

099392

RED-76-83

4-2-76

099392

RESTRICTED — Not to be released outside the General Accounting Office except on the basis of specific approval by the Office of Congressional Relations.



REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

RELEASED



Information On Federal Land Exchanges With Private Citizens In New Mexico

Department of the Interior

From 1962 to 1973, a land exchange program was conducted in New Mexico with Bureau of Land Management lands. Land exchanges are generally initiated by citizens filing proposals to exchange private lands for public lands. This report includes information on (1) the Bureau's exchange and appraisal procedures, (2) the lands transferred and received, and (3) the involvement of third parties in land exchanges.

APRIL 2, 1976

RED-76-83

~~907319~~

703001



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-184196

The Honorable Harold Runnels
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Runnels:

In accordance with your June 13, 1975, request and subsequent agreements with your office, we reviewed certain matters relating to land exchanges between the Bureau of Land Management, the Department of the Interior, and private citizens in New Mexico. As requested by your office, we obtained information on:

- Bureau procedures for land exchanges with private citizens in New Mexico;
- the amount of land transferred and received, including the number of exchanges which included transfers of mineral rights;
- appraisal procedures of the Bureau; and
- involvement of third parties, such as those which coordinate exchanges between private parties and the Federal Government.

On October 22, 1975, we briefed you on the results of our review to date. On the basis of this briefing, limited additional work was done to clarify certain matters regarding appraisal procedures and involvement of third parties. As you requested, this report is a summary of the information we obtained. Also, as requested, no conclusions or recommendations are included and we have not obtained written agency comments on the information presented here. However, we have discussed this information with appropriate Bureau officials in the field and in Washington, D.C.

INTRODUCTION

The Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315g) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to exchange Federal land for privately owned lands. The fair market value of the property conveyed to the United States shall not be less than the fair market value of the Federal property exchanged.

With regard to the policy of the Department of the Interior on land exchanges, the Government must benefit before an exchange will be considered. For example, Departmental Manual, part 602.3.2, dated March 29, 1961, states:

"Private exchanges will not be entertained or consummated except where it is shown that there are compelling reasons to acquire the offered lands to augment long-range Federal Resource Management programs."

A Bureau headquarters official said that each Bureau State Director must decide whether or not exchanges would be made to benefit only the Bureau or the Bureau and other agencies. The extent of the exchanges depends somewhat on the amount of funds available. Thus a State Director may be reluctant to use his funds to do the work required in an exchange for another agency.

The State Director of the New Mexico Bureau State Office from 1965 to 1973 conducted an active exchange program to consolidate Federal land holdings. Private land exchanges were consummated in many cases to permit Federal agencies, other than the Bureau, to obtain land. The current Director believes there must be compelling reasons for the Federal Government to acquire land to augment long-range Bureau resource management programs before an exchange will be considered. Exchanges, he adds, will not be made solely to benefit other Federal agencies, to consolidate Federal land ownership, or to dispose of isolated tracts of land.

Private exchanges are generally initiated by private parties (proponents) who file a proposal with the Federal Government, offering to exchange lands (offered lands) for Federal lands (selected lands). If the Bureau determines that the proposal is feasible and in the public interest, it will (1) take certain action to notify interested parties, such as county officials, of the proposed exchange, (2) appraise the lands, (3) obtain a mineral report from the Geological Survey, (4) receive title evidence from the proponent, (5) obtain the Department of the Interior's Field Solicitor's opinion on the validity of the proponent's title to the offered lands, and (6) issue a patent (legal title) on the Federal lands.

Third parties frequently play an important role in such exchanges by combining requests of a number of private citizens into one proposal. Since no cash equalization is now authorized, the third parties often add land from their own holdings to the offered land so that the value

B-184196

is at least equal to that of the Federal lands desired by the private citizens. This permits land exchanges to be consummated more expeditiously than would otherwise be possible.

