

L-2000

LD 8047250

[Handwritten signature]

P - 2000

~~32~~

*Keep
Permanently*


L-2000

LF

5605

.L365

1263



Bureau of Land Management
Library
Bldg. 50, Denver Federal Center
Denver, CO 80225

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAW
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY

Interim Report X

United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

August 1963

BLM LIBRARY
RS 150A BLDG. 50
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER
P.O. BOX 25047
DENVER, CO 80225

ZT
0135

Foreword

The agricultural land law effectiveness study is an attempt to evaluate the significance of the traditional public land agricultural laws under present circumstances. It was conceived out of a growing awareness that, as the reservoir of public lands suitable for agriculture was reaching its lowest levels, the administration of the laws seemed to be demanding ever-increasing amount of time and public funds. Reviews of individual cases, more and more contributed the impression that in many respects and in many situations the law was a mockery. On the other hand, the bona fides were obvious in other cases.

False conclusions are easily derived for consideration of isolated cases. A decision, therefore, was made in 1961 to consider all cases which originated during the 1950's in the western States. In Alaska, it was possible to consider all homesteading since the homestead laws were extended to Alaska in 1898.

The study is being conducted for the most part by Bureau of Land Management personnel in connection with their regular assigned duties. Data are collected by field personnel and tabulated and analyzed by central office personnel.

All actions on applications filed during the 1950's have not been completed. Partial analyses are made from time to time to meet existing needs for information. This report is based on:

1. Actions on applications as of late 1962.
2. Examination in the summer of 1962 of entries patented as of late 1961.

BLM LIBRARY
RS 150A BLDG. 50
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER
P.O. BOX 25047
DENVER, CO 80225

Some Background

Behind the statistics in this report are people--people seeking to acquire some public lands for various reasons and under a great variety of circumstances. To describe the background of these attempts would be a job of heroic proportions for a qualified historian. The following brief comments are meant merely to suggest the nature of some of the forces at work in the several States.

Alaska--The Korean Conflict emphasizes the national defense significance of Alaska. Armed forces personnel stationed there include large numbers of men who are veterans of World War II. Military construction brings in many additional veterans. The homestead law permits veterans with sufficient service to earn title after seven months residence and no cultivation. Veterans in and out of the service can secure title to 160 acres with little difficulty. Homesteading increases. Mental Health grants to the Territory of Alaska in 1956 and Statehood grants in 1958 amounting to more than 100 million acres signal an end of Federal homesteading for all practical purposes. Homesteading is stimulated. Oil strikes on the Kenai Peninsula in 1957 also intensify interest. Statehood discussion exaggerates economic consequences of Statehood and leads to additional interest, and projects including the Detroit Fifty-niners, an ill fated colonizing attempt.

Arizona and New Mexico--High price of cotton after World War II and new development of underground water supplies lead to "killings" in the Southwest. Interest in desert lands skyrockets. State Supreme Court of Arizona rules that percolating underground waters in Arizona cannot be appropriated, ending opportunities under the Desert Land Act in Arizona for all intents and purposes. Pending entries saved by special legislation. Case records indicate traffic in entries, with large mortgages, and trading around of water supplies. Promotions in homesteads start in Arizona at end of period. Water scarcity general, with ground water levels dropping. New Mexico takes action and delimits areas of critical water supply where new entries are not allowed.

California--Large-scale promotions of desert land applications in Southern California lead to large numbers of applications, prosecutions for fraud, amendment of State law to bring public land promoters under State real estate code, and closing of large acreages to further desert land and homestead application. Attempt at promotions in Northern California stifled by prompt rejection action.

Idaho--Market for potatoes, development of heavy marketing, and drilling and pumping equipment combined with an available underground water supply and rich lands offer real opportunities under the Desert

Land Act. (Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 292, December 1958). End of period sees margins of possibilities, as development approaches lava beds and water supplies require long lift.

Nevada--Lure of Las Vegas leads to wide-scale promotion in small tracts. Promoters then take up the Desert Land Act and Pittman Act applications. Most of Nevada is Federally owned and some opportunity for cultivation in many desert basins, but rechargeable water supply is very limited as are markets. State follows a careful policy with respect to water avoiding mining of supplies of geological water. Nevada is the only State in which non-residents can make desert land applications.

Oregon--Development of Boardman industrial complex terminates some of the better agricultural opportunities on public lands in the State.

Colorado, Montana, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming--Modest opportunities receive local attention.

Interim Analysis

By almost any measure, except to the individuals involved, homesteading in the Western States during the decade of the 50's was a minor matter. A little more than 4,000 applications were filed, of which some 560 were approved to the extent of permitting the applicants to go upon the land to try their luck as homesteaders. By the end of 1962, a total of 230 homesteaders received patents while some 190 had given up. The remainder still had time to prove up.

From experience to date with the applications, the expected record for the period when it is finally closed looks as follows: about 14 percent of the applications will have been allowed and 86 percent rejected; of the allowed entries, 50-60 percent will be patented.

By States, about 60 percent of the allowances were in two States, Nevada and Utah, where 28 percent and 19 percent of the applications, respectively, were allowed. So far in Nevada, only 29 percent of the allowed entries have gone to patent with the outlook being that the final figure may be about 40 percent. Comparable Utah figures are 40 percent allowed and perhaps 65 percent patented.

Homesteading in Alaska, often referred to as the "last frontier", never did reach beyond minor proportions, considering the length of time and the great area of lands involved. Sixty-five years of homesteading in that State so far has led to about 10,000 claims. Of these, 3,250 have gone to patent, with some claims still pending. This indicates that eventually the total patented will amount to about 40 percent of the claims. This figure is highly influenced by the period 1944-1954 during which many World War II veterans could earn title simply by residence on the land for seven months. The averages before and immediately after this period both amounted to about 20 percent.

Applications under the Desert Land Act, applicable only in 13 western States, totalled about 20,000 in the 10-year period. Of these applicants, some 3,300 were permitted to go upon the land to develop it. By the end of 1962, a total of 1,250 has received patents while 1,100 had given up. Almost 1,000 still had time to reclaim the lands.

Experience to date indicates that eventually about 20 percent of the applications will have been allowed. Patents will probably issue for 50-60 percent of the allowed entries.

About two-thirds of the desert-land allowances were in the two States, Idaho and Nevada. In Idaho, a little more than 40 percent of the applicants were allowed compared to about 20 percent for Nevada.

ZT
0135

Agriculture Land In-Effectiveness
Study. Interim Report

Bureau of Land Management

August 1963

(

Patenting in Idaho is expected to run to about 60 percent of the allowances. The figures for Nevada are more uncertain and could run between 40-60 percent.

The Pittman Act, operable only in Nevada, was almost a complete failure. Out of 1,700 applications, 172 were allowed, and two went to patent by the end of 1962. Only a few remained uncanceled.

Activities initiated under these agricultural land laws during the 1950's resulted in passing about 300,000 acres in the western States into private ownership by late 1962. Better than one-third of this acreage was in Idaho (134,000 acres). Nevada was next with 46,000 acres and Arizona third with 27,000 acres. These laws did not prove to be a very significant means of getting lands into private ownership. Public sales during the same period transferred 1,200,000 acres out of public ownership.

In Alaska, homesteading has also not proved to be a means to get large areas into private ownership. Sixty-five years of homesteading resulted in the transfer of about 400,000 acres, about one-tenth of one percent of the land area of the State.

In terms of actual cultivation of lands, the objective of these laws, the results are even smaller. Studies in the summer of 1962 of the lands patented by 1961 showed a total of about 125,000 acres cultivated in the western States. About 60 percent of the cultivated lands were in Idaho. Most of the farming appears to be oriented to the livestock industry--alfalfa, grass, and small grains being the principal crops. Outside of these groups were potatoes (some 11,000 acres, mostly in Idaho), beans (some 5,000 acres, again chiefly in Idaho), safflower (about 5,000 acres, practically all in Arizona), and very small acreages of other crops.

Data on cultivation in Alaska are not yet tabulated. However, only about 25,000 acres are under cultivation in all of Alaska. In terms of acreage patented within the scope of these studies, cultivation amounted to almost 60 percent of the lands patented under the Desert Land Act, about 30 percent of the lands in the western States patented under the homestead acts, about two percent of the lands patented in Alaska under the homestead acts, and none of the lands patented under the Pittman Act.

By States, the percentage of patented land cultivated included about 70 percent for Idaho, 45 percent for Arizona, 40 percent for Nevada and Utah, 30 percent for California, and two percent for Alaska, listing only the States having patents for more than 15,000 acres.

In the western States, the percentage of entries in 1962 which were entirely devoted to non-farm uses or entirely out of economic production

or use varied from one-third to one-half in five States, one-fifth in three States and less than one-tenth in three States, including Idaho. By 1962, 40 percent of the entries had changed ownership in their entirety and another five percent partly. In Alaska, 84 percent of the entries were estimated to be unoccupied or devoted entirely to non-farm uses.

No attempt has yet been made to analyze the social costs of getting lands into private ownership during the 1950's via the agricultural land laws. For the purposes of getting an idea of what the magnitudes could be, in the preliminary analyses, an assumption was made of social costs of \$300 per application. This appears to be low, considering the costs involved in examination of the lands and analyses of the situation by the applicants and by the government, the flim-flams by bunco artists and the costs of the investigations and prosecutions, the costs of processing appeals and protests and holding hearings involving the government, the applicants, grazing users, and other interested parties, the costs of supplying information to the public aware of the fact that there are homestead laws still on the books, water and other investigations and actions by States and local governments, actions by the Better Business Bureau, newspapers, etc, etc.

