ERRATA [1]

FS-687
February 2001
USDA Forest Service
2000 RPA Assessment of Forest and Range Lands

Page 11
First paragraph under "*Ownership of Forest and Range Lands"* heading: percentages of forest land in the various ownership categories have changed. After the 2000 RPA Assessment was published, the ownership classification assigned to several million acres of forest land in interior Alaska was revised. The following revised paragraph reflects the most current resource statistics[2] for forest land area by ownership across the United States:

> In the United States, 57.6 percent of the forest land is privately owned (figure 9). Some 15.7 percent of the forest land in private ownership is classed as forest industry and the remainder as nonindustrial private (Smith et al., 2001). Forest land owned by Native Americans is included in the latter category. Of the remaining 42.4 percent of total forest land, the USDA Forest Service is the largest public forest land management agency, with responsibility for 46.4 percent of the total forest area in this ownership category. Other ownership categories delineated by the data are State (19.1 percent), Bureau of Land Management (15.3 percent), and county and municipal (2.9 percent). The remaining 16.3 percent of the forest land in public ownership includes lands managed by the National Park Service, Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and all other Federal ownerships.

Second paragraph under "*Ownership of Forest and Range Lands"* heading, fourth to sixth sentences: percentages of forest land in various ownership categories have changed, for the same reason as stated above. The following revised sentences reflect the most current resource statistics:

> Some 41 percent of the forest land in the State category is located in Alaska; 33 percent is in the North. Over three-quarters of the county and municipal forest lands are in the North. Approximately 79 percent of the publicly owned forest land is in the West, and 74 percent of the privately owned forest land is in the East.

Figure 9: The *"Federal"* portion of the pie chart should be 33.0% and the *"Nonindustrial Private"* portion should be 48.6%. The reason for this change is the same as described above.

Page 70
Figure 63: In the legend, shading for "*hardwood"* should be the dark shading (the upper part of each bar in the graph), and shading for "*softwood"* should be the light shading (the lower part of each bar in the graph).

Pages 17-18
Sections under the headings "*Forest Land"*, "*Rangeland"* and "*Agricultural Lands"*; and Table 3: land use/cover information has changed. In the 2000 RPA Assessment of Forest and Range Lands, draft information from the 1997 National Resources Inventory (NRI) conducted by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service was used as the basis for discussion of changes in land use and cover. Subsequent to the

[1] Errata as of March 12, 2002. If any additional errata are found, they will be posted on the RPA Assessment website at the same location as the 2000 RPA Assessment document. Go to **http://www.fs.fed.us/pl/rpa/list.htm** and click on 2000 RPA Assessment and Supporting Publications.

[2] Smith, W. Brad, et al. 2001. **Forest resources of the United States, 1997.** Gen. Tech. Report NC-219. St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service, North Central Research Station. 190 p.

publication of the 2000 RPA Assessment, the 1997 NRI information was updated (available at **http://www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov/NRI/1997/summary_report/original/contents.html**). The updated information affects some of the changes discussed under the headings, "*Forest Land"* and "*Rangeland"* on page 17 and "*Agricultural Lands"* on page 18. The text under these headings has been duplicated below with the updated information. The direction of change for land use/cover classes is the same for both the draft and updated NRI information. The updated information is also shown below in a revised Table 3.

Forest Land

According to the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (2000), there was a net increase in forest land area of about 3.6 million acres on non-Federal lands between 1982 and 1997 (table 3). This amounts to less than 1 percent of the area that existed in 1982. Losses to other uses were more than offset by gains from other sources. The largest loss of forest land was to development (10.3 million acres or 2.6 percent of the area in 1982). The largest gain in forest land was from pasture land (14.1 million acres or 2.5 percent of the area in 1997). In total, 23 million acres of forest land (5.7 percent of the area in 1982) was converted to other uses between 1982 and 1997 and 26.6 million acres (6.5 percent of the area in 1997) was added to the forest land classification.

The current situation for forest lands is a far cry from conditions that existed around 1900 (MacCleery, 1992). At that time, there were about 80 million acres of "cutovers" that continued to be either idle or lacking merchantable trees. The volume of timber cut nationally exceeded that of forest growth and there was no provision for reforestation. Aside from a few experimental programs, long-term forest management was not practiced at the turn of the century.

Rangeland

Between 1982 and 1997, there was a 2.6 percent net loss of non-Federal rangeland area nationwide (table 3). Of those acres that were rangeland in 1982, 5.3 percent were converted to another land use class in 1997. Of these converted acres, the largest proportion was converted to cropland (31.5 percent), just over 14.8 percent was converted to developed land, 13.7 percent was converted to pasture land, and 13.7 percent was converted to forest.

