the delay in funding has hampered our ability to plan the final details of what service each Forest Service AmeriCorps project will provide this year, the service is likely to be similar to that provided last year.

Last year, Members in projects funded through the National Forest System performed the following service:

* Constructed, maintained, and improved 682 miles of trail.

* Achieved 2,569 acres of wildlife habitat improvement; built 133 structures to shelter or protect wildlife; built 296 nesting boxes; and constructed a threatened and endangered plant greenhouse.

* Improved 668 acres of timber stand.

* Built or completely rehabilitated 446 campground sites.

* Reforested 638 acres of land.

* Prepared 42 campsites for accessibility to people with disabilities.

* Improved 760 acres of fisheries habitat.

* Constructed 86 miles of new fence.

* Maintained 18 miles of vehicle trails to keep them free of obstructive growth and slides.

* Improved watersheds damaged by fire by cutting and planting 92,500 willows in riparian areas.

* Built I I flood fences to prevent future flooding.

* Improved Forest Service road and safety conditions ---- by "day lighting" 50 curves.

* Released 775,000 salmon fry in a fish stocking operation.

* Constructed a major visitor information center.

* Provided conservation education to 8 8,3 7 3 students K- 1 2.

Last year, Members in projects funded through State and Private Forestry performed the following service:

Arkansas - Members worked to promote alternative energy sources which are environmentally safe, to select appropriate sites for installation of dry fire hydrants, to facilitate implementation and coordination of demonstration projects for five poultry litter spreaders. They also helped to promote alternative wood products and value-added manufacturing technologies, resulting in local people obtaining job training and higher paying employment while maintaining the quality of the rural environment. Tons of industrial wood waste is now being processed into energy in the form of wood pellets. The Members also helped the Community of Holly Grove facilitate the FEMA buy out of homes in the 1 00-year flood plain.

Georgia - A Member created of Recreation Opportunity Guides for the Forests, assist in developing the series of videos entitled "America's Great Outdoors", working with the Environmental Education Coordinator to present environmental education programs and fire prevention programs, worked with the Wilderness Ranger on the Brasstown Ranger District doing trail maintenance and doing presentations to local groups on wilderness management. The Recreation opportunity Guides that the Member produced will also be of value to the thousands of Forest visitors expected to visit the Forest during the 1996 Olympics.

Kentucky - Member worked with the McCreary County Fiscal Court, primarily with the County Road Supervisor, to take help create a (91 1) emergency response system and to start a road inventory and management system for the county.

Louisiana - One Member assisted grant development for a successful application to use timber bridge technology and materials for recreation tourism project in Lake Providence LA. He continues to assist Humpheys County, MS, in their timber bridge construction efforts. Two members assisted in the first stage of the Shiitake Mushroom forestry-related project.

Mississippi- One Member helped develop a recycling program in Leflore County. One Member organized construction of an outdoor classroom and implemented a plan to improve science test scores by 25 percent. A Member worked to start a community recreation and education program.

North Carolina - One Member developed a 5-year Master Plan for the development of a Parks and Recreation Department on the Cherokee Reservation. In addition, he established a Mountain Bike Trail on the Qualla Boundary for public use and special biking events. Another Member assisted in the identification and renovation of parks and other recreational facilities which do not comply with ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements.

South Carolina - Two Members worked a dry fire hydrant project improve rural fire protection, lower fire insurance rates, reduce losses from fire, and stimulate rural development. a Member worked to create a nature trail at an elementary school. One Member provide technical assistance in solid waste management and recycling to communities in Claiborne, Grainger, Hancock, Hawkins, and Union Counties.

Tennessee - One Member assisted the Shady Valley Ruritan Club (non-profit) in organizing native cranberry restoration Action plan. The purpose of the cranberry restoration project is to stimulate economic development through tourism and educate the public about the uniqueness of the native cranberry and the Shady Valley community. One Member sponsored household hazardous Waste collections held in 6 counties in July with participation increasing by 23%.