If the social costs are only \$300, then the total costs for handling the applications filed in the western States during the 1950's was about \$8,000,000, or perhaps about \$20 per acre transferred to private ownership. These would be merely the costs of transfer-- costs of development would be additional and in individual cases can amount to as much as \$150 per acre.

If the nondevelopment social costs amount to \$1,000 per application, which is not unreasonable, then the costs of transfer could be close to \$75 per acre. During the 1950's, sales of small tracts averaged between \$40 and \$50 per acre while lands sold under the public sale act averaged close to \$10 per acre.

Especially if Idaho is eliminated from consideration, it seems altogether reasonable to conclude that quite often, if not generally, social costs of transfer of lands under the agricultural lands laws in the 1950's exceeded the raw land value of the transferred land.

Comments on the Summaries

The Request

Enclosed are copies of an analysis of data you submitted in connection with the Agricultural Land Law Effectiveness Study. As soon as possible, please send us your comments, including:

1. Your views as to the validity of the summary.
2. Any additional observations you can make based on your knowledge of the cases involved, such as any additional valleys (besides the mentioned) having any appreciable development as a result of the allowance of entries.
3. Your estimate of the acreage of the remaining unentered public land that is probably suitable for agricultural entry.

The Comments

Arizona

1. The summary presents an accurate picture of the development under the laws.
2. (a) Today, the larger percentage of crop production consists of "specialty crops" such as safflower. Well balanced agricultural development is lacking.

(b) Small marginal units are often used for speculation, with only the minimum development necessary to achieve patent. The successful agricultural developments in the desert valleys are large-scale.
3. Due to inadequate water supply and declining ground water levels, "there is no public land in Arizona suitable for agricultural entry."

California

1. (a) The cost of handling applications and disposing of entries is excessive in relation to the agricultural development achieved.

(b) Other Valleys that may have limited development are Mesquite, Fremont, and Fish Lake, located south of Kingston, northeast of Mojave, and northeast of Bishop, California, respectively.
2. Scattered parcels within the Imperial and Palo Verde Irrigation Districts may be suitable. 6,000 acres in Kern County, scattered south and west of Bakersfield, may be suitable for production of

alfalfa, field crops, and irrigated pasture if and when water becomes available under the California Water Plan. No other lands are potentially suitable for agricultural development due to lack of imported water and the scarcity of ground water.

Colorado

1. The summary is quite complete and informative.
2. All the major valleys having entries were mentioned in the summary. The valleys can more properly be described as canyons.
3. There are three areas in Colorado that may have small areas of potentially tillable land if economic factors and present surplus crop factors are altered by future events. These areas are: Cortez-Dove Creek Area (southwestern Colorado)--estimated potentially tillable acreage--1,500 acres; Gunnison County--estimated potentially tillable acreage--2,500 acres; and Timber Lake Creek Area (northwestern Colorado)--estimated potentially tillable acreage--1,500 acres.

Idaho

1. The summary is generally valid.
2. The statistics given in the summary are representative of the most favorable areas in Idaho. The chances of getting a desert land application approved at this time are probably less than 42 percent.
3. While opportunities for independent farm unit development are decreasing, there is increased opportunity for group or project type desert entry development.

About 150,000 acres, principally within the Snake River drainage area, are suitable for agricultural development if an adequate water supply can be obtained.

Montana

1. The summary confirms by statistics what has been suspected for a number of years: that obtaining title to public lands in Montana under the agricultural land laws is essentially dead.
2. Most of the areas analyzed are in private ownership and were patented many years ago. While we are unable to observe the effect of these entries on the local communities, we feel that the effect would be very insignificant.
3. We have no knowledge of any acreage which is suitable for agricultural entry in the State.

Nevada

1. A study for the period 1960-65 would produce a significantly different evaluation with regard to the amount of money being spent by entrymen in developing the land. Efforts today at irrigation, etc., are far more thorough than in the early 1950's. Generally good development results are presently being achieved. The economies of Lander and Eureka Counties have been particularly stimulated by the expenditures of entrymen.
2. There are approximately 250,000 acres susceptible of agricultural development under the present water policies, 30,000 of which are now under application. These potential agricultural lands are expected to be identified under the Master Unit System.

New Mexico

1. The summary as originally submitted appears to be valid.
2. (a) There are no unmentioned areas having any appreciable development as a result of allowance of entry.

(b) The most successful entries are on the better agricultural lands. Unsuccessful entries are often due to land promotion schemes, which induce entry by persons unfamiliar with farming in the arid southwest areas.
3. Most of the unentered public lands suitable for agricultural development are embraced in declared or closed underground water basins. There are between 3,000 and 4,000 acres of such land outside these basins, where a critical water situation exists. An example is the Crow Flats area located approximately 90 miles east of El Paso, Texas.

Oregon - Washington

1. While the statistical data is correct, the validity of the highlight summary is questionable. Specifically, in regarding an applicant's chances for getting an application approved, there is a wide range in the results for Oregon and Washington, and the sample taken was too small to yield reliable data.
2. There may be increasing opportunities for irrigation and pumping from reservoirs in Washington due to dam construction on the Columbia and Snake Rivers.
3. There are no more than 2,000 acres in Washington suitable for agricultural entry. In Oregon, 20,000 acres "may have some agricultural

potential." 15,000 of these acres are in the Fort Rock - Christmas Lake Valleys, 3,000 in the Paisley - Summer Lake Area, and 2,000 in the Harney - Virginia Valleys.

Utah

1. Without further development and irrigation, rainfall is generally insufficient for dry farming or disposition for cultivation in public land areas. Surface water is seriously over-obligated, precluding additional reclamation with surface water as the source of irrigation.

2. It is possible that a substantial area can eventually be brought under cultivation through utilization of the underground reservoir. A number of reclamation projects are planned for the State which will provide water for some new land, but are primarily planned as a means of providing supplemental water to established farms and to irrigation companies which have over-obligated the available water. It is estimated that the planned and proposed projects will bring into cultivation approximately 50,000 acres of public land.

3. The underground reservoir and the possibility of obtaining irrigation water from that source have not been fully explored. It is possible that a substantial area can eventually be brought under cultivation with the underground reservoir source of irrigation water. The expansion of the agricultural economy by this means will depend on the need for agricultural products and on the economic relationship of cost and returns. On the basis of meager information concerning the underground reservoir, it is our opinion that several valleys in the western part of the State do possess possibilities. On the basis of the scant information available, it is estimated that there is a potential reservoir of approximately 170,000 acres which may possibly be reclaimed by this means.

Wyoming

1. The statistics in the summary are considered valid and useful. The "Highlights" section should be amended to clearly spell out that the \$6.00 per acre cost of transfer from Federal to private ownership does not include the cost of reclaiming the land.

2. There is accelerated interest in public desert lands in the Saratoga vicinity of the Upper Platte River Valley, where a promotion is possible. There is an apparent surplus of surface water in the area, but no applications had been filed as of May 31, 1963. The accelerated interest is believed to be due to recent changes in the use of private land from grazing to cultivation for small grains and grass seed.

3. There are now 50,200 acres of potential arable public land in Wyoming.

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
ARIZONA

INTRODUCTION

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (the Homestead Acts, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The enclosed statement is a summary of statistics derived by January 1963, from that study of operations in Arizona. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results are based on partial data. The reliability of the results can be judged from the following summary:

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>		
Homestead applications	291	281	or	97%
Desert Land Applications	1,624	1,624	or	100%
Homestead entries	17	14	or	82%
Desert Land entries	172	163	or	95%
Patented entries	99	91*	or	92%
Acreage cultivated	11,367	10,172**	or	90%

* The utilization portion of the study covered entries that were patented prior to 1962

** The analysis covers only the crops listed as primary and secondary for each farm studied

HIGHLIGHTS

Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?

Answer: Homestead Acts 17 out of 281 or 6%
Desert Land Act 172 out of 1,624 or 11%

Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?

Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State Government, and the applicant (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$21 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $1,893 \times \$300 = 567,900 + 27,087 = \21 per acre. A total of 27,087 acres were patented by November 1, 1962.

Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands?

Answer: Homestead Acts 2 out of 14 or 14%
Desert Land Act 97 out of 163 or 60%

Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented?

Answer: In the summer of 1962,
64% were part time or full time farms.
3% were used for nonfarm purposes.
33% were not in use.

Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?

Answer: 11,367 out of 25,106 patented prior to 1962.

Question: What crops were raised in 1962 on the patented lands?

Answer: Safflower on 44% of the cultivated lands.
Cotton on 15% of the cultivated lands.
Other crops on 41% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What were the principal crops?

Answer: Safflower was grown on 44% of the acreage.
Cotton was grown on 15% of the acreage.
Grasses and fallow comprised 15%.
Barley (matured) was grown on 11% of the acreage.
Other crops were grown 15% of the acreage.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 35% had no cultivated land.
14% had less than 80 acres of cultivated land.
51% had more than 80 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where the larger farms located (those with more than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 34 were in the Centennial (Valley) Wash tributary of the Gila River, west of Saddle Mountain between Burnt Well and Cortez Butte (Maricopa County).
4 were just east of Tonopah in the valley of a small tributary of Centennial Wash (Maricopa County).
4 were just east of the Gillespie Dam in the Gila River Valley, near the Buckeye Hills (Maricopa County).
2 were in Avra Valley west of Brawley Wash and Santa Cruz River (Pima County).
1 was near confluence of Santa Rosa and Greens Washes (Western Pinal) County.
1 was in the Gila River Valley near Cotton Center, several miles South of Gillespie Dam (Maricopa County).