SCOPE

As you requested, we reviewed 11 of the 109 land exchanges that occurred between fiscal years 1962 and 1975. The cases were selected if they met one or more of the following criteria and were located in the Albuquerque or Roswell Bureau districts.

- A large amount of land traded in a recent exchange.
- High ratio of land transferred by Federal Government to land received from private citizens.
- A transfer of mineral rights involved.
- Short timespan between time of application and date of the patent.
- Cited by an interested party as being a questionable transfer.

We made our review primarily at the Bureau's State Office in Santa Fe, New Mexico. We also obtained data from

- Bureau Offices in Albuquerque and Roswell, New Mexico, and the Geological Survey Office in Roswell;
- pertinent Federal agencies, private citizens, and third parties involved in the land exchanges; and
- former Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Indian Affairs employees which had specific knowledge about the cases we selected.

We contacted one of the third parties who had been involved in a number of land exchange cases and reviewed pertinent documents pertaining to a selected land exchange case. A financial review was not made to determine the amount of profit, if any, that was realized by the third party as a direct result of the land exchange transaction.

REASONS FOR AND PROCEDURES USED IN LAND EXCHANGES

Revised Bureau of Land Management procedures for private land exchanges were issued June 2, 1975. The procedures

which were in effect when the land exchange transactions we reviewed were made were generally the same except they did not provide specific chronology of processing steps nor did they specify the authority or responsibility for each phase of the process. A schedule showing each step necessary in completing current land exchanges is included as appendix I.

In 3 of the 11 cases we reviewed, the Bureau was the benefiting agency and in one case the Bureau and the Forest Service benefited. The records did not indicate the basis for the exchanges. Bureau officials said they obtained the lands to consolidate Federal lands and to facilitate land resource management.

The Taylor Grazing Act exchange provision--to benefit other agencies--was used by the Forest Service in 4 of the 11 cases to eliminate private holdings in national forests or to expand forest boundaries. In another case, the Atomic Energy Commission--now the Energy Research and Development Administration--was the benefiting agency. This land will be returned to the Forest Service when it is no longer needed by the Energy Research and Development Administration.

Land transferred to the Federal Government in the remaining two cases--one case completed in September 1966 and the other in November 1968--was in turn sold by the Bureau to Carlsbad, New Mexico, under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act (43 U.S.C. 869-1). Both parcels of land, appraised at \$42,500, were sold to the city for \$213. Bureau headquarters officials told us this was an improper use of the Taylor Grazing Act exchange program because the land was obtained by the Bureau State Office for the purpose of selling it to the city.

Bureau headquarters officials stated, however, that their policy prohibiting such exchanges was not communicated to Bureau field offices until August 1968. They stated that at that date it was too late to stop the Carlsbad exchange. They further indicated that because Bureau State officials did not purposely intend to circumvent policy, no specific actions regarding the case had been taken. They stated, however, that Bureau procedures had been clarified and the Bureau should not have considered an exchange proposal if the Federal Government did not intend to retain the land.

The land transferred in the 11 cases by the Federal Government to private parties, with two exceptions, was

ultimately used for ranching and/or grazing purposes. In the remaining two cases, the land was used for a housing subdivision near Albuquerque, New Mexico. Appendix II provides additional details on the 11 cases we reviewed.

LAND AND MINERAL STATISTICS

Land transferred and received

The 109 land exchanges completed between fiscal years 1962 and 1975 resulted in the transfer of 697,977 acres of Federal lands and the receipt of 336,914 acres of private lands. Most of the land received by the Federal Government was transferred to the U.S. Forest Service. Appendix III shows the number of acres in the 11 sample cases and the value of the land.

According to Forest Service and Bureau officials, the lands received were more desirable than the Federal lands transferred; thus the value for each acre was higher. For example, lands in national forests generally have a higher value than land used for grazing.

The following table shows the ratio of the number of acres transferred to the number of acres received for the 109 private exchange cases completed during fiscal years 1962 through 1975.