Virginia - Member researched and wrote a Tree Identification Teachers manual and completed tree identification plaques for the Marion Riverwalk. Another Member completed timber bridge design for 2 species of lumber, 3 lumber grades for each species, and 6 different bridge spans for each species and lumber grade. He also developed and received funding for designing and constructing 2 nail-laminated pedestrian timber bridges in the towns of Teasel and Marion. They also contacted over 1 00 volunteers and municipal fire departments pertaining to interest in installing dry fire hydrants.

Minnesota - Members completed major analysis of the current situation in the development of hybrid poplar as an alternative crop. Members also completed analysis and documentation of a survey of primary and secondary forest products manufacturers to determine barriers they face in engaging in more value-added production..

West Virginia - AmeriCorps Members have helped implement Hayfield-McCoy Trail System by identifying trail heads, as well as conducting inventories of service providers such as gas stations, motels, and restaurants. AmeriCorps Members also completed field work and analysis of current amounts of residues left in the forests after logging has been completed. This survey, covering the central counties of West Virginia, has been used as a template for other areas of West Virginia and surrounding states. In West Virginia, probably the most meaningful project was the Braxton County project; developing a trail system for environmental education. The project included clearing and constructing interpretive nature trails, building a large wooden foot bridge over a river, hanging bird and bat boxes, and identifying and labeling plants/trees along the way.

Colorado - Members completed draft of San Juan Skyway Corridor Management Plan, Completed conceptual master plan for a Petting Zoo, completed conceptual plan for Mangos Watch able Wildlife Wetland Park, developed GIS base map of political boundaries and wildlife corridors on the San Juan Skyway, initiated Ponderosa Pine Partnership, which allowed a timber contract to bought and delivered to Montezuma County (first time in history this has occurred), and completed the Mangos Riverwalk, which received Governor Roamer's Smart Growth and Development Award for 1995.

Utah - Members completed a site inventory of 23 sites for inclusion in the Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway, completed signing project for Scenic Byways project in San Juan County, completed Urban Forestry project in Moab and in Huntington, and completed work with College of Eastern Utah Prehistoric Museum on sorting and cataloging artifacts collected in 1987.

New Mexico - Member worked with the non-profit Castile Arts and Crafts Guild to **find** work for people who were unemployed because of the closure of a lumber mill, AmeriCorps provided technical assistance to develop a plan for the second year of operation for the Sangria De Crista Wood Workers. Working with Carson National Forest Engineer, AmeriCorps helped the people of the village of Velocities figure out how to improve their situation of a contaminated and insufficient water supply. AmeriCorps worked with the non-profit organization Gannets Del Vale and La Madeira Cooperative to develop a long range plan for economic development in the village of Velocities, using forest products and locally produced arts and crafts. In addition, because of the efforts of AmeriCorps, the 2,000 residents of the village of El Rico is one year closer to having safe drinking water. In Coyote, AmeriCorps is assisting the Volunteer Fire Department in locating a building to house the fire engine and to serve as a fire house. Trees in Taos County: AmeriCorps is also assisting the development of a group who will provide a long range plan for tree planting in Taos County.

Arizona -Members assisted distressed Arizona communities to retain or expand businesses. AmeriCorps Members implemented the Econ DB, an economic data base profile, in 8 communities. Area Developers as well as the Arizona Department of Commerce's National Marketing Team will use the Econ DB. Public and private enterprises alike consider the Econ DB beneficial in attracting, developing and retaining businesses. Members also assisted multi-community action teams to have the Four Comers Heritage Council adopt the "Trail of Many Tracks" into the Four Comers Heritage Trail System. The Trail of Many Tracks is a heritage auto-touring route covering approximately 260 miles located in north central Arizona. The touring route passes through all communities adjacent to the Apache Sitgraves National Forest.

Oregon - The University of Oregon's Learn and Serve AmeriCorps Members are working and living in fourteen rural communities, five of which are USDA Forest Service supported. These participants are providing assistance in the areas of- 1) Economic Development; 2) Environmental Preservation, Restoration and Education; 3) Community Empowerment and Development.

Question 2: Does the AmeriCorps staff have the required professional experience to do the work?

All AmeriCorps Members receive extensive technical training before they start their service and ongoing professional supervision during their service. Forest Service managers and community leaders alike have repeatedly praised AmeriCorps Members for the high quality of their service.