Question: Where were the entries with no cultivation?

Answer: 16 were in Centennial (Valley) Wash bounded by Big Horn, Eagle Tail and Gila Bend Mountains (Maricopa County).
10 were in or near the Hassayampa River Valley just west of Tonopah and Wintersburg (Maricopa County).
3 were in the Buckeye Hills area of the northern end of Rainbow Valley west of Waterman Wash (Maricopa County).
1 was in Castle Dome Plain just North of Muggins Mountains (Southwestern Yuma County).
1 was in Bill William's River Valley between Rawhide Mountain and the Buckskin Mountains (Yuma County).
1 was in the Kanab Creek Valley between the Vermilion and Shinarump Cliffs and the Coconino County line (northeastern Yuma County).

Question: In summary, where were the cultivated entries?

Answer: 41 were in Centennial (Valley) Wash.
8 were in valleys of small tributaries of Centennial Wash, west of the Hassayampa River.
6 were in the Gila River Valley.
2 were on Avra Valley.
1 was near the confluence of Santa Rosa and Greens Washes.
1 was in Sulphur Springs Valley.

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these entries?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
42% still held their lands.
58% had conveyed all their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950-January 1, 1960

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Homesteads:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	264	17	281	2	12	14
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>10</u>	-	-	<u>3</u>
Total	-	-	<u>291</u>	-	-	<u>17</u>
<u>Desert Land Act:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	1,452	172	1,624	97	66	163
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>0</u>	-	-	<u>9</u>
Total	-	-	<u>1,624</u>	-	-	<u>172</u>
;						
<hr/>						
GRAND TOTAL						
Acted on by 11/1/62	1,716	199	1,905	99	88	177
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>10</u>	-	-	<u>12</u>
Total	-	-	<u>1,915</u>	-	-	<u>199</u>

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Full-time farms	3
Part-time farms	55
Rural residence	1
Other non-farm use	2
Abandoned	<u>30</u>
Total for which data available	91

C. Transfers of Patented Lands - Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	53
None	<u>38</u>
Total for which data available	91

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
0	32
1-10	2
11-20	3
21-40	3
41-80	5
81-160	12
161-320	<u>34</u>
Total entries for which information available	91
Total acreage cultivated	11,367 acres

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season (Major & Secondary Crops)

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Safflower	4,468
Fallow and Grass	1,575
Cotton	1,568
Barley (matured)	1,075
Pasture and hay	766
Other	<u>720</u>
Total acreage reported	10,172

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Safflower	4,468
Grass plus fallowed land	1,575
Cotton	1,568
Barley (matured)	1,075
Alfalfa	535
Grain Sorghum	492
Irrigated Pasture	231
Orchard	120
Vineyard	100
Row Crop (unidentified)	8
	<hr/> 10,172

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
CALIFORNIA

Introduction

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (the Homestead Acts, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The enclosed statement is a summary of statistics derived by January 1963, from that study of operations in California. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results are based on partial data. The reliability of the results can be judged from the following summary:

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>
Homestead applications	636	624 or 98%
Desert Land applications	8,723	8,703 or 99%
Homestead entries	50	40 or 80%
Desert land entries	443	315 or 71%
Patented entries	117	106* or 90%
Acreage cultivated	4,568	4,533**or 99%

* The utilization portion of the study covered entries that were patented prior to 1962 (100 entries - Riverside Land Office plus 6 entries - Sacramento Land Office).

** The analysis covers only the crops listed as primary and secondary for each farm studied.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?
- Answer: Homestead Acts 50 out of 624 or 8%
Desert Land Act 443 out of 8,703 or 5%
- Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?
- Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State government, and the applicants (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$167 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $9,189 \times \$300 = \$2,756,700 \div 16,525 = \167 per acre.
A total of 16,525 acres was patented by November 1, 1962.
- Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands:
- Answer: Homestead Acts 27 out of 40 or 68%
Desert Land Act 90 out of 315 or 29%
- Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented:
- Answer: In the summer of 1962,
54% were part time or full time farms.
7% were used for nonfarm purposes.
39% were not in use.
- Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?
- Answer: 4,568 out of 15,415 patented prior to 1962.
- Question: What crops were raised in 1962 on the patented lands?
- Answer: Pasture and hay crops on 47% of the cultivated lands.
Small grains on 28% of the cultivated lands.
Orchard on 15% of the cultivated lands.
Other crops on 10% of the cultivated lands.
- Question: What were the principal crops?
- Answer: Alfalfa was grown on 33% of the acreage.
Orchard was maintained on 15% of the acreage.
Grain sorghum was grown on 11% of the acreage.
Irrigated pasture was maintained on 11% of the acreage.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 48% had no cultivated land.
38% had less than 80 acres of cultivated land.
14% had more than 80 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where were the larger farms located (those with more than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 6 were in Mojave River Valley (San Bernadino County).
4 were along East Highline Canal (Imperial County).
1 was in Alamo River Valley (Imperial County).
1 was along McCoy Wash in Palo Verde Valley (Riverside County).
1 was in Coachella Valley (Riverside County).
1 was south of Cantil and northeast of Mojave (south-eastern Kern County).
1 was in Pit River Valley, between Essex and Kelley Reservoirs (Modoc County).

Question: Where were the entries with no cultivation?

Answer: 15 were along West Side Main Canal (Imperial County).
9 were in Mojave River Valley (San Bernadino County).
6 were along East Highline Canal (Imperial County).
5 were in Chuckwalla Valley (Riverside County).
3 were just north of Boron, 2 were between the El Paso and Rand Mountains, and 1 was southeast of Cross Mountain, (Kern County).
2 were in Kelso Creek Valley (Kern County).
2 were just west of Buena Vista Lake in McKettrick Valley (Kern County).
1 was in Carrizo Creek Valley (San Diego County).
1 was between the San Marcos Mountains and San Diego Aqueduct (San Diego County).
1 was southeast of Mineral Spring in Ivanpah Valley (San Bernadino County).
1 was along McCoy Wash in Palo Verde Valley (Riverside County).
1 was in Eureka Valley (Inyo County).
1 was along Dry Creek tributary of the Yuba River (Yuba County).

Question: In summary, where were the cultivated entries?

Answer: 15 were in Mojave River Valley.
10 were along East Highline Canal.
8 were in Coachella Valley.
8 were in Palo Verde Valley.

Answer: 3 were along West Side Main Canal.
2 were in Alamo River Valley.
1 was along Coachella Canal.
The remaining 8 were in 8 separate valleys.

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these entries?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
47% still held their lands.
45% had conveyed all their lands.
8% had conveyed part of their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950 - January 1, 1959

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
Homesteads:						
Acted on by 11/1/62	574	50	624	27	13	40
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>12</u>	-	-	<u>10</u>
Total	-	-	636	-	-	50
Desert Land Act:						
Acted on by 11/1/62	8,263	443	8,703	90	225	315
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>20</u>	-	-	<u>128</u>
Total	-	-	8,723	-	-	443
<hr/>						
GRAND TOTAL						
Acted on by 11/1/62	8,837	593	9,327	117	238	455
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>32</u>			<u>138</u>
			9,359			593

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Full-time farms	51
Part-time farms	6
Rural residence	7
Other non-farm use	1
Abandoned	<u>41</u>
	106

C. Transfers of Patented Lands - Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	48
Part of entry	8
None	<u>50</u>
Total for which data available	106

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
0	51
1-10	3
11-20	3
21-40	10
41-80	24
81-160	12
161-320	<u>3</u>
Total entries for which information available	106
Total acreage cultivated	4,568 acres

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season (Major & Secondary Crops)

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Pasture and hay	2,130
Small grains	771
Orchard	687
Grain sorghum	500
Other crops	<u>445</u>
Total acreage reported	4,533

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Alfalfa	1,600
Orchard	687
Irrigated pasture	530
Grain sorghum	500
Rye	352
Oats	314
Cotton	260
Row Crops (n.e.s.)	128
Barley	105
Potatoes	55
Vineyard	<u>2</u>
	4,533

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
COLORADO

Introduction

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (The Homestead Acts, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The attached statement is a summary of statistics derived by January 1963, from that study of operations in Colorado. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results can be judged from the following summary:

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>	
Homestead applications	456	456	or 100%
Desert land applications	69	66	or 96%
Homestead entries	56	50	or 89%
Desert land entries	27	20	or 74%
Patented entries	50	35*	or 70%
Acres cultivated	2,482	2,442**	or 98%

* The utilization portion of the study covered entries that were patented prior to 1962.

** The analysis covers only the crops listed as primary and secondary for each farm studied.

HIGHLIGHTS

Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?

Answer: Homestead Acts 56 out of 456 or 12%
Desert Land Act 27 out of 66 or 41%

Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?

Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State Government, and the applicant (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$19 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $509 \times \$300 = 152,700$; $8,219 = \$19$ per acre.
A total of 8,219 acres was patented by November 1, 1962.

Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands?

