

# 14.

## *Planning the Use of Land Resources*

V. WEBSTER JOHNSON

*Division of Land Economics,  
Bu. of Agr. Econ., USDA*

**T**HE PLANNING OF LAND USES IS NOT NEW IN HUMAN experience, and most of the disciplines of learning have long been involved in the planning process. Physical, social, economic and political factors are constantly considered in the formulation of land use plans and policies. Planning is a broad field that at times takes form in following more or less established practices; at other times it appears as a concerted effort to reach ends sought by new patterns of organized effort. Farmers as individual operators constantly make adjustments in the use of land without direct public assistance. But individual adjustments have not been enough. Consequently, during the last 20 years we have heard a great deal about government assistance and positive concerted action for the best use of the land.

In considering a subject as broad as planning the use of land resources, we must select some aspect of the field as a special focus

of attention. This chapter will explore some of the broader aspects of land planning from a public viewpoint. Very little attention will be given to the purely private aspects of the subject; that is, to those decisions that individual operators make in planning for the profitable and desirable use of their land. No clear line of demarcation can be drawn between planning on purely an individual basis and that prompted by government action. However, the primary problems and setting that shall be discussed will center around public and group action in the land planning process. These include consideration of the concept of planning; the need for planning; objectives of planning, means for carrying out plans, relation of research to planning, planning and operations, and some current land planning activities and problems.

### THE CONCEPT "PLANNING"

Planning involves four steps, each of which must be taken with a high degree of accuracy to be most effective. These are: (1) The establishment of policy objective or the ends that are sought. This is the most crucial of the four and probably the most difficult. Value judgments are more important, with statistical data less available; and quantitative proof is harder to assemble. Ethical and philosophical considerations are significant. (2) Determining where we are at the present with reference to each of the policy objectives. This involves a detailed assessment of the present situation. Here the selection of the crucial factors is important. (3) Measuring the distance between where we are at present and the end objectives that we have in mind. (4) Devising ways and means of bridging the gap between the present situation and the objective—of bringing present conditions up to the desired. This undertaking demands imagination and ingenuity and a keen sense of the institutional framework within which suggested programs of action must operate.

In planning the use of land resources, specific objectives are of prime importance. They change from time to time and place to place. In a highly dynamic society, planning constantly must keep abreast of the changing objectives toward which action must be directed.

Land resource goals have their origins partially in value judgments and not wholly in logical analysis, but it is through analysis of pertinent data and information in relation to reasonable objectives that goals take shape into desirable plans. The means to the attainment of a goal as expressed in a plan of action need to be

rationally conceived but they must also be politically and economically feasible.

In considering public planning in the use of land resources, one of the first essentials is a feeling that something is in need of being improved. That is, there must be a felt problem or condition that calls for some type of public action. In the determination of what is needed to deal with a difficulty, it is very often not possible to divorce the felt need from the way in which the need can be fulfilled through some type of administrative set-up, because the extent to which a need is satisfied is related to the means used to fulfill the need. Needs and means to ends are not independent variables. Thus, planning for the wise use of land resources is simply organized social intelligence striving toward determined objectives through a designed course of public action.

### THE NEED FOR LAND PLANNING

The early "planners" predicated many of their action programs upon the classical theory which held that if an individual were left to his own devices he would so conduct himself in a competitive economy that the best interests of society would be served. Our early land policy was designed to place the land in the hands of those who tilled the soil in family-sized units. It was reasoned that under private property the owner would "turn sand into gold." Time has proved that the short-time interest of the individual is not always in harmony with the best long-time interests of society.

So long as large acreages of land in the United States were unsettled and undeveloped, we were not very much concerned with how the individual used or abused the land. Other and often more fertile lands were to be found by moving on to new sites. But as the supply of good undeveloped land became scarce and as we began more fully to recognize that exploitation of land was a matter of national interest, it was both natural and imperative for us as a people to become concerned over land exploitation and undesirable land use practices.

Throughout much of our history we have had abundant production from the land. This, in itself, did not engender a spirit of conservation. Our timber, mineral, and all other types of land were profitably exploited. It was to no small extent true that through the mining of our land resources, we as a nation became strong and prosperous. There were assets as well as liabilities in the practices followed.