Question 3: Who has done this type of work in the past? If contracts were used, why not continue to use competitive bids and get professional quality work with appropriate oversight?

By law, AmeriCorps Members can not displace existing employees or duplicate existing work. However, they are performing service far more cost-effectively than would be performed under more traditional staffing or contracting methods.

Forest Service project managers for Public Lands and Environment Team Members have calculated the exact cost savings to the Forest Service for each of their projects. For each dollar spent on these by the Federal government --- the AmeriCorps Members performed service that, if funded by Forest Service "force account," would have cost no less than $1.15 and as much as $1.51. If the same work were contracted out, it would have cost the no less than $1.50 and as much as $2.30 to perform the same work that was performed with one dollar of AmeriCorps funding.

The Clinch Powell RC&D Council in Rutledge Tennessee calculated that the Forest Service Rural Development Team Member supervised by the Council --- who spent the service year creating a county-wide recycling plan --- performed fully $3.29 worth of service for each dollar spent by the Forest Service.

Question 4: Are the AmeriCorps centers appropriately located so the priority projects are tackled for each of the main program areas listed?

All Forest Service projects --- selected after an intense internal competition and then a highly competitive external competition run by the Corporation for National Service --- are specifically designed to meet each regions' most pressing environmental and human needs. Rather than using a top-down approach in which Forest Service officials in Washington dictate to the forests, the AmeriCorps program empowers each forest and each region to determine their own priorities and their own strategies to meet those priorities.

Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 00000000066

From: Elizabeth Crane:R8
Date: ## 06/03/96 12:16 ##
Stay tuned?

Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 00000000257

From: Marsha Gittinger:WO
Date: ## 06/03/96 12:12 ##
I understand the Secretary signed the reprogramming request on 5/30 and it has gone to the Hill. So another hurdle is over, now we need to hear from the Hill. Thanks for hanging in there everyone.

From: Joel Berg
To: BBURKE,SHAGUE
Date: 4/25/96 12:10pm
Subject: AmeriCorps Follow-Up on the Budget Agreement

Now that FY96 appropriations have been agreed to that funds both the Forest Service and the overall AmeriCorps program, I hope we will now be able to proceed rapidly to start Forest Service AmeriCorps projects around June 1.

Even before the Secretary speaks to Regula and Gorton, I suggest the Forest Service take the following steps:

1) Re-drafting the reprogramming letter immediately, including the answers I suggested to Regula's questions. Once we get a revised version from the Forest Service, I will work to get OGC, OPBA, the Cage, and OMB to approve the letter as quickly as possible. This letter should then be hand-carried to the offices of Regula, Gorton, Byrd, and Yates.

2) Revising the Forest Service AmeriCorps budgets as soon as possible, based on the assumption that ALL originally proposed sites will be funded ---- especially the one on the Olympic National Forest. To do so, the Forest Service would have to take a serious look a taking at least some money "off the top." I would point out that Ken Cohen of OGC did state that taking money off the top might reduce the false appearance that we were displacing existing employees in the field.

3) Appointing a temporary task force --- comprised of Forest Service employees from both Washington and the field --- in which individuals experienced in managing AmeriCorps projects would be given immediate responsibility for dealing with the recruitment, budgetary, administrative, public affairs, personnel, etc. issues so critical to a rapid start-up on the program. THIS APPROACH WAS USED BY THE FOREST SERVICE IN 1994 FOR THE START-UP OF THE FIRST YEAR AND WAS HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL.

4) Clarifying AmeriCorps funding in the FY97 budget proposal and in the instructions to the field for FY98. Clarifying with OMB that they do indeed want us to spend these funds to promote this key Presidential initiative.

Let me know if a meeting on the above matters would be useful. Thanks.

From: Joel Berg
To: GFRAZIER,JLYONS, BBURKE,MPHIPPS,CRAWLS,SDEWHURST
Date: 3/18/96 3:32pm
Subject: Decision By the Secretary on FS Reprogramming for AmeriCorps

Even as Senator Grassley, the leading opponent of AmeriCorps, has reached a compromise with the Administration to save the program, the Forest Service portion of AmeriCorps (nearly half of the Department's overall AmeriCoprs program) still has been unable to start this year because of the lack of an Interior Appropriations Bill and the lack of an approved reprogramming letter.