Answer: Homestead Acts 35 out of 50 or 70%
Desert Land Act 15 out of 20 or 75%

Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented?

Answer: In the summer of 1962,
82% were part time or full time farms.
9% were not in use.
9% were used for nonfarm purposes.

Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?

Answer: 2,482 out of 6,204 acres patented prior to 1962.

Question: What crops were raised in 1962?

Answer: Pasture and hay on 41% of the cultivated lands.
Summer fallow comprised 19% of the cultivated lands.
Pinto beans on 18% of the cultivated lands.
Small grains on 16% of the cultivated lands.
Other crops on 6% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What were the principal crops?

Answer: Irrigated pasture was maintained on 32% of the acreage.
Summer fallow comprised 19% of the acreage
Pinto beans were grown on 18% of the acreage.
Wheat was grown on 15% of the acreage.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 14% had no cultivated land.
54% had less than 80 acres of cultivated land
32% had more than 80 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where were the larger farms located (those with more than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 3 were between Roaring Fork and Lone Pine Creek tributaries of the North Platte River, and 1 along North Fork of the North Platte River (Jackson County). 2 were in Sandstone Creek Valley and 1 was in Cross Canyon (Montezuma County). 1 was in Summit Canyon and 1 was along Basin Creek tributary of the San Miguel River (San Miguel County). 1 was along the Colorado River between its confluences with Williams Fork and Troublesome Creek tributaries (Grand County). 1 was between Morgan and Maudlin Gulches, tributaries of the Yampa River (Moffat County).

Question: Where were the entries with no cultivation?

Answer: 1 was in Cross Canyon (Dolores County).
1 was between Sandstone Creek and Cross Canyon (Montezuma County).
1 was between the Rio Grande River and La Garito Creek (Saguauche County).
1 was in Huerfano River Valley (Huerfano County).
1 was in Grand Valley (Mesa County).

Question: In summary, where were the cultivated entries?

Answer: 6 were in Cross Canyon.
4 were along tributaries of the North Platte River.
4 were in Dolores River Valley (Dolores County).
2 were in the Colorado River Valley.
2 were in Monument Creek Valley (Dolores County).
2 were in Sandstone Creek Valley.
2 were in Yellow Jacket Canyon (Montezuma County).
8 were in 8 separate valleys.

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these lands?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
77% still held their lands.
23% had conveyed all their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950 - January 1, 1960

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Homesteads:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	400	56	456	35	15	50
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	-	-	-	6
Total	-	-	456	-	-	56
<u>Desert Land Act:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	39	27	66	15	5	20
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	3	-	-	7
Total	-	-	69	-	-	27
<hr/>						
GRAND TOTAL						
Acted on by 11/1/62	439	83	522	50	20	70
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	3			13
Total	-	-	525			83

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Full-time farms	11
Part-time farms	18
Rural Residence	0
Other non-farm use	3
Abandoned	<u>3</u>
Total	35

C. Transfers of Patented Lands-Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	8
None	<u>27</u>
Total	35

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
0	5
1-10	2
11-20	4
21-40	6
41-80	7
81-160	6
161-320	<u>5</u>
Total entries	35
Total acreage cultivated	2,482 acres

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season (Major and Secondary Crops)

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Pasture and hay	1,006
Summer fallow	466
Pinto beans	450
Small grains	392
Other	<u>128</u>
Total acreage reported	2,442

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Irrigated pasture	770
Summer fallow	466
Pinto beans	450
Wheat	372
Hay	135
Alfalfa	101
Introduced grasses	76
Flood plain pasture	42
Oats	20
Orchard	10
Total acreage reported	<u>2,442</u>

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
IDAHO

Introduction

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (the Homestead Act, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The attached statement is a summary of statistics derived by January, 1963, from that study of operations in Idaho. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results can be judged from the following summary:

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>		
Homestead applications	206	198	or	96%
Desert land applications	3,144	3,051	or	97%
Homestead entries	27	20	or	74%
Desert land entries	1,277	1,038	or	81%
Patented entries	641	540*	or	84%
Acres cultivated	74,011	59,172**	or	80%

* The utilization portion of the study covered entries that were patented prior to 1962 (or 540 entries).

** The analysis covers only the crops listed as primary and secondary for each farm studied.

HIGHLIGHTS

Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?

Answer: Homestead Acts 27 out of 198 or 14%
Desert Land Act 1,277 out of 3,051 or 42%

Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?

Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State Government, and the applicant (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$7 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $3,003 \times \$300 = \$900,900$; $134,134 = \$7$ per acre.
A total of 134,134 acres were patented by November 1, 1962.

Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands?

Answer: Homestead Acts 12 out of 20 or 60%
Desert Land Act 629 out of 1,038 or 61%

Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented?

Answer: In the summer of 1962,
94% were part time or full time farms.
5% were not in use.
1% were used for nonfarm purposes.

Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?

Answer: 74,011 out of 110,323 acres patented prior to 1962.

Question: What crops were raised in 1962 on patented lands?

Answer: Pasture and hay crops on 41% of the cultivated lands.
Small grains on 23% of the cultivated lands.
Potatoes on 19% of the cultivated lands.
Other crops on 17% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What were the principal crops?

Answer: Alfalfa was grown on 28% of the acreage.
Potatoes were grown on 19% of the acreage.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 7% had no cultivated land.
34% had less than 80 acres of cultivated land.
59% had more than 80 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where were the larger farms located (those with more than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 233 were in the Snake River Valley, mostly on stream benches and along the valleys of many small tributaries. 24 were distributed along Goose Creek and 13 were located in the Raft River Valley (Cassia County). 29 were in the northwestern quarter of Jefferson County near Mud Lake and Jefferson Reservoir. 16 were in the Big Lost River and Little Lost River Valleys (Butte and Custer Counties). 3 were in the Lemhi River Valley (Lemhi County). 2 were near Blue Creek just north of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation (Owyhee County).

Question: Where were the entries with no cultivation:

Answer: 9 were in the Snake River Valley (Bingham, Jerome, and Lincoln Counties). 8 were in the Big Lost River and Little Lost River Valleys (Custer County). 7 were in the immediate vicinity of Raft River and Goose Creek (Cassia County). 6 were near Montevue and Mud Lake (Jefferson County). 3 were in the vicinity of Little Wood River (Lincoln County). 2 were in the Boise River Valley (Canyon County). 1 was in the Salmon River Valley (Blaine County). 1 was along the French Creek tributary of the Salmon River (W. Idaho County).

Question: In summary, where were the cultivated entries?

Answer: 76% were in the Snake River Valley complex, including 10% concentrated near Raft River and Goose Creek. 6% were near Mud Lake and Jefferson Reservoir in Jefferson County. 18% were in 13 other valley and bench locations.

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these lands?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
53% still held their lands.
40% had conveyed all their lands.
7% had conveyed part of their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950-January 1, 1960

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Homesteads:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	171	27	198	12	8	20
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>8</u>	-	-	<u>7</u>
Total	-	-	206	-	-	27
 <u>Desert Land Act:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	1,774	1,277	3,051	629	409	1,038
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	93	-	-	<u>239</u>
Total	-	-	3,144	-	-	1,277
 <hr/>						
GRAND TOTAL						
Acted on by 11/1/62	1,945	1,304	3,249	641	417	1,058
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>101</u>			<u>246</u>
Total	-	-	3,350			1,304

4

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Full-time farms	491
Part-time farms	14
Rural Residence	0
Other non-farm use	8
Abandoned	<u>27</u>
Total	540

C. Transfers of Patented Lands-Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	218
Part of entry	37
None	<u>285</u>
Total	540

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
0	37
1-10	21
11-20	17
21-40	59
41-80	86
81-160	133
161-320	<u>187</u>
Total entries	540
Total acreage cultivated	74,011 acres

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season (Major and Secondary Crops)

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Pasture and hay	24,060
Small Grains	13,852
Potatoes	11,121
Other	<u>10,139</u>
Total acreage reported	59,172

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Alfalfa	16,247
Potatoes	11,121
Barley	5,555
Mixed small grains	5,467
Beans	4,192
Row Crops (n.c.s.)	4,048
Irrigated pasture	3,011
Hay	2,774
Wheat	2,146
Dry pasture	1,903
Oats	478
Rye	206
Grass	205
Clover	125
Corn	118
Orchard	37
Grain Sorghum	30
Safflower	4
All other crops	<u>1,505</u>
Total acreage reported	59,172

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
MONTANA

Introduction

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (the Homestead Act, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The attached statement is a summary of statistics derived by January 1963, from that study of operations in Montana. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results can be judged from the following summary:

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>	
Homestead applications	126	126	or 100%
Desert land applications	16	16	or 100%
Homestead entries	4	4	or 100%
Desert land entries	8	7	or 88%
Patented entries	9	7*	or 78%
Acres cultivated	581	581**	or 100%

* The utilization portion of the study covered entries that were patented prior to 1962.

** The analysis covers all crops reported for each farm studied.

HIGHLIGHTS

Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?

Answer: Homestead Acts 4 out of 126 or 5%
Desert Land Act 8 out of 16 or 50%

Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?

Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State Government, and the applicant (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$34 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $141 \times \$300 = \$42,300 \div 1,242 = \$34$ per acre.
A total of 1,242 acres were patented by November 1, 1962.

Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands?

Answer: Homestead Acts 4 out of 4 or 100%
Desert Land Act 5 out of 7 or 71%

Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented?