Rangeland supports habitat for some wildlife species and provides the settings for hunting and other recreation activities. In evaluating the state of rangeland habitats, it is important to recognize that present land use dynamics do not indicate the extent to which certain rangeland systems have been altered historically. Many rangeland ecosystems underwent extensive conversions long before land based inventories were designed. Grazing, agricultural development, fire suppression, urban development, and exotic species invasions are primary agents of rangeland alteration. Tallgrass prairie habitats have been lost primarily to agriculture development. Eastern and Northwestern grasslands and savannas have been lost to urban development, agriculture, and fire suppression.

Agricultural Lands

Agricultural lands consist primarily of lands used to produce food, feed, fiber, and oilseed crops and are described as cropland and pasture land. Cropland is classed as cultivated and noncultivated. Cultivated cropland is annually planted for commodities including rowcrops such as corn, soybeans, and cotton or small grains such as wheat and oats. Noncultivated cropland consists of land planted to multiyear or perennial crops such as hay, horticultural plants, and orchards. Pasture land is used for livestock grazing and differs from rangeland in the level of management it receives. Pasture lands are planted with introduced or domesticated native forage species and receive periodic cultural treatments such as tillage, fertilization, mowing, weed control, or irrigation. Agricultural lands provide food and cover used by many species of wildlife

and many agricultural cropping practices are used in managing habitats for wildlife. They also provide significant opportunities for outdoor recreation and are important for water quantity and quality.

During the period from 1982 to 1997, there was a net decline in cultivated cropland of 10.4 percent (table 3). This net loss of 44 million acres resulted from 26.7 million new acres being converted to cultivated cropland while 70.7 million acres of cultivated cropland went to other uses. Of those 70.7 million acres of converted cropland, 43 percent was enrolled into the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), 27.3 percent was converted to pasture land, and 10 percent went to developed land. The CRP removed highly erodable land out of crop production and established perennial vegetative cover for 10 to 15 years. The 1990 Farm Bill capped CRP acreage at 36 million and created an environmental benefits index that gives preference to lands being bid that will improve water quality and wildlife benefits.

Although there was only a net decline in pasture of 9.1 percent from 1982 to 1997, 30.2 percent of the 1982 pasture was converted to another use category. Some 38 percent of the pasture loss went to cropland and 35 percent of it reverted to forest land.

For the most part, farms have become larger and are now characterized by larger field sizes, reduced crop diversity, and a loss of wildlife habitats provided by fencerows and wetlands. These changes reduce the amount of vertical and horizontal wildlife habitat diversity.

The CRP has potential to directly improve wildlife habitat associated with agriculture. Enrollments in the CRP have shown local benefits to some nesting birds such as the ring-necked pheasant.

Table 3 -- Changes in land cover/use between 1982 and 1997

Land cover/use in 1982	Land cover/use in 1997								
	Cropland	CRP land	Pasture land	Rangeland	Forest Land	Other rural land	Developed land	Water areas and Federal land	1982 total
	1,000 acres								
Cropland	350,265.3	30,412.1	19,269.4	3,659.2	5,606.5	3,158.9	7,097.5	1,485.1	420,954.0
Pastureland	15,347.0	1,329.6	92,088.3	2,567.9	14,091.4	1,619.0	4,230.0	732.8	132,006.0
Rangeland	6,967.5	728.5	3,037.2	394,617.4	3,021.6	1,702.7	3,281.3	3,383.2	416,739.4
Forest Land	2,037.1	128.8	4,168.2	2,098.8	380,343.3	1,754.8	10,279.2	2,528.0	403,338.2
Other Rural Land	1,386.8	93.1	1,013.6	719.1	2,767.7	42,713.3	726.9	227.8	49,648.3
Developed Land	196.7	1.2	78.6	110.8	227.0	12.0	72,618.7	0.8	73,245.8
Water areas and Federal Land	797.5	2.7	336.6	2,204.0	897.7	180.8	18.1	443,760.6	448,198.0
1997 Total	376,997.9	32,696.0	119,991.9	405,977.2	406,955.2	51,141.5	98,251.7	452,118.3	1,944,129.7

Read this table horizontally to determine how a particular 1982 land use (row heading) was distributed in 1997 (column headings). Read this table vertically to determine where a particular 1997 land use (column heading) came from, in terms of 1982 land uses (row headings).