Our land has been very much in the same category as farm commodities in the right of the owner to use and dispose of as he sees fit. No criticism of this established policy is implied here. Within the last half-century, however, a change has come about in our attitudes toward land. We more firmly realize that the way in which an individual uses his land directly and vitally affects the present and future welfare and security of our nation. This recognition is creating a new attitude toward the land, an attitude that some of the older countries of Europe and Asia have held for many centuries.

The spirit of better land use is assuming greater proportions as we become more familiar with the problems surrounding our land resources and as we more fully realize that the interests of the individual and of society in conservation are not fully compatible. The public has a real stake in conservation investments. Public interest or value is the core of the land conservation problem.

It may well be pointed out, however, that the adjustments in land use now needed are greater than are realized by our citizens. Individuals must assume greater responsibilities in the care and development of our lands. We need a more widespread and fundamental individual philosophy that will reflect a greater concern for the public interest in the wise use of land resources. Too often we simply look to the federal government to do jobs for which individuals could well take primary responsibility.

Another item of vital importance in planning the use of our land resources is the production of the desired quantity of an acceptable quality of each needed agricultural product at the right time and place. Many aspects of this problem are quite apart from the matter of conservation, although the two objectives must be harmonized. Adequate production under emergency conditions, as for example during a war, may well call for some exploitation of certain land resources, for national survival then becomes of more immediate importance than soil conservation. At other times, when total requirements are low, it is advisable to under use land resources and to build up soil reserves. In either event, planning on a national basis is called for.

Individuals live in the present and it is often to their immediate interest to exploit land resources. Public policy, however, requires constant consideration toward the use of resources for the benefit of future generations. Free and unrestrained private ownership of all types of land has not always directed land into uses or under conditions of use that have been most beneficial from the standpoint

of society. This is not intended in any way to detract from the great contributions that our free competitive system of private enterprise has made to our way of life.

"Not until 1872 was there any indication that the federal government would retain possession of any part of the land except for such purposes as military reservations, forts, post offices, etc., under the delegated powers of the constitution. In that year Yellowstone National Park was set aside, the first of the park reservations, and in 1891 forest land was withheld from alienation, thereby initiating the federal forest policy."<sup>1</sup>

The change in our philosophy in regard to public ownership of some types of land grew essentially out of two factors: (1) The increasing complexities of our social and economic life and the accompanying necessity of satisfying arising needs by public action, and (2) an embryonic recognition of a need to conserve and develop our land resources. It would hardly be true to say, however, that any real concern existed before 1900 over the conditions of use of farm or range lands.

Planning for the use of land resources in the United States arose out of the existence of underlying conflicts in the use of land. To the extent that these conflicts were resolved by general agreement or public support for goals or objectives sought, our progress has been generally satisfactory. But the sharp struggles for power by groups with selfish interests or the presence of such groups in strategic positions have not always led to the best use of land resources.

## OBJECTIVES OF LAND PLANNING

Many people feel that a need exists to spell out in some detail our objectives of land use. For instance, should not we as a people be more specific in setting forth our aims in regard to family farms, the retirement from farming of submarginal agricultural land, land conservation, and the development of land by irrigation and drainage? We realize that any policy statement should not and could not be definitive for specific situations and also that conditions are constantly changing. As we progress in a piecemeal manner, at best a policy statement would be a more settled course or direction for government action with respect to public problems in which land is a major factor.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ely, Richard T., and Wehrwein, George. *Land Economics*. p. 90. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1940.

It has been said, and truly so, that we have had no well-defined land policy in the United States. We have had, however, a number of dynamic leaders who were wholeheartedly concerned with the condition of our land resources, and very largely through their efforts land programs have been advanced and launched to carry out phases of a land policy.

The objectives of land planning should be in line with, or a phase of, the over-all national objectives of planning, of which the following are well accepted: (1) to enlarge the national income; (2) to progressively broaden the distribution of the national income; (3) to maintain freedom of enterprise; (4) to increase the economic security of the people; (5) to provide greater economic opportunities for individuals; (6) to so use our resources as to insure sustained and efficient production; and (7) to safeguard and strengthen our position among nations.