As you may now, Congressman Regula's recent response to the Secretary's FS AmeriCorps reprogramming letter made two basic points about his views:

A) Such a request for reprogramming will not be approved before the year-long VA/HUD and Interior Appropriations bills are passed; and,

B) The Department should ask for PERMISSION from the Committee to spend the money, not just notify the committee of our intention to spend the money.

Despite the letter from Regula, OGC still believes that the FS currently DOES have the legal authority to fund and run AmeriCorps under the CR or an appropriations. However, the Forest Service has refused to take such action unless specifically directed to do so by the Under Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, or the Secretary.

At this critical juncture, the Department has five options, not all of which are mutually exclusive:

1) Authorize the FS to begin spending money on AmeriCorps immediately.

2) Send another, updated letter to Regula, revising the request. (This would only be appropriate if a VA/HUD and an Interior Appropriations pass).

3) Ask the White House to include approval of the FS AmeriCorps program as one of the conditions for the President agreeing to sign a final Interior Appropriations bill.

4) Have the Secretary call Congressman Regula and Senator Gorton personally to discuss the matter.

5) Cancel the FY96 FS AmeriCorps program, thereby eliminating planned projects in 19 states.

Given that these issues are both complicated and controversial, I strongly suggest that Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, and/ or Greg Frazier be orally briefed on this matter as soon as possible. I believe that such an oral discussion should take place shortly, even if we also provide a decision memorandum on paper.

Such a decision would need to be made extremely soon if we are to have any realistic hope of having a significant FS AmeriCorps program this year.

CC: DKAPLAN,SHAGUE

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 | # of pages ▸ 1

To GUANDA VINNY FINCH	From JOEL BERG
Co.	Co.
Dept.	Phone #
Fax #	Fax #

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 | # of pages ▸ 1

To ROBIN THOMPSON	From JOEL BERG
Co.	Co.
Dept.	Phone #
Fax #	Fax #

FACT SHEET ON FOREST SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS USED FOR AMERICORPS NATIONAL SERVICE PROJECTS

Background:

This year, the USDA Forest Service spent approximately $10 million to sponsor 364 AmeriCorps Members working in Public Lands Teams and Rural Development Teams in 38 states. In the first three quarters of the program year, these Members performed over 365,000 hours of community service.

Next year --- if allowed to do so by Congress --- the Forest Service will again spend $10 million, but would greatly increase the size of the program. By further improving the cost-efficiency of the program, the Forest Service would be able to directly sponsor 584 AmeriCorps Members serving in 23 states and indirectly sponsor another 100 Members serving in the Northwest Service Academy near the Oregon/Washington border.

Language currently in the Interior Appropriations bill would bar the Forest Service from spending any funds at all on AmeriCorps. This language would not only wipe out all Forest Service AmeriCorps activities, but would likely end other vital youth conservation projects.

*** BARRING THE FOREST SERVICE FROM USING APPROPRIATED FUNDS ON AMERICORPS WOULD HAVE MANY UNINTENTIONAL NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES**

Not only would such language bar USDA from running AmeriCorps projects on Forest Service land, but the language would greatly harm --- and perhaps end ---- many other Forest Service-funded youth service projects regularly supported by Republicans. For instance, this language would severely injure the Northwest Service Academy, a AmeriCorps project on the Oregon/Washington border which Senator Hatfield has previously praised in a public letter. This language could also potentially take away significant Forest Service funds from state and locally-sponsored youth conservation corps that may have AmeriCorps components. This language could even prevent such corps from fighting fires on National Forests.

*** THIS YEAR, THE FOREST SERVICE RAN SUCCESSFUL AMERICORPS PROJECTS IN 20 STATES**

Sites for 1994 - 1995 Forest Service Public Lands AmeriCorps Projects:

Total of 297 Members

(State of project, National Forest on which project is located, # of Members at site)

Arizona - National Forests state-wide - 45 Members

California - San Bernadino National Forrest - 80 Members

California - Six Rivers National Forest - 25 Members

Mississippi - Bienville National Forest - 20 Members

New Hampshire - White Mountain National Forest - 32 Members

Oregon - Rogue River National Forest - 37 Members

Vermont - Green Mountain National Forest - 20 Members

Washington - Olympic National Forest - 38 Members

This year, the Forest Service sponsored both Public Lands Team and Rural Development Team projects through AmeriCorps. Most of the Members served in Public Lands Team, and each of these Team sites had more Members than the Rural Development Team sites.