<u>Ratio of acres of Government lands transferred to private lands received</u>		<u>Number of transfers</u>
<u>Out</u>	<u>In</u>	
1 to 14		1
1 to 3		1
1 to 2		9
1 to 1		39
2 to 1		27
3 to 1		16
4 to 1		4
5 to 1		2
Greater than 5 to 1		<u>10</u>
Total		<u>109</u>

Details on the 10 cases exceeding the 5 to 1 ratio of acres transferred to those received follow.

<u>Month and year land was patented</u>	<u>Acres</u>		<u>Ratio out to in</u>
	<u>Transferred out</u>	<u>Transferred in</u>	
7/65	1,280	160	8.0 to 1
3/66	14,161	960	14.8 to 1
9/66	2,501	55	45.5 to 1
11/66	13,445	440	30.6 to 1
4/67	10,320	301	34.3 to 1
8/67	18,845	1,121	16.8 to 1
12/67	20,431	3,851	5.3 to 1
11/68	1,404	30	46.8 to 1
2/69	4,030	369	10.9 to 1
1/70	20,624	2,782	7.4 to 1

Lands transferred to the Federal Government in the two cases with a ratio of more than 40 to 1 were the lands that the Federal Government in turn sold to Carlsbad for use as a municipal golf course.

Transfer of mineral rights

Bureau procedures require that a mineral report must be prepared by the Geological Survey on the value of minerals on lands transferred and received. An official of the area Survey office in Roswell said mineral resource information could be more accurate and reliable if it had additional manpower and funds to develop more definite geological data.

Bureau procedures prefer land transfers in which neither party reserves the mineral rights to avoid problems that could be caused to surface owners by extraction of minerals. However, in 96 cases, or 88 percent of the 109 exchanges, only the surface rights were transferred by both parties. The Government and the private parties in these 96 cases retained their mineral rights. Private parties transferred mineral rights to the Government without receiving mineral rights in 6 percent of the 109 cases. In the remaining 6 percent of the cases, both parties had transferred the mineral rights.

Bureau procedures require that appraisal reports on private exchanges must be submitted to the Bureau Director for acceptance by the Office of the Secretary if the value of either the selected or offered lands is \$250,000 or more. Bureau headquarters officials stated that the only way they would have been aware of the 96 cases in which both parties retained their mineral rights, which

we called to their attention, would have been if the assessed value of these cases was \$250,000 or more. In addition, Bureau headquarters, in the past, did not encourage the State and/or District offices to have the parties transfer both mineral and surface rights.

A New Mexico State Bureau staff member said there may have been various reasons for both parties to retain their mineral rights. One reason may be that exchanges are consummated easier when mineral rights are not transferred.

The following table shows by fiscal year the extent to which ownership of mineral rights was transferred for the 109 land exchanges.

<u>Fiscal year</u>	<u>Total number of cases</u>	<u>Only surface rights were transferred</u>	<u>Both parties transferred mineral rights</u>	<u>Only private party transferred mineral rights</u>	<u>Only Government transferred mineral rights</u>
1962	2	2	0	0	0
1963	0	0	0	0	0
1964	2	2	0	0	0
1965	6	6	0	0	0
1966	16	16	0	0	0
1967	9	9	0	0	0
1968	17	16	1	0	0
1969	17	14	1	2	0
1970	8	6	0	2	0
1971	13	9	4	0	0
1972	9	7	1	1	0
1973	6	5	0	1	0
1974	3	3	0	0	0
1975	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	<u>109</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>
Per- cent of total	100	88	6	6	0

Our 11 sample cases included 2 of the 7 cases where both parties had transferred mineral rights. These two cases covered 41 percent of the private land that was offered and 49 percent of Federal land on which mineral

rights were transferred during this 14-year period. The cases are identified as cases I and J in appendix II.

APPRAISAL PROCESS

Generally, the Bureau appraisal reports on land to be exchanged include the following data. This information is cited in the "Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions," published by the Interagency Land Acquisition Conference in 1973.