As one looks ahead from the vantage point of today, the main over-all objectives of a policy statement, or planning for the use of land, appear to be: (1) to greatly expand farm and home planning in order to produce as nearly as possible the needed quantity and quality of agricultural products with desirable land use practices; (2) to extend the soil conservation program throughout all of its needed aspects; (3) to develop and restore many lands for agriculture, forestry, grazing, recreation and other principal uses; (4) to give more stability to desirable land uses; (5) to improve effective tenure arrangements on both public and private land and thus improve their condition of use; and (6) to maintain a fair income to land users through shifts in land uses and an improved pattern of production.

The final formulation of objectives and the determination of programs of action to bring the existing situation up to the desired goals demand the attention of many minds. Researchers are partly responsible for problem refinement and delineation and for the presentation of alternative lines of action. They should also evaluate the relative merits and probable results of specific proposals. State and federal legislative bodies are responsible for final selection from among the various alternative actions and for the timing and speed with which programs are instigated. Administrators and farmers are responsible for helping in the formulation of over-all programs and in their adaptation to local conditions.

#### **WAYS OF CARRYING OUT PLANS**

In carrying out the purposes and objectives of a course of action

that takes shape in some type of land program, there are, in the main, six ways by which government—local, state and federal—may bring about changes in the use and condition of use of land. They are: (1) Direct administration of land by public ownership; (2) public regulation of privately held land through the use of the police power; (3) agreements that may be made with special districts as in case of soil conservation districts; (4) taxation, particularly yield and severance taxes; (5) regulations induced by or incident to conservation payments and aids; and (6) educational activities and programs.

It is not a purpose of this chapter to deal in any detail with these techniques or measures for bringing about adjustments in the use of resources. However, brief consideration of them is appropriate.

The mention of public land ownership brings to mind the extensive forest and grazing land holdings of the federal government. And during the 1930's we had the submarginal land purchase program. Although it is true that land in public ownership has not always been managed by sound or forward-looking policies, public ownership in the main has been and is an effective means for the development and conservation of certain types of land resources. This is true particularly for those lands that yield relatively low returns, lands that must be operated at high risk, lands needed for watershed protection, and those whose use is in the nature of a group consumption good, as in the case of recreational land.

Through the exercise of the police power, governments control the use and occupancy of land. Under the police power the state may establish reasonable use and occupancy regulations of private property, if to do so is in the interest of the public. The people themselves vote upon the controls that may be established. Rural zoning is the outstanding example of land use control effected through the police power.

To date some 36 states have enacted rural zoning enabling legislation; and within 23 states, 173 counties have adopted land use ordinances. Some of the soil conservation districts and some of the grazing districts also may enact land use regulations to deal with conservation problems. A number of districts, as in Colorado, for instance, have adopted ordinances that deal essentially with grazing regulations in the management and protection of grazing lands.

Contractual agreements are also made by farmers and ranchers with soil conservation districts. Under these agreements much has been done in the way of farm planning and improved land use.

Closely related to this program are conservation payments made to farmers for performing certain practices. Price-support programs are also significant. When government assistance is used to bring about shifts in land use that occur as part of a program, either to increase or to decrease production, and such effort results in a better use of the land resources, it is proper to credit such aids to one means of planning for more desirable land use practices. At times, payments have not been used to bring about desirable shifts in land use but it is true that payments have been so used and could be used in the future far more effectively in obtaining shifts in land use with a lessening of group conflict and individual sacrifice. So far it is probably true that Agricultural Conservation Program payments have been far more effective in shifting to a more desirable allocation of resources than in controlling agricultural production.

Taxes on land are not generally looked upon as a way of regulating land use. Rather, they are considered a means of raising revenue. Nevertheless, taxes are used for both purposes. We are all familiar with yield or severance taxes on forest lands and with the rather widespread homestead exemption legislation adopted to promote farm home ownership. Adjustment in taxes as a device for effective land use is a field that might well be given future study. In the Great Plains, for example, thought may well be given to adjusting payments on both property and income taxes over a period, in order to see what could be done to minimize the risk factor and to encourage conservational uses of land by means of tax flexibility and variations in taxes according to conservational classes of land use.

Land planning is a process and as a part of that process in a democratic society, education is particularly important. Acceptance of a program and willingness to support it are basic to its success. And the start of a program must be from the levels of the culture, knowledge, skills, and organizational competencies of the people affected, rather than from levels introduced from outside. Representative government must be close to the source of power—the people. The educational aspects of land planning are most significant in that progress is made through the understanding and growth within individuals of a felt need for desirable social objectives.