Public Lands and Environment Team Members performed rehabilitation and watershed protection work, reforested fire-damaged lands, constructed and maintained trails for hiking and horseback riding, planted cuttings for riparian and wildlife restorations, maintained and rehabilitated campgrounds and made campgrounds accessible for the disabled, completed timber stand improvements, restored historic sites, conducted threatened and endangered species habitat surveys, removed and installed fences, improved wildlife habitats, and hung erosion control netting on roads.

Sites for 1994-1995 Forest Service Rural Development Team projects

Total of 86 Members

(states in which Members are located, # of Members in the state)

Arizona/New Mexico border - 5 Members

Arkansas - 5 Members

Colorado - 2 members

Georgia - 1 Member

Kentucky - 2 Members

Louisiana - 5 Members

Minnesota - 10 Members

Mississippi - 10 Members

North Carolina - 2 Members

Oregon - 4 Members

South Carolina - 6 Members

Tennessee - 5 Members

Utah - 1 member

Virginia - 4 Members

West Virginia - 6 Members

Members of the Rural Development Team provided service on projects related to areas such as running water and indoor plumbing, emergency response and prevention, alternative uses of natural resources, environmental education facilities, tourism promotion, water quality protection, recycling promotion, and cultural resource preservation.

*** NEXT YEAR --- IF ALLOWED TO DO SO BY CONGRESS --- THE FOREST SERVICE WILL RUN AMERICORPS PROJECTS IN 23 STATES**

Sites for 1995 - 1996 Forest Service Public Lands AmeriCorps Projects:

Total of 548 Members

(State of project, National Forest on which project is located, # of Members at site)

Arizona - National Forests statewide - 45 Members

California - San Bernardino National Forest - 138 Members

California - Sequoia National Forest- 20 Members

California - Six Rivers National Forest - 37 members

Georgia - Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest - 25 Members

Mississippi -- Bienville National Forest- 20 Members

Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho -- Greater Yellowstone area - 92 Members

New Hampshire/Maine - White Mountain National Forest - 32 Members

North Carolina - various National Forests - 30 members

Oregon - Rogue River National Forest - 35 Members

Utah - Ashley National Forest- 20 Members

Vermont - Green Mountain National Forest- 20

Washington - Olympic National Forest- 35 Members

Partially Funded by the Forest Service: Northwest Service Academy on Mt. Hood National Forest, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Columbia Scenic Gorge (OR and WA) - 110 Members

Sites for 1994-1995 Forest Service Rural Development Team projects

Total of 36 Members

(states in which Members are located, # of Members in the state)

Arkansas - 3 Members

Four Corners Region - Colorado, New Mexico, Utah - 8 Members

Georgia - 1 Member

Kentucky - 2 Members

Louisiana - 2 Members

Minnesota - 7 Members

Mississippi - 2 Members

North Carolina - 1 Member

Tennessee - 4 Members

Virginia - 2 members

West Virginia - 4 Members

*** NEXT'S YEAR'S FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROGRAM WOULD HAVE ALMOST TWICE AS MANY MEMBERS FOR THE SAME FUNDING**

By increasing funding from non-Forest Service partners, by reducing overhead costs, and by transferring AmeriCorps slots to the project type in which Members earn a lower living stipend, next year's Forest Service AmeriCorps program would be able to fund far more AmeriCorps Members for the same level of spending.

With the same $10 million in spending, the size of the Forest Service program would rise from 364 Members in 20 states to 584 Members in 23 states.

*** FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROJECTS DO NOT COST THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER MORE THAN WOULD ORDINARILY BE SPENT ON THE FOREST SERVICE**

The Forest Service is not spending one cent extra of appropriated funds to support AmeriCorps. Rather, it is using funding already appropriated to re-build trails, make areas accessible to the disabled, refurbish recreation areas, improve timber stands, etc., to perform precisely those tasks. All the Forest Service is doing is using AmeriCorps as a delivery mechanism to perform the same work that would normally be performed for the Forest Service. The only difference is that, since AmeriCorps Members perform far more work per dollar than the same work performed through routine means, the Forest Service is able to complete more work by using AmeriCorps.

National Forests have a massive backlog of work important that needs to be done. For instance, According to a March 1994 Forest Service report, the National Forest system then had 26,000 recreation sites needing $746 million in work; 120,000 miles of trails needing $277 million in work; and fish and wildlife habitats requiring $14 million in work.

*** FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROJECTS "GET THINGS DONE" MORE CHEAPLY ON FEDERAL LANDS THAN DO OTHER METHODS**

The limited cost/benefit analyses already performed prove that both the Public Lands Team and the Rural Development Team AmeriCorps projects are extremely cost-effective.

After the first half a year of operating AmeriCorps, the Forest Service calculated that its 236 AmeriCorps Members serving on Public Lands Teams perform at least $1.51 worth of service for each $1.00 that the American taxpayer spends to support such service. Although it is difficult to blend cost benefits from different Forest Service regions around the country, the cost-benefit figures are based on an average of the combined cost savings of all recreation projects completed. These costs included all Federal spending, including the Member stipends and educational awards.

The Forest Service AmeriCorps Public Lands crews completed recreation projects for 51% less than similar projects completed by force account (if completed by Federal employees), and 68% less than similar services completed by contracted services. For example, in one area it cost AmeriCorps $64,185 to complete 53 miles of heavy trail maintenance. The same projects would have cost $126,000 by force account, and $212,000 if the services were contracted.

The Clinch-Powell Resource Conservation & Development Council in Tennessee calculated that in the first four months of the program, the four USDA AmeriCorps Rural Development Team Members, who are managed by the Council, performed approximately $2.73 worth of service for each $1.00 that the American taxpayer spent to support such service. As evidenced by the attached "Chart 1," the Council calculated that if purchased on the "open market," one service project performed by one Member would have cost an estimated $23,975 while another service project performed by three Members would have cost an estimated, $50,400, bringing the total value of the service performed to $74,375. The cost of the AmeriCorps Members, pro-rated to the four months period in which they performed the projects, was $27,272.

* FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROJECTS HAVE RECEIVED WIDE-SPREAD BI-PARTISAN SUPPORT

"It's going to be a wonderful boon for us in the area of the environment."
- Senator James Jeffords (R-VT)
Discussing Forest Service and NRCS AmeriCorps Projects in Vermont

"Last week a crew of young people in the AmeriCorps program braved wet, steep slopes, and wrestled with downed logs, dying trees, and poison oak to help make this area less of a fire danger.... the clean-up does illustrate the value of this national service program ... In addition to watershed work, the crews protect wetlands, restore recreation areas, increase handicap accessibility, and much more ... Important work is being done and the long-range benefits are great in learned job skills and educational incentives."

- "AmeriCorps forest project shows what can be done,"
Editorial, *Ashland-Tidings*, Oregon, June 26, 1995

"Thank you for sending me a copy of your recent letter to Joe Parvankin testifying to the importance of the AmeriCorps program in helping Friends of Trees in their tree planting projects. I appreciate this kind of information. Over and over again, I have heard good things about the Northwest Service Academy and the work they are doing."

- Senator Mark O. Hatfield (R-OR)
Letter to Richard Seidman, Executive Director, Friends of Trees

"The White Mountain National Forest AmeriCorps program, the state's largest AmeriCorps program, not only helps preserve our natural resources but enhances economic growth as well."