Answer: In the summer of 1962,
71% were full time farms.
29% were part time farms.

Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?

Answer: 581 out of 1,022 patented prior to 1962.

Question: What crops were raised in 1962 on patented lands?

Answer: Hay on 48% of the cultivated lands.
Wheat on 39% of the cultivated lands.
Alfalfa on 13% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 71% had less than 80 acres of cultivated land.
29% had more than 80 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where were the larger farms located (those with more than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 1 homestead was in the Marias River Valley between Sterrenberg and Prospect (Toole County). 160 acres cultivated in 1962.
1 desert land entry was between Cabin and Crystal Creeks near Beaverhead National Forest (Beaverhead County). 237 acres cultivated in 1962.

Question: Where were the smaller farms located (those with less than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 1 enlarged homestead (18 acres cultivated in 1962) and 1 desert land entry (25 acres cultivated in 1962) were along the Thirtymile Creek tributary of the Milk River (Blaine County).
1 enlarged homestead was in Milk River Valley near confluence of Milk River and Whitewater Creek (Phillips County). 18 acres cultivated in 1962.
1 homestead was in Whitewater Creek valley (Phillips County). 50 acres cultivated in 1962.
1 desert land entry was between Clarks Fork and Rock Creek tributaries of the Yellowstone River (Carbon County). 73 acres cultivated in 1962.

Question: In summary, where were the cultivated entries?

Answer: 2 were in Thirtymile Creek Valley
5 were in 5 separate valleys.

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these lands?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
71% still held their lands.
29% had conveyed all their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950 - January 1, 1960

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Homesteads:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	122	4	126	4	-	4
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	<u>126</u>	-	-	<u>4</u>
 <u>Desert Land Act:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	8	8	16	5	2	7
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	-	-	-	<u>1</u>
Total	-	-	<u>16</u>	-	-	<u>8</u>
	—	—	—	—	—	—
 GRAND TOTAL						
Acted on by 11/1/62	130	12	142	9	2	11
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	-	-	-	<u>1</u>
Total	-	-	<u>142</u>	-	-	<u>12</u>

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Full-time farms	5
Part-time farms	<u>2</u>
Total	7

C. Transfers of Patented Lands-Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	2
None	<u>5</u>
Total	7

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
0-10	0
11-20	2
21-40	1
41-80	2
81-160	1
161-320	<u>1</u>
Total entries	7
Total acreage cultivated	581 acres

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Hay	280
Wheat	228
Alfalfa	<u>73</u>
Total acreage reported	581

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
NEVADA

Introduction

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (the Homestead Acts, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The enclosed statement is a summary of statistics derived by January 1963, from that study of operations in Nevada. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results are based on partial data. The reliability of the results can be judged from the following summary:

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>		
Pittman applications	1,752	1,718	or	98%
Homestead applications	634	622	or	98%
Desert land applications	4,684	4,576	or	98%
Pittman Act permits	172	156	or	91%
Homestead entries	173	139	or	80%
Desert land entries	861	423	or	49%
Patented entries	213	115-117*	or	54-55%
Area cultivated	10,300	9,300**	or	90%

* The utilization portion of the study covered entries that were patented prior to 1962 (or 117 entries).

** The analysis covers only the crops listed as primary and secondary for each farm studied.

HIGHLIGHTS

Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?

Answer: Pittman Act 172 out of 1,718 or 10%
Homestead Acts 173 out of 622 or 28%
Desert Land Act 861 out of 4,576 or 19%

Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?

Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State government, and the applicants (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$42 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $6,428 \times \$300 = \$1,928,400 \div 46,308 = \42 per acre.

Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands:

Answer: Pittman Act 2 out of 156 or 1%
Homestead Acts 51 out of 139 or 37%
Desert Land Act 160 out of 423 or 38%

Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented?

Answer: In the summer of 1962,
56% were part time or full time farms.
22% were used for nonfarm purposes.
22% were not in use.

Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?

Answer: 10,300.

Question: What crops were raised in 1962 on the patented lands?

Answer: Pasture and hay crops on 57% of the cultivated lands.
Small grains on 35% of the cultivated lands.
Other crops on 8% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What were the principal crops?

Answer: Alfalfa was grown on 49% of the acreage.
Wheat was grown on 25% of the acreage.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 41% had no cultivated land.
15% had less than 80 acres of cultivated land.
44% had more than 80 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where were the larger farms located (those with more than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 35 were in Kings River and Quinn River Valleys (Humboldt County).
5 were in Amargosa Desert and Ash Meadow, and three were in Pahrump Valley (Nye County).
2 were in Reese Valley (Lander County).
2 were in Granite Basin (Washoe and Pershing Counties)
1 was in Carson Valley (Douglas County), Dixie Valley (Churchill County) and Meadow Valley Wash (Lincoln County).

Question: Where were the entries with no cultivation?

Answer: 17 were in Carson Valley (Douglas and Ormsby Counties).
6 were in the East Yerington area (Lyon County).
5 were in Fish Lake Valley (Esmeralda County).
The remainder were in several separate valleys.

Question: In summary, where were the cultivated entries?

Answer: 73% were in 3 valleys (Kings River, Quinn River, and Amargosa Desert-Ash Meadow).
27% were in 10 valleys.

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these entries?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
50% still held their lands.
42% had conveyed all their lands.
8% had conveyed part of their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950-January 1, 1960

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Pittman Act:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	1,546	172	1,718	2	154	156
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>34</u>	-	-	<u>16</u>
Total	-	-	1,752	-	-	172
<u>Homesteads:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	449	173	622	51	88	139
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>12</u>	-	-	<u>34</u>
Total	-	-	634	-	-	173
<u>Desert Land Act:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	3,715	861	4,576	160	263	423
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>108</u>	-	-	<u>438</u>
Total	-	-	4,684	-	-	861
<hr/>						
GRAND TOTAL						
Acted on by 11/1/62	5,710	1,206	6,916	213	505	718
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>154</u>			<u>488</u>
Total	-	-	7,070			1,206

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>Patented No. of Entries</u>
Full-time farms	56
Part-time farms	10
Rural residence	23
Other non-farm use	3
Abandoned	<u>25</u>
Total for which data available	117

C. Transfers of Patented Lands - Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	48
Part of Entry	10
None	<u>58</u>
Total for which data available	116

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
0	48
1-10	2
11-20	2
21-40	5
41-80	8
81-160	29
161-320	<u>21</u>
Total entries for which information available	115
Total acreage cultivated	10,300 acres

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season (Major & Secondary Crops, 116 Entries)

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Pasture and hay	5,335
Small grains	3,218
Other	<u>743</u>
Total acreage reported	9,296

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Alfalfa	4,507
Wheat	2,313
Row crops (n.c.s.)	390
Clover	320
Oats	295
Barley	270
Corn	260
Hay	238
Irrigated pasture	210
Mixed small grains	160
Rye	150
Grass	60
Grain Sorghum	30
Peanuts	30
Safflower	30
Beans	20
Potatoes	8
Cotton	3
Melons	<u>2</u>
	9,296

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
NEW MEXICO

Introduction

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (the Homestead Acts, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The attached statement is a summary of statistics derived by January 1963, from that study of operations in New Mexico. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results can be judged from the following summary:

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>
Homestead applications	756	754 or 98%
Desert land applications	735	708 or 96%
Homestead entries	70	49 or 70%
Desert land entries	108	61 or 57%
Patented entries	65	50* or 76%
Acres cultivated	3,126	3,082** or 99%

* The utilization portion of the study covered entries that were patented prior to 1962.

** The analysis covers only the crops listed as primary and secondary for each farm studied.

HIGHLIGHTS

Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?

Answer: Homestead Acts 70 out of 754 or 9%
Desert Land Act 108 out of 708 or 15%

Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?

Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State Government, and the applicant (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$44 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $1,394 \times \$300 = \$418,200$; $9,465 = \$44$ per acre.
A total of 9,465 acres were patented by November 1, 1962.

Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands?

Answer: Homestead Acts 32 out of 49 or 65%
Desert Land Act 33 out of 61 or 54%

Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented?

Answer: In the summer of 1962,
80% were part time or full time farms.
14% were not in use.
6% were used for nonfarm purposes.

Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?

Answer: 3,126 out of 7,135 acres patented prior to 1962.

Question: What crops were raised in 1962 on patented lands?

Answer: Various row crops on 34% of the cultivated lands.
Cotton on 22% of the cultivated lands.
Grain sorghum on 17% of the cultivated lands.
Grass and fallowed land comprised 12% of the cultivated lands.
Pasture and hay crops on 12% of the cultivated lands.
Other crops on 3% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What were the principal crops?

Answer: Cotton was grown on 22% of the acreage.
Grain sorghum was grown on 17% of the acreage.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 24% had no cultivated land.
40% had less than 80 acres of cultivated land.
36% had more than 80 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where were the larger farms located (those with more than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 7 were northeast of Victorio Mountains (Luna County).
5 were between the Coyote Hills and Lisbon (Hidalgo County).
2 were between the Carrizalillo Hills and Tres Hermanas Mountains (Luna County).
2 were between the Corundas Mountains and Brokeoff Mountains (Otero County).
1 was in Rio Grande River Valley south of Turney (Dona Ana County).
1 was in Pecos River Valley (De Baca County).

Question: Where were the entries with no cultivation?