To reach objectives sought in land use planning, through whatever means or combination of means, requires an enlightened social consciousness. In fulfilling this need, education has a definite place in the planning and formulation of land use programs.



## RELATION OF RESEARCH TO PLANNING

Land use planners need basic data on soil, land cover, production practices, plant and animal diseases, market outlets and a whole host of things of which this list is merely a random selection. Not only is basic information needed in formulating a plan but, as the program unfolds, problems arise that are in need of answers by currently provided facts.

Problems of obtaining the adoption of conservation land use practices involve analyses of who will pay the costs of conservation and who will get the benefits. The cost-income balance must be observed as between private individuals and the public, and between private landlords and tenants. Tenure arrangements, adjustments in the ways of doing things by and for land operators, institutional changes and changes in systems of farming are strategic to the success of a conservation program.

Whatever the type of research needed—be it on soil conservation, watershed management, forest or range problems or evaluation of costs and benefits—statistics and ideas arising from analysis of data on problem situations that give rise to difficulties in program planning are the grist of the planning process. Without research, which supplies knowledge, social intelligence must drift or muddle along. One of the functions of research is to help solve or delineate problems, and there are plenty of problems in the planning process and in the formulation of sound land programs.

As government enters more and more into our economic life, to an increasing and expanding degree solutions to conflicts of interests between groups take place through government action and not in the market place. We no longer rely solely on the play of free competitive forces to solve problems. Therefore, it behooves government to know a great deal more about the means and consequences of public action than was formerly necessary. This requires intelligent research.

Tremendous good should come from a dynamic research program that comes to grips with institutional and economic problems relating to land resources. For instance, from studies of such problem situations as: (1) achievements in conservation under present programs; (2) obstacles to conservation practices; (3) economic feasibility of land development in specific areas; (4) alternative means of bringing about best use of resources; (5) public control or ownership of land where public investments are high; (6) changes in tenure arrangements, both public and private, in the interest of better land use

practices. You can readily think of many other timely subjects in need of research. We all realize that in a period such as the present, with farm income exceptionally high, the feeling against group controls which follows major wars, and the many struggles and adjustments that are taking place, it is exceedingly difficult for research to venture very far in studying current issues and policy problems. It is true that one can stop short of policy issues, but this can hardly be done if we are to come to grips with some of our real land problems. And we must be aware that researchers are human, that they are likely to come up occasionally with crackpot panaceas or pleas for special causes, and that they may also get original ideas which are commonly found to be disturbing.

Nevertheless, in the hands of a truly capable analyst, alternative proposals or ways of doing things can be objectively analyzed for the choice of policy makers. We are obligated to do a good job in this field.<sup>2</sup>

We are at the threshold of a period of great emerging public interest in land resources, and the demands for improved techniques of investigation were never greater. Research methods and techniques are the essence of economic investigations that deal with problems of public interest and which have largely been neglected as a field of study by students and professional researchers. Not just the types of methods as statistical, case, psychological, and so forth, and their use in themselves, but of their integrated use in ferreting out significant human relationships. The door of opportunity is wide open in the field of land planning for social scientists to make an immense contribution through research in the study of problems arising in land conservation, in land development, and in the sharing of responsibilities in resource development between individuals and governments.

It should be emphasized that research and planning are not synonymous. Research can refine, delineate, anticipate, and describe problems. It can develop alternative means of action, and it can indicate probable results of specific plans. In short, research can supply information, facts, and ideas. Research is not planning, but for research to be most useful it must contribute to the improved well-being of man and, in this sense, it is an essential phase of planning.

---

<sup>2</sup>Salter, Leonard A. *A Critical Review of Research in Land Economics*. p. 51-53. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1948.

**PLANNING AND OPERATIONS**

At this point it might be well to consider briefly the question of the relationship between planning and operations. This question has never been satisfactorily answered. Those who insist that the functions are separate and should be maintained apart hold that different kinds of psychology, of personality, and of approach and training are required for planning than for operations. It is held that the planner is the contemplative type who seeks data, continually balances relationships, appraises, weighs, thinks, and lacks the initiative and drive to act; while the operator, on the other hand, lacks the capacity for contemplative thought.