- Terry Shumacker and Debbie Tasker, bi-partisan Co-Chairs
New Hampshire National and Community Service Executive Board

CHART 1
"COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF USDA AMERICORPS PROJECTS"
PREPARED BY CLINCH-POWELL RC&D COUNCIL, TENNESSEE

AMERICORPS SOLID WASTE SPECIALIST (One member sponsored by the U.S. Forest Service)

Accomplishments (4 months)	Cost to Community if Service Purchased on Open Market*	Cost as Provided Through AmeriCorps	Savings to Community Through AmeriCorps
Assist Hancock County with Convenience Center Design, Permitting and Funding Grant	$3,400		
Assist Hancock County with completion of 10 year Solid Waste Management Plan as required by state law.	$8,500		
Preparation of Bid Specs and package for Recycling Equipment for the City of Harrogate.	$1,700		
Preparation of Bid Specs and Package for Transfer Station for Claiborne County.	$2,550		
Preparation of Bid Specs and Package for Grainger County Recycling Center	$2,125		
Design and Layout of Solid Waste Education Brochure	$1,400		
Preparation, development and writing of four grant proposals for outside funding of important solid waste projects.	$4,000		
TOTAL	**$23,975 (estimate)**	**approx. $7,272**	**$16,703**

* *Estimated costs based on the known 'going price' in the RC&D region.*

SPECIALTY RECREATION AND TOURISM INITIATIVE (three members sponsored by the Natural Resources Conservation Service)

Accomplishments (4 months)	Cost to Community if Service Purchased on Open Market*	Cost as Provided Through AmeriCorps	Savings to Community Through AmeriCorps
Inventory, Development of Regional Committee, Setup of Tourism Network, Preliminary Funding Search, Eco-Tourism Feasibility Study, Wilderness Road Draft and Design of Regional Tourism Database	**$50,400 (estimate)**	**approx. $20,000**	**$30,400**

* *Estimated costs based on the known 'going price' in the RC&D region.*

"These Members .... protect natural resources.... These Vermont USDA Members are not 'Federal bureaucrats' as opponents have charged. I would invite any Member of Congress to come to Vermont to see the volunteers and the work that is being done to help communities.... It is clear that the USDA AmeriCorps program has reinvented government by creating new federal, state and local non-profit partnerships."

- Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT)
June, 2 1995

"AmeriCorps Members in these programs are accomplishing vital reforestation, recreation and conservation projects for the Forest service; projects that would not otherwise be possible. Members have enhanced recreational opportunities that address the needs of local communities and promote tourism. And they have addressed conservation issues vital to the health and well-being of our national forests. These two USDA AmeriCorps programs are prime examples of federal/non-profit AmeriCorps partnerships that leverage additional funds."

- Arthur Pope, Executive Director, Northwest Youth Corps
June 7, 1995

"There are many things the federal government does wrong. But creating opportunities for young people to help their country, while putting a small amount of money aside, usually to pay for college, is not one of them... There are 38 young men and women at a work camp in the Applegate ranger District this winter, working in the woods as well as renovating structures and parks in Butte Falls and Prospect. So far, AmeriCorps is a success in America's forests."

-Editorial, *Medford Mail Tribune*, Oregon
January 18, 1995

* AMERICORPS PROJECTS ON FOREST SERVICE LAND HAVE ACCOMPLISHED AMAZING RESULTS

The following is a brief summary of second quarter accomplishments and cumulative accomplishments --- as of March 31, 1995 ---- from the eight Public Lands and Environment Teams operating on National Forest land through the USDA direct grant, in which a total of 236 AmeriCorps Members performed over 141,702 hours of service since the beginning of the program. This summary also includes accomplishments of one camp operating through the Northwest Service Academy, which receives significant technical support from the Forest Service. It should be noted that many of the tasks listed below were accomplished during the worst period of weather to be encountered by most of the sites. In addition to the service listed below, Forest Service AmeriCorps Members have accomplished much since this data was last reported on March 31:

* Maintained 180 miles of trail this quarter, bringing the cumulative total to 241 miles this program year.

* Maintained and prepared 16 campgrounds for forest visitors this quarter, bringing the cumulative total to 24 campgrounds maintained and prepared this program year.

* Completely restored 45 individual campsites this quarter, bringing the cumulative total to 55 campgrounds maintained and prepared this program year.

* Reconstructed 20 campsites to make them accessible to people with disabilities this quarter, bringing the cumulative total to 26 campsites made accessible for this program year.

* Completed 354 acres of timber stand improvement projects this quarter, bringing the cumulative total to 551 acres improved this program year.

