

BUDGETS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE FOREST PLAN

The purpose of this Appendix is to explain how the Forest obtains funding and what effect different funding levels will have on implementation of the Forest land and resource management plan (LMP). This appendix explains:

- (1) The Federal budget process,
- (2) Alternate sources of funding,
- (3) Forest priorities, and
- (4) Monitoring for Plan compliance.

THE BUDGET PROCESS

The Federal budget process is lengthy and complex. The Six Rivers National Forest budget is combined with the budgets of the other 17 National Forests that comprise Region 5 of the Forest Service. The budgets of the nine Forest Service regions combine to form the Forest Service's budget which is part of the Department of Agriculture's budget. It is reviewed by pertinent Congressional subcommittees. The budget is negotiated at each step. Figure N-1 illustrates the chain of events a Forest budget undergoes on its way to and from Congress.

Note that the factors influencing the Forest's final budget are many and relatively uncontrollable from the Forest's perspective. For this reason alone actual budgets will probably not match the Forest Plan budget. The role of the Forest Plan in this process is to identify for Congress and the public what appears to be the best program and funding level for the Six Rivers. The ultimate decision-making power over the budget resides with Congress: for the total budget as well as individual budget items (e.g., timber sales, recreation, wildlife). However, it is anticipated that the parties involved in the budget process will use the Forest Plan for guidance and long range direction in deciding budget priorities.

Table N-1 provides an indication of the Six Rivers National Forest budget trends and priorities as they have been reflected in recent budgets. The table shows Forest funding by appropriation and resource activity for fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990. For comparison, equivalent budget items from the PRF alternative are also displayed.

Table N-1.
Comparison of the PRF Budget and the Forest Budget for Recent Years
 Thousands of 1989 Dollars

Budget Activity	1988	1989	Average 1990	(1988-90)	PRF
National Forest Funds					
Aviation and Fire	1132	1033	1042	106	2986
Cooperative Law	162	145	118	142	168
Cultural Management	134	130	155	140	238
Facilities Maintenance	111	100	126	112	208
Fisheries and Wildlife	814	1082	1251	1049	1929
General Administration	1136	1210	1120	1155	1085
Geology	72	88	111	90	96
Land Management	94	99	122	105	279
Land Line Location	512	455	362	443	270
Minerals	26	46	36	36	115
Range	104	184	62	117	111
Recreation	314	338	292	315	949
Reforestation & TSI	540	862	356	586	149
Road Maintenance	593	748	672	671	921
Timber	1480	2248	2544	2091	444
Trails	52	81	44	59	496
Watershed	326	600	297	408	689
Total National Forest Funds	7602	9449	8710	8588	11133
Construction					
Timber Purch. Roads	1230	1118	1014	1121	192
Trails	80	98	0	59	160
Recreation	21	33	23	26	754
General Purpose	0	46	112	53	496
Total Construction	1331	1295	1149	1259	1602
Federal Highway Admin.	7	5	2	5	7
Hazardous Waste	0	3	0	1	27
Range Betterment	5	5	3	4	6
State and Private	0	4	5	3	5
Working Capital Fund	210	227	185	208	200
Total Appropriated Funds¹	9155	10988	10054	10068	12980
Permanent Appropriations					
Brush Disposal	818	988	1502	1103	319
Quarters	67	58	68	64	49
Timber Salvage	1240	513	376	710	68
Total Permanent Appropriations	2125	1559	1946	1877	436
Trust Funds					
KV — Timber ²	2649	2608	3326	2861	726
KV — Other ³	399	499	528	475	233
FS — Fire ⁴	330	392	304	342	0
FS — Other ⁵	587	216	507	437	443
Reforestation/TSI	274	0	316	197	56
Total Trust Funds	4239	3715	4981	4312	1458
Total Forest Budget⁶	15519	16262	16981	16257	14874

1 Appropriated funds are comprised of National Forest, construction, Federal Highway Administration, hazardous waste, range betterment, state and private, and working capital funds.
 2KV — Timber funds are cooperative funds for planting and timber stand improvement projects
 3KV — Other is comprised of cooperative funds for other resource improvement projects
 4FS — Fire is for cooperative fire work with the State. FS — Fire is no longer available after FY 91.
 5FS — Other is comprised of cooperative funds collected from timber purchasers for road maintenance.
 6 Does not include other Federal/State agency funds, emergency fire fighting funds (FFF), excess timber receipts, or nursery management funds from the Regional Office that are distributed by the Forest.