Another consideration affects the merging of plans and operations. Operations require immediate attention and decisions; they involve pressing day-by-day problems. Postponement is often costly, sometimes impossible. On the other hand, planning is a slow and cautious process. Thus, it is held, if plans and operations are merged within the same organization the urgency of pressing operational problems will occupy the principal attention of the staff, with the result that the development of new plans will be neglected.

It has been pointed out, too, that the planner will remain contemplative and unrealistic as long as his planning is not tied in with operations. Only as the planner must also act can there be assurance of realistic plans. It is too easy to suggest what should be done when one takes no responsibility for explaining how to do it or does not participate in the actual doing of it. It is held that we do not want the sort of plans that are prepared by persons incapable of acting, nor the sort of actions taken by persons incapable of planning.

In the development of land programs, what we actually find is the need for planning at different levels. It would be difficult to see how those agencies that deal with land programs could divorce planning from operations. In fact, a little more planning might be, and very likely would be, a good thing. However, at the top level of government, as for instance, in the Office of the President, or on a lower rung of government, as in a county, there is believed to be a definite place for planning completely divorced from operations.

**EARLY LAND PLANNING ACTIVITIES**

The first significant acts relating to planning were designed to conserve resources. Proponents of more efficient utilization and conservation of our land resources became aggressively active toward the end of the 19th century. President Harrison was the first to set aside

from the public domain a sizable tract of land as a national forest reserve. The three succeeding presidents, Cleveland, McKinley and Roosevelt, set aside additional tracts of land as forest reserves amounting to some 180 million acres. A Bureau of Forestry (later designated as the Forest Service) was created in the Department of Agriculture in 1897.

In 1906, during the tenure of President Theodore Roosevelt, all valuable coal lands in the public domain were withdrawn from entry. Soon afterward, Congress endorsed this policy by passing a withdrawals act. In this and subsequent acts, however, coal lands withdrawn from private entry were made subject to agricultural entry for surface rights only.

Additional forest reserves, mineral, water, and military reserves, and National Park areas were set aside at frequent intervals. With a land area of more than a quarter-billion acres in reserve prior to World War I, the Government was obviously in the planning business to stay.

Planning such as that referred to during the period before World War I was piecemeal or subconscious planning. Even though there may be an uncanny relationship between the sequence of governmental acts, often referred to as policies, it must be candidly admitted that governmental acts pertaining to use and conservation of our land resources were largely the results of demands for corrective action or for the prevention of further maladjustment in resource uses. In that period of our history the sequence of governmental proclamations, laws, or administrative rulings had little relation to a projected plan of action.

The great depression which followed World War I and grew increasingly serious during the early thirties brought about, in effect, a mandate for the federal government to assume responsibility for reviving the economy. We are all familiar with the many land programs that sprang up during the 1930's and the rise of a number of land planning agencies. Reference to this period brings to mind the National Resources Board and its successor, the National Resource Planning Board. Within the framework of the National Resources Board, a Land Planning Committee was set up to report on land use and water resources. Whether the Resources Board was, in fact, a planning agency, is debatable. Published reports of the Board usually carried this notation: "The National Resources Board assumes no responsibility for the views and opinions expressed herein." In discussing the work of the Resources Board, a former employee of that agency writes:

If the Board's published reports from 1934 to 1943 are critically examined, it is immediately apparent that none of these reports is an actual plan for administrative operation. Rather the reports deal with fundamentals of public policy. They provide factual data indicating essential public needs. The outlines of desirable public policy are either implied in the data set forth or are presented by the Board or by the Board's committee making the study. . . . Only the broadest recommendations are made in these studies.<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless, Congress was not in favor of having such a body engaged in planning even to this extent, and the Board passed out of existence.