- Land and mineral rights.
- Zoning or other legal restrictions.
- Description of the property.
- Date of appraisal.
- Area and neighborhood analysis, relating primarily to social and economic values.
- Property analysis including location, access, character, utility availability, goods and service availability, improvements and use analysis.
- Method used to determine property value.
- Photographs of lands involved in the exchange and lands used as comparative sales, if any.

Appraisals are normally made by appraisers of the benefiting agency. A total of seven Bureau appraisers, four Forest Service appraisers, and four Bureau reviewing officials were involved in the appraisal of lands included in the cases we reviewed.

An appraisal is made after the Bureau determines that the exchange application is in order. All appraisals must be prepared in accordance with Department of the Interior standards and reviewed and approved by Bureau or Interior reviewing appraisers. Interior requires the following for each appraisal.

- The appraisal report, which is a summary of all the factual material, methods, and techniques used by the appraiser in arriving at the estimate of value.
- Arranging the data, analysis, and conclusions in a concise logical sequence to permit the reader to

follow the process by which the appraiser reached his conclusions.

--All appraisal reports must be signed and dated by the appraiser.

Interior's review, as cited in the "Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions" is made to determine whether the appraisal (1) is adequately supported, (2) complies with recognized appraisal practices, and (3) conforms to governing legal premises as prescribed by legal counsel.

The market data approach was the method used to obtain the appraised values of both the offered and selected lands in the 11 sample cases. The market data approach, or sales comparison, basically is a technique of comparing the property under valuation with actual sales of similar properties. These actual sales are analyzed and summarized by the appraiser and the evidence of this sales data is used to arrive at an estimate or appraised value of the property being appraised.

All Bureau appraisers and reviewing officials had from 2 to 10 years of appraisal experience. All these employees had completed various American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers' courses, and most of them belonged to professional appraisal organizations. All but two had college degrees in the agriculture or forestry field.

Three of the four Forest Service appraisers had college degrees in the forestry field but had limited experience in appraising. Each had taken various institute courses, and one completed the courses after his appraisal of one of the cases we reviewed. Records were not available to determine the education, training, and experience of the fourth Forest Service appraiser who had retired from the Federal Government before our fieldwork.

Before 1971 realty specialists in Bureau district offices made appraisals. In 1971, however, the New Mexico Bureau State Office established a centralized appraisal organization. At the time of our review, four professional appraisers were assigned to this organization. All the appraisers had at least 3 years of appraisal experience, were members of professional appraisal organizations, and had completed various institute courses. Three of these appraisers also had a college degree in an area of study related to the appraisal field.

Current Bureau policy requires that Bureau staff appraisers be used except when

- there are insufficient staff appraisers to perform necessary work in time to meet program goals,
- the character of the work requires the services of an appraiser with special skills and experience, or
- circumstances make it advantageous to the Bureau to have the work done by an outside appraiser.

A Bureau State Office official told us that most of the appraisal staff's time was spent on right-of-way appraisals with less than 1 percent spent on appraising properties involved in private land exchanges.

INVOLVEMENT OF THIRD PARTIES

Third parties have participated in the Federal land exchange program in New Mexico by helping to coordinate exchanges between private parties and the Federal Government. Such parties often combine the requests of several individuals into one large exchange proposal, file the application, and handle any legal problems. We were told by a third party we interviewed and several Bureau officials that third parties do not receive direct compensation from either the private citizen or the Federal Government. However, one third party stated that he makes his profits from the subsequent appreciation of the land received which he later exchanges with land companies or private citizens.

Information is not readily available to determine the number of cases in which third parties had participated in the 109 cases. However, we were told in discussions with various Bureau officials involved with New Mexico land exchanges that one particular third party is involved in a large number of such exchanges. We contacted this third party and by comparing his files to Bureau files for the 109 exchange cases, we determined that he was involved in 39 cases.