Answer: 4 were in Tularosa Valley northwest of Newman (Otero County).
1 was in Animas River Valley (San Juan County).
1 was in San Juan River Valley (San Juan County).
1 was in La Plata River Valley (San Juan County).
1 was in Rio Grande River Valley (Bernalillo County).
1 was northeast of the East Potrillo Mountains (Dona Ana County).
1 was between Trujillo and Tierra Blanca Creeks in Rio Grande River Valley (Sierra County).
1 was west of the Sacramento Mountains between Alamagordo and Valmont (Otero County).
1 was in or near Last Chance Canyon (Eddy County).

Question: In summary, where were the cultivated entries?

Answer: 8 were northeast of the Victorio Mountains.
8 were southeast of Lordsberg, north of the Coyote Hills.
8 were in the Rio Grande River Valley.
14 were in 8 separate valleys.

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these lands?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
68% still held their lands.
20% had conveyed all their lands.
12% had conveyed part of their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950-January 1, 1960

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Homesteads:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	684	70	754	32	17	49
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>2</u>	-	-	<u>21</u>
Total	-	-	<u>756</u>	-	-	<u>70</u>
<u>Desert Land Act:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	600	108	708	33	28	61
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>27</u>	-	-	<u>47</u>
Total	-	-	<u>735</u>	-	-	<u>108</u>
GRAND TOTAL						
Acted on by 11/1/62	1,284	178	1,462	65	45	110
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>29</u>			<u>68</u>
Total	-	-	<u>1,491</u>			<u>178</u>

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Full-time farms	26
Part-time farms	14
Rural residence	3
Abandoned	<u>7</u>
Total	50

C. Transfers of Patented Lands - Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	10
Part of entry	6
None	<u>34</u>
Total	50

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
0	12
1-10	2
11-20	5
21-40	7
41-80	6
81-160	16
161-320	<u>2</u>
Total entries	50
Total acreage cultivated	3,126

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season (Major and Secondary Crops)

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Various row crops	1,036
Cotton	678
Grain sorghum	510
Grass and fallowed land	380
Pasture and hay	376
Other crops	<u>102</u>
Total acreage reported	3,082

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Row crops (n.e.s.)	1,036
Cotton	678
Crain sorghum	510
Grass and fallowed land	380
Alfalfa	215
Irrigated pasture	161
Melons	84
Orchard	<u>18</u>
Total acreage reported	<u>3,082</u>

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
OREGON

Introduction

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (The Homestead Acts, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The attached statement is a summary of statistics derived by January 1963, from that study of operations in Oregon. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results can be judged from the following summary.

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>		
Homestead applications	140	140	or	100%
Desert land applications	240	236	or	98%
Homestead entries	14	14	or	100%
Desert land entries	113	101	or	89%
Patented entries	49	35*	or	71%
Acres cultivated	1,768	1,746**	or	98%

* The utilization portion of the study covered entries that were patented prior to 1962.

** The analysis covers only the crops listed as primary and secondary for each farm studied.

HIGHLIGHTS

Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?

Answer: Homestead Acts 14 out of 140 or 10%
Desert Land Act 113 out of 236 or 48%

Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?

Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State Government, and the applicant (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$15 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $364 \times \$300 = \$109,200 \div 7,414 = \$15$ per acre.
A total of 7,414 acres were patented by November 1, 1962.

Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands?

Answer: Homestead Acts 11 out of 14 or 79%
Desert Land Act 38 out of 101 or 38%

Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented?

Answer: In the summer of 1962,
92% were part time or full time farms.
8% were used for nonfarm purposes.

Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?

Answer: 1,768 out of 4,007 acres patented prior to 1962.

Question: What crops were raised in 1962 on patented lands?

Answer: Pasture and hay crops on 91% of the cultivated lands.
Other crops on 9% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What were the principal crops?

Answer: Alfalfa was grown on 68% of the acreage.
Hay was grown on 11% of the acreage.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 6% had no cultivated land.
83% had less than 80 acres of cultivated land.
11% had more than 80 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where were the larger farms located (those with more than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 2 desert land entries (320 acres each) were in the Columbia River Valley west of the Umatilla River (Morrow County).
1 desert land entry (200 acres) was in the Columbia River Valley east of the Umatilla River (Umatilla County).
1 desert land entry (280 acres) is between Silver Lake and Thorn Lake (Lake County).

Question: Where were the entries with no cultivation?

Answer: 1 desert land entry (160.40 acres) was in the Owyhee River Valley (Malheur County).
1 homestead (70.14 acres) was in the Umpqua River Valley near the confluence of the Umpqua River and Yellow Creek (Douglas County).

Question: In summary, where were the cultivated entries?

Answer: 10 were in the Owyhee River Valley complex near Jordan, Dry and Soldier Creeks.
5 were in the Columbia River Valley complex.
18 were in 14 separate valleys.

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these lands?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
54% still held their lands.
35% had conveyed all their lands.
11% had conveyed part of their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950-January 1, 1960

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Homesteads:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	126	14	140	11	3	14
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	<u>140</u>	-	-	<u>14</u>
<u>Desert Land Act:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	123	113	236	38	63	101
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>4</u>	-	-	<u>12</u>
Total	-	-	<u>240</u>	-	-	<u>113</u>

GRAND TOTAL						
Acted on by 11/1/62	249	127	376	49	66	115
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>4</u>			<u>12</u>
Total	-	-	<u>380</u>			<u>127</u>

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Full-time farms	27
Part-time farms	5
Rural residence	3
Total	<u>35</u>

C. Transfers of Patented Lands - Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	13
Part of entry	3
None	19
Total	<u>35</u>

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
0	2
1-10	7
11-20	7
21-40	8
41-80	7
81-160	1
161-320	3
Total entries	<u>35</u>
Total acreage cultivated	1,768 acres

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season (Major and Secondary Crops)

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Pasture and hay	1,587
Other crops	159
Total acreage reported	<u>1,746</u>
Alfalfa	1,192
Hay	195
Irrigated pasture	150
Melons	130
Dry pasture	50
Rye	28
Unknown	1
Total acreage reported	<u>1,746</u>

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
UTAH

Introduction

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (the Homestead Acts, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The attached statement is a summary of statistics derived by January 1963, from that study of operations in Utah. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results can be judged from the following summary:

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>	
Homestead applications	776	775	or 99%
Desert land applications	523	520	or 99%
Homestead entries	145	93	or 64%
Desert land entries	148	107	or 72%
Patented entries	119	104*	or 87%
Acres cultivated	8,217	7,576**	or 93%

* The utilization portion of the study covered entries that were patented prior to 1962.

** The analysis covers only the crops listed as primary and secondary for each farm studied.

HIGHLIGHTS

Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?

Answer: Homestead Acts 145 out of 775 or 19%
Desert Land Act 148 out of 520 or 28%

Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?

Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State Government, and the applicant (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$14 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $1,202 \times \$300 = \$360,600 \div 25,206 = \$14$ per acre.
A total of 25,206 acres were patented by November 1, 1962.

Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands?

Answer: Homestead Acts 58 out of 93 or 62%
Desert Land Act 61 out of 107 or 57%

Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented?

Answer: In the summer of 1962,
82% were part time or full time farms.
14% were not in use.
4% were used for nonfarm purposes.

Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?

Answer: 8,217 out of 21,561 acres patented prior to 1962.

Question: What crops were raised in 1962 on patented lands?

Answer: Pasture and hay crops on 52% of the cultivated lands.
Small grains on 25% of the cultivated lands.
Other crops on 23% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What were the principal crops?

Answer: Pasture was maintained on 26% of the acreage.
Alfalfa was grown on 23% of the acreage.
Wheat was grown on 13% of the acreage.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 17% had no cultivated land.
47% had less than 80 acres of cultivated land.
36% had more than 80 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where were the larger farms located (those with more than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 17 were in the Montezuma Canyon-East Canyon Wash complex (San Juan County).
4 were in the Black Rock Desert area, 3 between Clear Lake and Flowell, 1 between Hatton and Meadow (Millard County).
3 were in southeastern Dugway Valley between the Simpson and McDowell Mountains (Juab County).
3 were between East Tintic Mountains and West Hills near Tintic Wash (Juab County).
2 were in Curlew Valley (Box Elder County).
2 were in northern Hansel Valley east of Snowville (Box Elder County).
1 was along the trend of the Hansel Mountains (Box Elder County).
1 was in Grouse Creek Valley (Box Elder County).
1 was along Eightmile Creek (Millard County).
1 was in southern Snake Valley near the Conger Range (Millard County).
1 was in Green River Valley southeast of Vernal (Uintah County).
1 was along Trachyte Creek (Garfield County).

Question: Where were the entries with no cultivation?

Answer: 7 were in Green River Valley southeast of Leota (Uintah County).
6 were in Curlew and Hansel Valleys (Box Elder County).
2 were in Virgin River Valley (Washington County).
1 was in Lisbon Valley (San Juan County).
1 was in Black Rock Desert (Millard County).
1 was in Skull Valley (Tooele County).

Question: In summary, where were the cultivated entries?

Answer: 29 were in the Montezuma Canyon-East Canyon Wash complex.
8 were in Black Rock Desert.
7 were in northern Castle Valley near Price River (Carbon and Emery Counties).
6 were in Green River Valley.
6 were in Skull Valley.
6 were in the Curlew and Hansel Valleys area.
24 were in 12 separate valleys.