Another major planning development occurred in July of 1938, at Mt. Weather, Virginia, with the drawing up of a cooperative plan of action to build land-use programs and policies more applicable to varying local conditions. This plan, often referred to as the Mt. Weather Agreement, was drawn up between the land grant colleges and the USDA, and "constituted a new charter of relations between the agencies of the two sovereignties, state and national."<sup>4</sup>

Under the Mt. Weather Agreement the Department of Agriculture was committed to correlate all of its programs in the field and to provide the best machinery available for encouraging farmer participation in agricultural program planning. The land grant colleges through the state extension services were to take the responsibility for setting up in each of the agricultural counties an Agricultural Land-Use Planning Committee — a subcommittee of the over-all County Agricultural Program Building Committee. The proper functioning of the county committees was to be implemented by the establishment of community committees made up entirely of farm men and women from neighborhoods having similar problems or interests. These community committees were to channel their recommendations to the county committees.

Planning experience under this charter of working arrangements between the state and federal agencies was of limited duration and varying degrees of effectiveness; and the merits of the program were obscured by conflicts of interests that developed between agencies and organizations as to who should formulate plans. However, that it had lasting and continuing values few will doubt.

Planning, of which land planning is a significant part, has

---

<sup>3</sup> Millett, John D. *The Process and Organization of Government Planning*. pp. 18-19. Columbia University Press, New York, 1947.

<sup>4</sup> Tolley, Howard R. *The Farmer Citizen at War*. p. 48. Macmillan, New York, 1943.

become definitely established as a function of government. But by whom is the planning to be done? This question is pertinent not only within the federal government; it remains unanswered at the state level, and it also involves federal-state relationships. One of the present problems is to resolve conflicts that have arisen in the organizational aspects of the planning process. When this is done we shall be in a better position to do a good job of land planning.

#### **CURRENT LAND PLANNING ACTIVITIES AND PROBLEMS**

A glance at some of the current land planning activities in the federal government should be helpful in exploring further the mechanics of the land planning process. In addition to the regular work for land and water conservation and development by agencies of the federal government, a number of special programs are under way. For example, in the Department of Agriculture, programs are being planned and submitted to the Congress for flood control work and for the development of comprehensive agricultural conservation programs for selected river basins. Other departments and agencies are also involved in planning for better land use. A total of approximately 40 billion dollars has been proposed or requested of the Congress by various agencies for multiple-purpose water-land conservation and development purposes. In addition, the states have under way or are planning significant land resource development programs that are not in cooperation with the federal government.

For some river basins, flood-control planning in the Department of Agriculture is now carried on as a part of comprehensive agricultural planning for river basins. This is true in the case of the Missouri River Basin. This program is a joint planning endeavor of the agencies and bureaus of the Department, in cooperation with the land grant colleges of the Basin on certain aspects of the program. It is designed to develop an integrated agricultural plan for land and water development and conservation in the Missouri Basin.

In many watershed areas, however, flood-control work does not now encompass all the aspects of comprehensive land use planning. But, as this work is designated by legislation as a program for water retardation and soil erosion prevention, the task in its broader aspects does involve many activities of the entire Department. In the words of Secretary Brannan:

The Department's responsibilities as distinguished from those of the Department of the Army . . . have to do with treatment and

management of watershed lands for the purpose of retarding flood water run-off and reducing sedimentation. The measures employed for these purposes are, for the most part, identical with those employed in the Department's regular soil and forest conservation and agricultural betterment programs. These considerations have led us to administer the flood-control work as a co-ordinate part of our broad conservation program as a supplement to work performed under the Department's regular conservation programs. It is recognized that a large portion of the total flood-control benefits in the watershed programs come from the ordinary conservation practices which are essentially a part of wise land use and management. In short, the Department's watershed work in aid of flood control consists broadly of several major types of service, some of which have been successfully in force for many years. Furthermore, flood control is one benefit among several to be derived from what is essentially a multiple-purpose program of watershed conservation management. Just as conservation is a part of wise productive land use and not a separate function, so flood control on the watersheds is bound up inseparably with conservation in its broadest sense.

In carrying on planning and development work in river basins one of the real problems is the dovetailing and coordinating of the work of the departments of the government. A step in this direction is the operation of the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee. This committee has served as a means of keeping the several agencies currently informed of activities. It is further operating under a voluntary agreement to clear, in advance of submission to the Congress, each project proposal. Even though the agencies are not bound to follow the suggestions and criticisms obtained through this joint-clearance procedure, the process does have a beneficial effect.