* Constructed 20 miles of new fence and removed 15 miles of ineffective fence this quarter, bringing the cumulative total to 21 miles of fence constructed and 18 miles of fence removed this program year.

* Rehabilitated 12,000 acres of land damaged by wildfire this quarter, bringing the cumulative total to 24,000 acres of land rehabilitated this program year.

* Rehabilitated 60 acres of wildlife habitat including the construction of 2 water tanks and 3 water lots, bringing the cumulative total to 425 acres of habitat improved and 4 range waterlots installed this program year.

* Improved watersheds damaged by wildfire by cutting and planting 18,000 willows and cottonwoods in riparian areas to prevent further erosion, bringing the cumulative total to 63,000 cuttings gathered and planted this program year.

* Constructed 7 bridges in campground areas this quarter.

* Removed hazard trees from 24 campgrounds this quarter.

* Constructed 59 new picnic tables and 3 complete playground areas this quarter.

* Painted and refurbished several CCC historic structures this quarter.

* Constructed 153 visitor information signs this quarter.

* Rehabilitated 4,500 acres of wilderness areas.

* Enhanced Threatened and Endangered Species habitat by constructing and installing 238 bird boxes.

* Completed disaster relief projects including the construction of 11 fences and 20 retaining structures to prevent further flood damage.

* Pruned two acres of fruit trees.

* In addition, in the previous quarter, Members constructed 25 stream structures for anadramous fisheries on .75 miles of stream, constructed 6 new miles of new hiking trails, restored two historic sites, completed threatened and endangered species habitat surveys on 900 acres, protect 82 acres of huckleberry field sacred to the Warm Springs Takima Tribal Nations, hung erosion netting on 300 feet of steep Forest service road cut-backs, and helped clear 15 miles of road that provide access to water monitoring sites.

*** FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROJECTS ARE SO GOOD THAT THEY CAN PLEASE BOTH TIMBER COMPANIES AND ENVIRONMENTALISTS**

AmeriCorps projects on Forest Service both lands improve timber stands --- thus aiding future timbers harvests --- and preserve ecosystems --- thus helping save endangered species. AmeriCorps is one of the best ways to combine environmental protection and economic growth.

It's no wonder why --- even in communities in the Pacific Northwest which are deeply divided over timber issues --- both sides agree that AmeriCorps projects on Forest Service lands are one of the best possible activities to be engaged in by the government.

*** FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROGRAM ALLOWS MANY MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES TO PAY FOR COLLEGE**

The vast majority of AmeriCorps Members in Forest Service projects are from middle class families. These families usual earn between $20,000 - $50,000 -- at a time when most public universities cost a minimum of $5,000 per year and most private universities are in excess of $10,000 per year. Yet these solidly middle class families have been basically told by the Federal government that they are too "rich" to receive Pell Grants or Perkins Loans for their children.

Furthermore --- by including assets in the calculations --- the arbitrary financial needs tests for most forms of Federal student aid actually discriminate against families that save their money for their children's educations.

Thus, the Forest Service AmeriCorps programs provide middle class families with one of the few methods available to help fund their children's college educations.

*** FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROJECTS SUPPORT WORK INSTEAD OF WELFARE**

Although most Forest Service AmeriCorps members are from middle class families, some are from low-income families. Some of these Members from low-income families left AFDC to join AmeriCorps.

AmeriCorps projects on Forest Service lands require back-breaking physical labor. If we are really serious about reforming welfare, we should expand -- not eliminate --- programs such as this which reward hard work.

*** EXCELLENT NON-PROFIT AND STATE AGENCIES RECEIVE FUNDS TO HELP RUN FOREST SERVICE AMERICORPS PROJECTS**

By creating innovate public-private partnerships, Forest Service AmeriCorps projects reinvent government. Below is a partial list of non-Federal agencies receiving funds to help mange Forest Service AmeriCorps projects:

Arizona Conservation Corps

California Conservation Corps

Greater Jackson Youth Service Corps (Mississippi)

New Hampshire Conservation Corps

Northwest Youth Corps (Oregon, Washington)

Vermont Conservation Corps