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these lands?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
72% still held their lands.
26% had conveyed all their lands.
2% had conveyed part of their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950-January 1, 1960

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Homesteads:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	630	145	775	58	35	93
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>1</u>	-	-	<u>52</u>
Total	-	-	<u>776</u>	-	-	<u>145</u>
<u>Desert Land Act:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	372	148	520	61	46	107
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>3</u>	-	-	<u>41</u>
Total	-	-	<u>523</u>	-	-	<u>148</u>
<hr/>						
GRAND TOTAL						
Acted on by 11/1/62	1,002	293	1,295	119	81	200
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>4</u>			<u>93</u>
Total	-	-	<u>1,299</u>			<u>293</u>

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Full-time farms	40
Part-time farms	45
Rural residence	2
Other non-farm use	2
Abandoned	<u>15</u>
Total	104

C. Transfers of Patented Lands - Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	27
Part of entry	2
None	<u>75</u>
Total	104

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
0	18
1-10	3
11-20	10
21-40	11
41-80	25
81-160	23
161-320	<u>14</u>
Total entries	104
Total acreage cultivated	8,217 acres

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season (Major and Secondary Crops)

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Pasture and hay	3,937
Small grains	1,890
Others	<u>1,749</u>
Total acreage reported	7,576

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Alfalfa	1,766
Grass and fallowed land	1,573
Dry pasture	1,460
Wheat	987
Barley	684
Irrigated pasture	526
Oats	221
Soybeans	110
Rye	85
Corn	60
Grain sorghum	50
Hay	48
Pinto beans	6
Total acreage reported	<u>7,576</u>

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
WASHINGTON

Introduction

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (the Homestead Acts, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The attached statement is a summary of statistics derived by January 1963, from that study of operations in Washington. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results can be judged from the following summary:

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>
Homestead applications	38	38 or 100%
Desert Land applications	14	14 or 100%
Homestead entries	1	0 (pending action 11/1/62)
Desert land entries	9	9 or 100%
Patented entries	9	8* or 89%
Acres cultivated	375	375** or 100%

* The utilization portion of the study covered desert land entries that patented prior to 1962.

** The analysis covers all crops reported for each farm studied.

HIGHLIGHTS

Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?

Answer: Homestead Acts 1 out of 38 or 3%
Desert Land Act 9 out of 14 or 64%

Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?

Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State Government, and the applicant (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$19 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $51 \times \$300 = \$15,300 \div 803 = \$19$ per acre.
A total of 803 acres were patented by November 1, 1962.

Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands?

Answer: Homestead Acts 1 entry allowed--pending action
11/1/62
Desert Land Act 9 out of 9 or 100%

Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented?

Answer: In the summer of 1962,
62.5% were full time farms.
37.5% were part time farms.

Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?

Answer: 375 out of 673 acres patented prior to 1962.

Question: What crops were raised in 1962 on patented lands?

Answer: Pasture and hay on 70% of the cultivated lands.
Other crops on 30% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What were the principal crops?

Answer: Alfalfa was grown on 69% of the acreage.
Mint was grown on 19% of the acreage.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 62.5% had from 43 to 79 acres of cultivated land.
25% had 20 acres of cultivated land.
12.5% had 16 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where were the farms located?

Answer: 6 were along Roza Canal northeast of Granger and west of Sulphur Creek (Yakima County).
1 was in Yakima River Valley near Red Mountain (Benton County).
1 was in McCarteney Creek Valley south of Sulphur Canyon (Douglas County).

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these lands?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
62.5% still held their lands.
37.5% had conveyed all their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950-January 1, 1960

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
Homesteads:						
Acted on by 11/1/62	37	1	38	-	-	-
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	-	-	-	<u>1</u>
Total	-	-	<u>38</u>	-	-	<u>1</u>
Desert Land Act						
Acted on by 11/1/62	5	9	14	9	-	9
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	<u>14</u>	-	-	<u>9</u>
GRAND TOTAL	—	—	—	—	—	—
Acted on by 11/1/62	42	10	52	9	-	9
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	-	-	-	<u>1</u>
Total	-	-	<u>52</u>			<u>10</u>

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Full-time farms	5
Part-time farms	<u>3</u>
Total	8

C. Transfers of Patented Lands - Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	3
None	<u>5</u>
Total	8

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
16-20	3
43-79	<u>5</u>
Total entries	8
Total acreage cultivated	375

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Pasture and hay	264
Other crops	<u>111</u>
Total acreage reported	375

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Alfalfa	258
Mint	71
Wheat	20
Corn	15
Irrigated pasture	6
Orchard	<u>5</u>
Total acreage reported	375

AGRICULTURAL LAND LAWS
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY
WYOMING

Introduction

In 1960, a study was initiated to help evaluate the effectiveness in recent years of the agricultural public land laws (the Homestead Acts, Desert Land Act, and the Pittman Act). The study involves all applications under these Acts filed during the calendar years of 1950 through 1959. The attached statement is a summary of statistics derived by January 1963, from that study of operations in Wyoming. Since all applications have not yet been finally acted upon, the results can be judged from the following summary:

	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Number in Analysis</u>		
Homestead applications	111	109	or	98%
Desert land applications	326	313	or	96%
Homestead entries	1	1	or	100%
Desert land entries	160	127	or	79%
Patented entries	111	79*	or	71%
Acres cultivated	6,102	6,073**	or	99%

* The utilization portion of the study covered desert land entries that were patented prior to 1962.

** The analysis covers only the crops listed as primary and secondary for each farm studied.

HIGHLIGHTS

Question: What were the chances of getting an application approved?

Answer: Homestead Acts 1 out of 198 or 0.5%
Desert Land Act 160 out of 313 or 51%

Question: What were the costs of transferring lands to private ownership under these acts, not counting land development costs?

Answer: Assuming costs of \$300 per application by the Federal Government, the State Government, and the applicant (a modest estimate), then the cost was about \$6 per acre to transfer the lands from Federal to private ownership.
 $389 \times \$300 = \$116,700$ \div $21,084 = \$6$ per acre.
A total of 21,084 acres were patented by November 1, 1962.

Question: If an application was approved, what were the chances of getting patent to the lands?

Answer: Homestead Acts 1 out of 1 or 100%
Desert Land Act 110 out of 127 or 87%

Question: What has happened to the entries that were patented?

Answer: In the summer of 1962,
53% were part time or full time farms.
46% were not in use.
1% were used for nonfarm purposes.

Question: How many acres were cultivated in 1962?

Answer: 6,102 out of 13,082 acres patented prior to 1962.

Question: What crops were raised in 1962 on patented lands?

Answer: Pasture and hay crops on 91% of the cultivated lands.
Small grains on 6% of the cultivated lands.
Other crops on 3% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What were the principal crops?

Answer: Hay was grown on 48% of the cultivated lands.
Alfalfa on 20% of the cultivated lands.
Pasture was maintained on 20% of the cultivated lands.

Question: What was the acreage cultivated per entry?

Answer: 1% had no cultivated land.
61% had less than 80 acres of cultivated land.
38% had more than 80 acres of cultivated land.

Question: Where were the larger farms located (those with more than 80 acres cultivated)?

Answer: 7 were in Big Horn River Valley (Big Horn County).
6 were in Green River Valley (Sublette County).
6 were in South and North Piney Creeks area (Sublette County).
5 were in New Fork River Valley (Sublette County).
2 were in Big Horn Valley (Washakie County).
1 was in Green River Valley (Lincoln County).
1 was between North and South Cottonwood Creeks (Sublette County).
1 was in Buffalo Creek Valley (Natrona County).
1 was in Platte River Valley along Casper Creek (Natrona County).

Question: Where was the entry with no cultivation?

Answer: It was in the North Platte River Valley along the Iron Creek tributary (Natrona County).

Question: In summary, where were the cultivated entries?

Answer: 45 were in the Green River Valley complex.
27 were in the Big Horn River Valley complex.
3 were in the Platte River Valley.
2 were in the Shoshone River Valley complex.
1 was in Buffalo Creek Valley.

Question: What have the original entrymen done with these lands?

Answer: By the summer of 1962,
68% still held their lands.
31% had conveyed all their lands.
1% had conveyed part of their lands.