Of our 11 sample cases, 7 involved third parties. Six cases were handled by this third party on his own behalf or using other private citizens' land. The cases we selected involved 223,085 acres of private land and 527,761 acres of Federal land, accounting for 68 percent of the total offered lands and 76 percent of the total selected lands in the 109 exchanges.

Bureau and Forest Service officials identified certain advantages and one possible disadvantage, under existing legislation, in having third parties participate in land exchanges. They stated the following advantages:

1. Third parties possess a knowledge of the Bureau exchange requirements and procedures, land status, and land values which usually results in shorter processing time to complete the land exchange.
2. Third parties sometimes represent private citizens who are reluctant to deal directly with the Federal Government.
3. Third parties often own property--"land banks"--and thereby coordinate and consolidate several individual exchange proposals so that the value of offered lands equals or closely approximates the value of selected lands.

We were advised that one possible disadvantage to using third parties is adverse public opinion. In dealing with the Bureau, such third parties may be viewed by the public as having an advantage which would result in the consummation of land exchanges in their favor.

The number of or opportunity for third party participation may be greatly reduced if either party to the land exchange could make cash payments to equalize the value of the land being traded. For example, if a parcel of land to be traded to the Federal Government did not equal or exceed the value of the Federal land desired by the private citizens, then the difference in value could be made up by a cash payment to the Federal Government. This would eliminate the need to arrive at a fair and equitable amount of land by constantly adding or subtracting parcels of land.

The Administration's proposed National Resource Lands Management Act, introduced as S. 1292 and H.R. 5224, provides for a maximum of 20 percent cash equalization. Some of the comments we received on the "cash equalization proposal" from a Forest Service official and New Mexico Bureau State and District Office officials were:

- The Bureau would save time and money now expended in trying to equate land values by adding or subtracting parcels of land.

--Private parties would not tend to use third parties in land exchanges because additional land would usually not be needed to help equalize the land values.

--The Bureau would be able to make certain land exchanges which previously would not have been attempted because of problems in equalizing land values.

The officials said, however, that there should be some restrictions on the use of the cash equalization proposal. They felt that a 20-percent cash equalization could be allowed for smaller exchanges but the percentage of cash should be reduced as the value of the exchange increases. According to the officials, this type of restriction should prevent the Government from becoming overloaded with numerous amounts of exchange proposals for small amounts of land.

Sincerely yours

Thomas A. B. Roberts

Comptroller General
of the United States

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENTLAND EXCHANGES PROCESSING PROCEDURES

This appendix outlines current procedures and requirements for handling proposals for land exchange both before and after filing a formal application. The processing procedures are contained in the Bureau of Land Management Manual, parts 2201 and 2202.

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCY BENEFITING EXCHANGES

<u>Step</u>	<u>BLM State Office</u>	<u>BLM District Office</u>	<u>Other</u>
1.	Dates, serializes and assembles in case folder the informal request for availability of lands.		
2.	Reviews to determine if selected lands are available for classification.		
3.	Requests mineral report from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). If lands are not available for exchange, issues letter refusing request.		USGS provides report.
4.	Sends request to District Office.		
5.		Determines if proposal is in the public interest. Reviews Bureau Planning System. Counties are asked for comments. Surveys status of lands.	
6.		Furnishes report as to availability of lands for classification.	

<u>Step</u>	<u>BLM State Office</u>	<u>BLM District Office</u>	<u>Other</u>
7.	Notifies benefiting agency as to availability of lands. If lands are available, agency is informed to file a formal request for classification.		Benefiting agency files formal request.
8.	Reviews classification and forwards.		
9.		Prepares Mineral and Land Reports, and Environmental Analysis Record (EAR); completes classification and clears all conflicts; determines reservations for offered and selected lands.	
10.		Prepares Notice of Feasibility, sends with case file to State Office.	
11.	Contacts benefiting agency requiring correction of any defects and takes appropriate action to resolve any conflicts.		Benefiting agency takes necessary corrective actions.
12.	Notifies agency that proponent may file an exchange application and a Notice of Feasibility.		
13.	Upon receipt of application, application is date stamped and serialized.		