Another major difficulty, beyond the mechanics of doing a good job of program operations, is securing the integration of watershed-treatment measures, soil conservation needs, improved land practices, and essential institutional adjustments in a way that will insure the security of big public investments. For instance, measures that will obtain maximum waterflow retardation frequently conflict with current economic interests of landowners and operators. When, for example, in the Great Plains might it be desirable to restrict grazing in order to protect reservoirs from erosional wash from watershed lands? Can we always safely assume that a very large public investment will be protected without some degree of public control over the use of private lands?

In commenting on the means needed to do a good job of resource development in river basins, Secretary Brannan has said:

Investigations, preparation of plans and carrying out of plans dealing with the agricultural phases are all involved in river basin developments. When the Congress decides that resource development activities in any given basin or region are to be intensified and accelerated, the regular nation-wide programs of the Department of Agriculture may not fully meet the resulting special needs. Means should be available for authorizing intensified and accelerated agricultural activities to complement and balance the other special programs and projects authorized by Congress for the area. Means should be provided for any necessary stepping-up of agricultural services in a basin or region without drawing from other areas. The Department of Agriculture should be authorized, in cooperation with state agencies, to proceed with investigations and planning, similar to the authorities already available to other federal agencies. Plans and proposals developed under this procedure, when authorized by the Congress, would provide the means for . . . putting into effect the special programs and services needed to bring about effective and well-balanced regional development undertakings.

### ORGANIZATION IN PLANNING

As has been indicated, a real need exists for improved means and better organizational arrangements in the planning and programming of land and water projects. There is no one useful form of administration for all purposes. That a lack of true coordination exists between agencies is also known.

It is often contended that unification of responsibility for like types of functions would make for more orderly and efficient planning and operations. But disagreements arise in the proposals as to how this should be done. One of the most difficult problems that immediately arises is that of satisfying the need for unified administrative responsibility while retaining the values of established line agencies.

The TVA type of organization is strongly advocated by some people. It is argued that such an arrangement has many advantages over trying to integrate and co-ordinate all work from the federal level because decisions of importance can be made close to those affected and primary attention can be given to their needs, desires, and attitudes; and also because it is felt that relationships among resources in the region are more important than relationships on a national basis with respect to a single class of resource.

The nature and form of organization required to deal with land resource planning problems is far from settled. In fact, except for the TVA type of organization, thinking on organizational arrangements has not been too well crystallized. This does not mean that a number of other proposals have not been made, but experience



has been limited. We are learning as we progress in experience.

The Hoover Commission dealt with the present organization for land and water programs. Among other proposals, the Commission recommends a number of shifts and realignments in the work within the federal departments, and the transfer of certain activities from one department to another. One novel suggestion is the creation of a Board of Impartial Analysis to report to the President on the public economic value of water development projects, to review authorized projects and to recommend to the President discontinuance of those projects deemed undesirable.

This Board would be composed of outstanding men who could advise the President on the public welfare aspects of program development. Great responsibility rests at the level of the Presidency and the best possible advice is needed. Many persons feel that the President needs the additional counsel of a group of men, not associated with any specific program, who are engaged in the study of land and water problems.

In looking ahead, it appears that the federal government and the states, either directly or indirectly, must assume an increasing degree of responsibility in planning for the use of land resources. Whatever may be the organizational setup for doing the job—whether it be done by agencies, departments, types of regional authorities or what not—it is a responsibility of great magnitude that involves continued over-all appraisals of aggregate national welfare consideration so that the interests of all people may best be served.

Dynamic and positive planning of the use of our land is emerging slowly, painfully, but surely; and as it develops piecemeal and fragmentarily, it requires increased integration and a progressive approach to a comprehensive public point of view for the wise use of land resources.

#### SELECTED REFERENCES

- HAYEK, FRIEDRICH A. *The Road to Serfdom*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1944.
- LERNER, A. P. *Economics of Control*. Macmillan Co., New York, 1947.
- LORWIN, LEWIS L. *Time for Planning*. Chaps. 1-7. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1945.
- MILLET, JOHN D. *The Process and Organization of Government Planning*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1947.
- PIGOU, A. C. *Economics of Welfare*. 4th Edition. Macmillan Co., New York, 1932.
- RENNE, R. R. *Land Economics*. Chaps. 18 and 19. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1947.
- SALTER, LEONARD A. *A Critical Review of Research in Land Economics*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1948.