STATISTICS

A. Action on Applications Filed January 1, 1950-January 1, 1960

	<u>Applications Disallowed</u>	<u>Applications Allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Patented</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Homesteads:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	108	109	109	1	-	1
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>2</u>	-	-	<u>-</u>
Total	-	-	<u>111</u>	-	-	<u>1</u>
<u>Desert Land Act:</u>						
Acted on by 11/1/62	153	160	313	110	17	127
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>13</u>	-	-	<u>33</u>
Total	-	-	<u>326</u>	-	-	<u>160</u>
<hr/>						
GRAND TOTAL						
Acted on by 11/1/62	261	161	422	111	17	128
Pending 11/1/62	-	-	<u>15</u>			<u>33</u>
Total	-	-	<u>437</u>			<u>161</u>

B. Use of Patented Lands - 1962 Season

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Full-time farms	37
Part-time farms	5
Rural residence	1
Abandoned	<u>36</u>
Total	79

C. Transfers of Patented Lands - Through the Summer of 1962

<u>Extent of Transfer</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
Entire entry	24
Part of entry	1
None	<u>54</u>
Total	79

D. Cultivation - 1962 Season

<u>No. of Acres in Cultivation</u>	<u>No. of Patented Entries</u>
0	1
1-10	1
11-20	6
21-40	18
41-80	23
81-160	26
161-320	<u>4</u>
Total entries	79
Total acreage cultivated	6,102

E. Cultivation - 1962 Season (Major and Secondary Crops)

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Pasture and hay	5,533
Small grains	381
Other	<u>159</u>
Total acreage reported	6,073

<u>Type of Crops</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Hay	2,939
Alfalfa	1,217
Dry pasture	638
Irrigated pasture	624
Barley	396
Oats	100
Row Crops (n.e.s.)	62
Corn	55
Sugar Beets	35
Grass	7
Total acreage reported	<u>6,073</u>

SOME SUMMARY STATISTICS

ACTION TAKEN BY NOVEMBER 1, 1962 ON
PITTMAN ACT APPLICATIONS FILED DURING THE
PERIOD FROM JANUARY 1, 1950 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1959

<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	<u>NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS</u>
Applications Filed	1,752
Applications Pending	34
Applications Rejected	1,424
Applications Relinquished	122
Entries Allowed	172
Entries Pending	16
Entries Relinquished	7
Entries Cancelled	147
Patents Issued	2*

*Includes 1,266 acres

ENTRIES PATENTED AS OF AUGUST 1962
 FROM APPLICATIONS FILED DURING THE PERIOD
 FROM JANUARY 1, 1950 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1959

STATE	2289 R.S. HOMESTEAD	ENLARGED HOMESTEAD	DESERT LAND	PITTMAN	TOTAL ENTRIES
ARIZONA	1	0	90	--	91
CALIFORNIA	--	--	--	--	--
RIVERSIDE	20	0	83	--	103
SACRAMENTO	3	1	2	--	6
COLORADO	16	7	12	--	35
IDAHO	6	1	533	--	540
MONTANA	2	2	3	--	7
NEVADA	38	1	77	1	117
NEW MEXICO	22	6	22	--	50
OREGON	6	0	29	--	35
UTAH	11	42	51	--	104
WASHINGTON	0	0	8	--	8
WYOMING	0	0	79	--	79
GRAND TOTALS	125	60	989	1	1,175

TITLE TRANSFER	NUMBER OF TRANSFERS PER TYPE OF ENTRY *				TOTAL ** ENTRIES
	2289 R.S. HOMESTEAD	ENLARGED HOMESTEAD	DESERT LAND	PITTMAN	
ALL TRANSFERRED	41	13	401	0	455
PART TRANSFERRED	19	1	49	0	69
NONE TRANSFERRED	64	46	539	1	650
GRAND TOTALS	124	60	989	1	1,174

* As of August 1962

** Transfer status not determined for one 2289 R.S. Homestead in Nevada.

TYPE OF OCCUPANCY	NUMBER OF ENTRIES PATENTED PER TYPE OF OCCUPANCY *				TOTAL ENTRIES PER TYPE OF OCCUPANCY
	2289 R.S. HOMESTEAD	ENLARGED HOMESTEAD	DESERT LAND	PITTMAN	
FULL-TIME FARMING	43	19	690	0	752
PART-TIME FARMING	29	30	118	0	177
RURAL RESIDENCE	28	3	8	0	39
BUSINESS	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	4	0	13	0	17
NONE (Abandoned)	21	8	160	1	190
GRAND TOTALS	125	60	989	1	1,175

* As of August 1962

TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT	NUMBER OF PATENTED ENTRIES		PER TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT*		TOTAL ENTRIES
	2289 R. S. HOMESTEAD	ENLARGED HOMESTEAD	DESERT LAND	PITTMAN	
HOUSE	90	18	283	0	391
BARN	17	0	161	0	178
OUTBUILDING	43	11	272	0	376
WAREHOUSE	1	1	9	0	11
STORE	1	0	2	0	3
BUSINESS	0	1	5	0	6
FENCE	69	40	588	1	698
ROAD	85	51	538	1	675
DITCH	51	3	763	1	818
PIPELINE	24	2	283	1	310
RESERVOIR	28	24	91	1	144
NONE	3	2	4	0	9

* One entry not included from Utah due to insufficient information.

Data in this table valid through August 1962.

USES OF LAND PATENTED FROM AGRICULTURAL APPLICATIONS FILED

DURING THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 1, 1950 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1959 *

Land Uses	2289 R. S. Homestead		Enlarged Homestead		Desert Land		Pittman		Totals	
	Incidence Of Use		Incidence Of Use		Incidence Of Use		Incidence Of Use		Incidence Of Use	
	Major Use	Secondary Use	Major Use	Secondary Use	Major Use	Secondary Use	Major Use	Secondary Use	Major Use	Secondary Use
Cultivation	59	6	29	2	737	71	0	0	825	79
Grazing	20	21	12	20	124	210	1	0	157	251
Soil Bank	2	5	14	0	8	22	0	0	24	27
Subdivision	9	0	1	0	6	2	0	0	16	2
Rural Commercial	1	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	4	4
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Recreation	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Other	4	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	7	4
None **	29	92	4	37	108	676	0	1	141	806
GRAND TOTALS ***	125	125	60	60	989	989	1	1	1,175	1,175

* As of August 1962

** Entries under "Major Use" are abandoned.

*** Each column total equals total number of entries examined.

CULTIVATION ON LANDS PATENTED FROM AGRICULTURAL APPLICATIONS
 FILED DURING THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 1, 1950 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1959 *

ACREAGE RANGES	2289 R.S. HOMESTEAD		ENLARGED HOMESTEAD		DESERT LAND		PITTMAN		TOTALS*	
	Total Acres Cultivated	Number of Entries	Total Acres Cultivated	Number of Entries	Total Acres Cultivated	Number of Entries	Total Acres Cultivated	Number of Entries	Total Acres Cultivated	Number of Entries
0	--	50	--	16	--	142	--	1	--	209
1-5	18	6	--	0	24	5	--	0	42	11
6-10	17	2	--	0	260	30	--	0	277	32
11-20	175	10	66	4	817	48	--	0	1,058	62
21-40	306	9	167	6	3,861	113	--	0	4,334	128
41-80	1,609	26	445	8	11,040	164	--	0	13,094	198
81-160	2,290	18	1,606	15	28,532	226	--	0	32,428	259
161-320	600	3	2,255	11	68,119	260	--	0	70,974	274
GRAND TOTALS	5,015	124	4,539	60	112,653	988	0	1	122,207	1,173

* As of August 1962.

** Does not include one 2289 R.S. homestead and one desert land entry from Nevada due to lack of information.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER ON LANDS PATENTED FROM
 AGRICULTURAL APPLICATIONS FILED DURING THE PERIOD FROM
 JANUARY 1, 1950 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1959 *

Water Supply	NUMBER OF PATENTED ENTRIES				Total Entries Per Type of Water Supply
	2289 R. S. Homestead	Enlarged Homestead	Desert Land	Pittman	
ONE WELL	35	4	451	1	491
TWO WELLS	26	0	86	0	112
THREE WELLS	5	0	4	0	9
MORE THAN THREE WELLS	2	0	2	0	4
SURFACE	8	6	109	0	123
WATER COMPANY	14	0	208	0	222
TRANSFERRED FROM OTHER LANDS	5	0	52	0	57
OTHER	2	1	21	0	24
NONE	28	49	56	0	133
TOTAL ENTRIES	<u>125</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>989</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1,175</u>

* As of August 1962

STATIC DEPTH IN WELLS DEVELOPED ON LANDS
 PATENTED FROM AGRICULTURAL APPLICATIONS FILED
 DURING THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 1, 1950 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1959 *

STATIC DEPTH IN FEET	2289 R. S. Homestead	NUMBER OF WELLS			TOTAL WELLS PER RANGE OF STATIC DEPTH
		Enlarged Homestead	Desert Land	Pittman	
Flowing Well	2	0	29	0	31
1-50	43	3	73	0	119
51-100	31	1	126	0	158
101-150	10	1	82	0	93
151-200	3	2	60	1	66
201-250	1	0	82	0	83
251-300	0	0	53	0	53
301-350	0	0	53	0	53
351-400	0	0	36	0	36
over 400	1	0	17	0	18
Unknown	15	2	20	0	37
Total Wells	106	9	631	1	747

* As of August 1962


VOLUME OF WATER DEVELOPED FROM WELLS ON LANDS
 PATENTED FROM AGRICULTURAL APPLICATIONS FILED
 DURING THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 1, 1950 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1959 *

VOLUME IN GALLONS PER MINUTE	2289 R.S. Homestead	NUMBER OF WELLS BY VOLUME			TOTAL WELLS PER RANGE OF VOLUME
		Enlarged Homestead	Desert Land	Pittman	
1-500	44	7	49	1	101
501-1000	23	0	102	0	125
1001-1500	6	0	117	0	123
1501-2000	3	0	133	0	136
2001-2500	1	0	97	0	98
2501-3000	0	0	79	0	79
3001-3500	0	0	20	0	20
over 3500	2	0	10	0	12
unknown	27	2	24	0	53
Total Wells	106	9	631	1	747


* As of August 1962

Action On Agricultural Applications 1950 to 1959 *


Homestead



Desert Land



Pittman



Applications: Filed Processed Allowed

Filed Processed Allowed

Filed Processed Allowed

* As of November 1962

Bureau of Land Management
Library
Bldg. 50, Denver Federal Center
Denver, CO 80225

BLM LIBRARY
RS 150A BLDG. 50
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER
P.O. BOX 25047
DENVER, CO 80225