<u>Step</u>	<u>BLM State Office</u>	<u>BLM District Office</u>	<u>Other</u>
14.	Application is reviewed for completeness (to include Notice of Feasibility.) If application is defective (as to legal description, reservations, etc.), forwarded for correction.		Applicant (private party) corrects application.
15.	Application is noted on land records.		
16.	Notifies benefiting agency that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. appraisals must be completed on offered and selected lands, b. certificate of inspection and possession must be furnished. 		Benefiting agency makes appraisals. Benefiting agency provides necessary certificates.
17.	Upon receipt of appraisals, initiates review procedures.		
18.	Transmits approval of appraisal or request for correction(s).		Benefiting agency makes corrections.
19.	Notifies county of offered and selected lands of private exchange and completes final processing.		Involved county commissioners or other body provides comments.
20.	Request comments. (Step is not necessary if accomplished during classification action.)		

<u>Step</u>	<u>BLM State Office</u>	<u>BLM District Office</u>	<u>Other</u>
21.	Reviews case file for: EAR, Land Report, USGS, approved ap- praisal, county comments, classifi- cation; and Certi- ficate of Inspec- tion and Possession. If any defect exists, forward for appro- priate action.		
22.	Requires correction of defects.		
23.	Issues decision calling for Deeds, title evi- dence, publication, and tax deposit.		Applicant (private party) for- wards all information required in #22.
24.	Upon receipt of data in #23, forwards for title opinion.		Department of the In- terior Field Solicitor provides title opin- ion.
25.	Calls for additional evidence as required by solicitor. Calls for Certificate of Possession.		Applicant provides evidence.
26.			Final title opinion provided by Field Solicitor.
27.			Certificate of Posses- sion fur- nished by benefiting agency.

<u>Step</u>	<u>BLM State Office</u>	<u>BLM District Office</u>	<u>Other</u>
28.	Upon receipt of final title opinion (#26) and Certificate of Possession (#27), issues decision accepting title to offered and issues patent for selected lands.		

BLM BENEFITING EXCHANGES

1.		Informal discussions are conducted only after formal Bureau planning has been completed. (Includes title, reservations, estimate of value, etc.)	Exchange proponent discusses exchange.
2.	Receives request (or initiates discussion of an exchange).		
3.		Establishes file and requests serial number from State Office.	
4.		Conducts informal discussions to determine feasibility of exchange. (To include: county comments, survey and status of land, review of Bureau planning system, etc.)	Exchange proponent discusses exchange.
5.		Mandatory to obtain adequate form of title evidence on offered land.	Exchange proponent provides title evidence.
6.		Forwards report with appropriate recommendations.	

<u>Step</u>	<u>BLM State Office</u>	<u>BLM District Office</u>	<u>Other</u>
7.	Notifies requester as to concurrence with proposed exchange.		
8.		Upon receipt of concurrence of exchange, notifies proponent that a classification request is mandatory.	Exchange proponent requests classification.
9.		Upon receipt of proposal (#8) prepares mineral and land reports, EAR, completes classification, clears all possible conflicts, and determines all reservations.	
10.		Forwards Notice of Feasibility and case file to State.	
11.	Contacts proponent for any action requiring corrections, and also resolves any conflicts.		Exchange proponent makes corrections.
12.	Forwards Notice of Feasibility notifying proponent that an application may be filed.		Exchange proponent files application.
13.	Upon receipt of application:		
14.	Application is date stamped and serialized. (A new serial number is issued other than that used for the classification serial number.)		