Figure N-2 displays the PRF budget and the average budget for 1988 through 1990 as pie charts divided into broad resource categories. The pie on the top shows budget dollars, the pie on the bottom the Forest Plan PRF alternative dollars.

The two pie charts are proportional, with the preferred alternative budget approximately 110 percent of the average budget for 1988-1990. The charts reveal a shift in funding from timber to non-timber programs. The proportion of the budget associated with the timber sale program is reduced by 18 percent in timber and reforestation/TSI. The proportion of the budget allocated to cultural resources, fish and wildlife, geology, and watershed would increase by 9 percent, 2 percent for timber support and 7 percent for non-timber related activities. The proportion of the total Forest budget allocated to recreation is expected to increase by 5 percent due to an anticipated increase in recreational activity on the Smith River National Recreation Area and elsewhere on the Forest. Fire is expected to receive a larger proportion of the budget as well to offset the loss of State funding.

ALTERNATE SOURCES OF FUNDING

The budget given to the Forest Service by Congress authorizes it to spend both appropriated and trust funds. However, while the budget is paramount in a National Forest's ability to carry out activities, it is not the only factor that allows a Forest to get work done. Forests also receive money and services from many other sources. These other sources are becoming increasingly important toward accomplishing Forest objectives.

Cooperators and permittees often aid in accomplishing needed work. Many grazing permittees do range improvement work, such as fencing, as part of the management of their grazing allotments. The Forest receives funds from the State of California for wildlife improvement projects and from the Bureau of Reclamation for fisheries projects. Humboldt, Del Norte and Trinity counties maintain public roads on the Forest, providing primary access to Forest users. Volunteers are playing an increasingly large role on National Forests. Older American, job training, and youth programs bring volunteers to help with office work and field activities. The Forest has adopted a trail program and also uses the services of volunteers in the campground HOST program.

In addition, the Forest is continually investigating ways to improve efficiency and productivity. By operating more efficiently, more can be accomplished with available resources.

FOREST PRIORITIES UNDER THE PLAN

While output levels listed in the Plan are tied to budget levels, they are not the sole or even the primary product of the Plan. The Land and Resource Management Plan establishes management direction for the Forest. This includes the minimum management requirements (MMRs), minimum implementation requirements (MIRs) and standard and guidelines discussed in Chapter 2 of the FEIS and Chapter 4 of the Forest Plan. The Plan delineates which activities are appropriate for each section of the Forest. For example, areas managed as semi-primitive non-motorized will be managed primarily for dispersed recreation whereas other areas may be managed for wildlife, range or timber production as their primary function.

The PRF alternative shows the maximum potential the Forest can achieve (the amount of timber which can be sold, the number of cattle grazed, etc.) within the bounds of the management direction the Forest has set for itself. The amount of output actually produced and number of activities and projects actually implemented depends on available funding.

Should Congress not provide the budget levels required for plan implementation, management intensity and production levels will be lower than projected. Regardless of funding level, the Forest will implement the MMRs and MIRs contained in the Plan. These are necessary to maintain the health of the Forest and are not negotiable. Implementation of Forest standards and guidelines, however, may be affected by budget levels.

Generally, Standards and guidelines fall into two categories: (1) those associated with project

mitigation, and (2) those which will maintain or may enhance the Forest environment.

Standards and guidelines established by the Plan to regulate implementation of projects will not be relaxed simply to meet production levels. Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), an environmental analysis is prepared for every project that affects other resources. If the environmental analysis shows the project cannot be accomplished without violating the Forest's standards and guidelines, the project will be modified or revised to ensure it meets the established standards and guidelines. If analysis discloses that the guidelines should be modified, then the Forest Plan will be amended.

Other standards and guidelines address maintenance and/or enhancement of the environment but are not tied to specific projects. Budget levels will alter their rate of accomplishment. For example, the Forest has a guideline to identify and develop wildlife viewing areas and other non-consumptive wildlife opportunities. Without appropriate funding, providing

for non-consumptive wildlife uses may not be possible within the timeframe envisioned by the Plan.

MONITORING

The Six Rivers National Forest Plan includes a monitoring plan to determine whether the Forest has met its goals (Chapter 5 of the Forest Plan). If the Forest does not accomplish the objectives outlined in the Plan an amendment or revision may be required. However, because Plan objectives are expressed in average annual terms for a ten year period, accomplishment levels at less than the annual average will not automatically trigger a plan amendment. The allowed variability for each monitoring item is shown in the monitoring plan. If Forest activities fall outside of the allowed variability, a plan amendment or revision could be triggered.