<u>Step</u>	<u>BLM State Office</u>	<u>BLM District Office</u>	<u>Other</u>
15.	Application is reviewed. If application is defective (as to legal description, reservations, etc.), forwarded for correction. Corrected application is then completed.		Applicant (private party) corrects application.
16.		Prepares request for appraisal and furnishes Certificate of Inspection and Possession.	
17.	Forwards appraisal on both offered and selected lands.		
18.		Contacts proponent to secure any needed adjustments due to appraised values.	
19.		Upon approval of appraisal and completion of any adjustments forwards to State Office for final processing.	Involved county commissioners or other body make comments.
20.	Notifies county of offered and selected lands of private exchange and requests comments. (Step is not necessary if accomplished during classification action.)		
21.	Reviews case file-- should include: EAR, Land Reports, USGS reports, approved appraisal, county comments, and classification; and Certificate of Inspection and Possession.		

<u>Step</u>	<u>BLM State Office</u>	<u>BLM District Office</u>	<u>Other</u>
22.	If any defect exists, forwards for appropriate action.		
23.	Issues decision calling for deeds, title evidence, publication, and tax deposit.		Applicant forwards data required in step #22.
24.	Upon receipt of data in step #23, forwards for title opinion.		Field Solicitor provides title opinion.
25.	Calls for additional evidence as required by Solicitor. Calls for Certificate of Possession if all is proper.		Applicant provides additional evidence if required.
26.			Field Solicitor provides final title opinion.
27.		Provides Certificate of Inspection and Possession.	
28.	Upon receipt of final title opinion (#26) and Certificate of Inspection and Possession (#27), issues decision accepting title to offered lands, and issues patent for selected lands.		

DETAILS ON SAMPLE CASES

Case	Acreage		Date exchange was completed	Appraised value		Current use of lands		Benefiting agency or organization
	Offered lands (transferred to Government)	Selected lands (transferred from Government)		Offered lands	Selected lands	Offered lands	Selected lands	
A	10,000	24,716	11/10/65	\$ 230,000	\$ 229,698	forest land	grazing, ranching	Forest Service
B	55	2,501	9/16/66	27,500	27,500	municipal golf course	grazing, ranching	Carlsbad, N. Mex.
C	301	10,320	4/26/67	105,000	103,000	AEC buffer zone (within national forest)	grazing, ranching	Atomic Energy Commission (will revert to Forest Service)
D	30	1,404	11/20/68	15,000	15,000	municipal golf course	grazing, ranching	Carlsbad, N. Mex.
E	2,782	20,624	1/12/70	233,100	227,207	part-forest land; part-consolidation of public lands (BLM)	grazing, ranching	Part-Forest Service; part-BLM
F	13,495	19,074	1/30/69	229,450	228,891	consolidation of public lands (BLM)	grazing, ranching	BLM
G	13,251	18,262	1/30/69	223,400	223,160	consolidation of public lands (BLM)	grazing, ranching	BLM
H	1,579	6,924	1/14/71	112,000	111,000	forest land	grazing, ranching	Forest Service
I	640	1,334	12/15/70	255,000	248,900	forest land	housing subdivision	Forest Service
J	660	1,068	2/2/71	223,000	203,900	forest land	housing subdivision	Forest Service
K	600	640	1/31/75	39,000	37,600	consolidation of public lands (BLM)	grazing, ranching	BLM
Total	<u>43,393</u>	<u>106,867</u>		<u>\$1,692,450</u>	<u>\$1,655,856</u>			

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

NUMBER OF ACRES AND VALUE OF LAND IN SAMPLE CASES

BY BENEFITING AGENCIES

10

Benefiting agency	Number of acres		Value of lands		Average value an acre	
	Private land received	Federal land transferred	Private land received	Federal land transferred	Private land received	Federal land transferred
Forest Service	13,108	38,907	\$1,011,900	\$ 852,677	\$ 77	\$22
Bureau of Land Management	29,899	53,835	530,150	657,679	18	12
Energy Research and Development Administration	301	10,320	105,000	103,000	349	10
Carlsbad, N. Mex.	85	3,905	42,500	42,500	500	11
Total	<u>43,393</u>	<u>106,867</u>	<u>\$1,692,450</u>	<u>\$1,655,856</u>	\$ <u>39</u>	<u>\$15</u>

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE



THIRD CLASS