Mr. A. L. Hormay  
Pacific SW Forest & Range  
Experiment Station  
P. O. Box 245  
Berkeley, California  94701

Dear Mr. Hormay:

We did not keep a copy of the Range Inventory Analysis and Management Plan form for the Hampton Allotment that was sent to you July 1, 1965.

If it is possible, we would like a photocopy of this form prior to your May visit to the Prineville District.

Sincerely yours,

Alfred G. Larson  
Acting District Manager
April 9, 1966

Dear Sue,

It took me quite a while to get this letter boiled down to readable length.

I am enclosing pictures out of the Rod & Reel.

I do thank you for coming out here and conducting these meetings. They did a lot of good.

Was a real pleasure to meet you and be with you during your stay here.

If you come this way again and find it convenient, give me a call and say 'Hello'.

Hope that you are feeling better.

My very best regards,

[Signature]

DANIEL S. HEALY
711 SOUTH EIGHTH STREET
WORLAND, WYOMING
Dear Dr. Stoddard:

Mr. Gus Hormay asked me to write you regarding the series of range meetings which I organized and he conducted in the Big Horn Basin last week. About 200 people came, which was good attendance considering the time of year. The meetings lasted about 6 hours, which was a minimum time to cover Plant Growth, Livestock Grazing Habits, Ranch Management Objectives, and Management Solutions.

Mr. Hormay did a remarkably good job. He covered essential points, used question-and-answer effectively, and used excellent pictures for added interest and emphasis. It was a presentation that every rancher and public land official must hear, somehow.

Ranchers know livestock grazing habits but don't know how to use these habits for the benefit of the range vegetation. They are uninformed as to how grass grows, and what helps or hinders its growth.

Public land officials have a good background in regulations, have a limited background in plants including some outmoded or impractical ideas on range management, and no background on a practical and profitable livestock operation. They are usually very poor speakers.

I know of no one other than Mr. Hormay who has the knowledge and background to stand up before an audience and make this presentation. I think that it would be a mistake to ask anyone else to do it. Yet every Grazing District should have such meetings.

Could Mr. Hormay prepare and narrate a program such as we had here on records? A booklet should be handed out at the start of the program containing his excellent pictures in color and his graphs and illustration, all interspersed with outline and brief commentary. During the recorded narration, reference should be made to the booklet pictures. Possibly also, Mr. Hormay could ask a question, the phonograph could be stopped for discussion, and then be started up again with Mr. Hormay giving the answer. These records should be retained by each District office and the pamphlets retained by each listener, for later review and reference.

Such a record series and booklet would be effective—the next best thing to having Mr. Hormay there in person. If such were planned, Mr. Hormay should start on this right away while these meetings are fresh in his mind. Such a program could save many millions of Federal dollars in range rehabilitation, and could help everyone directly concerned.

I certainly want to thank you for making Mr. Hormay's trip here possible. I will send him a copy of this letter because he has no idea of what I planned to say.

Yours truly,

Daniel S. Healy
RANGE PROBLEMS IN WYOMING --- were discussed by noted range specialist A.L. (Gus) Hormay of Los Angeles, Calif., Thursday at a special session sponsored by the Bureau of Land Management and Park County Agricultural Agent Harold Hurich (right). Hormay spent all of Thursday in Cody lecturing on the problems of range management.

---Enterprise photo

MEET EETSE AREA RANCHERS --- Jack Winninger and Jerry Houseal review their range problems with Hormay. The noted range scientist presented slides and other pertinent material showing the various causes of range feed loss and how to correct the deficiencies of poor range land.

---Enterprise photo
Dear Mr. McDaniel:

Certainly enjoyed meeting Mr. Hornay and being with him while he was here. He certainly is a fine man and does a brilliant job.

I am enclosing a copy of my letter to Mr. Stoddard.

We all certainly appreciated the opportunity to hear Mr. Hornay. Thank you for making it possible. We should have 100 people to get his good program going.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Daniel S. Healy
711 South Eighth Street
Worland, Wyoming

April 9, 1966
Instruction Memo No. 66-171
Expires 12/31/66

To:        SD's, DM's
From:      Director

Subject: Implementation of policy on unauthorized construction of range improvements on the public lands

Unauthorized fence construction on the public lands in Wyoming received nationwide publicity during 1965. However, the problem of unauthorized construction is not confined to fences nor to Wyoming. As a result of the Wyoming publicity, we have been instructed by the Secretary of the Interior to clarify procedures regarding range improvements constructed on the public lands. These procedures re-emphasize existing regulations and provide penalties for failure of compliance.

BLM responsibilities require that construction of all range improvements by private interests on the public lands be consistent with multiple use management. We are aware of the additional work load these procedures may require of you, however, the importance of the problem warrants the increased effort.

These principles will serve as a guide to action on unauthorized private construction or maintenance of any kinds of range improvements on the public lands. The following action will be taken:

1. Publication of a legal notice (Encl. 1) following procedures required in PL 167. The notice requires certain actions by those responsible for the construction or maintenance of any type of unauthorized range improvements on the public lands, warns against future construction of unauthorized improvements, and outlines penalties.

2. Send copies of the Director's letter to all holders of grazing privileges by certified mail, (return receipt requested).

3. The DM will consider each improvement for which authorization is requested in relation to its effect on multiple use management of the public lands. Authorization for the improvements will be granted provided the improvement facilitates multiple use management. Any modifications to the improvements specified by the DM to meet multiple use standards will be a condition to the authorization.
4. Contact field solicitors and lay ground work for their cooperation in the enforcement of this policy.

A high and continuing priority in the Bureau will be given to the identification of unauthorized fences on public lands which require modification to serve multiple use purposes. The development of modifications will be closely coordinated with district advisory boards, range users, State wildlife agencies, land commissioners, and other interested local groups.

These instructions are directed toward unauthorized range improvements only. Occupancy or agriculture trespass cases that may come to your attention as a result of these above procedures shall be handled following established procedures for occupancy trespass.

Enclosure
   Encl. 1 - Legal Notice
   Encl. 2 - Letter to Holders of Grazing Privileges

Distribution: (w/encl.)
   SCB's, HE's
   IA - 15
   D&RM - 5
   712d - 10
   706b - 10
United States
Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Washington, D. C. 20240

To
All persons responsible for the construction or use of range improvements on public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior,

All range improvements located on public lands must be authorized under cooperative agreement or permit. Applications for permits for existing improvements not now authorized by permit must be filed by September 30, 1966. All range improvements found after this date to have been constructed on public lands without authorization will be ordered removed by the range user.

Failure to apply for and obtain permits for existing unauthorized range improvements or the construction of range improvements in the future will subject grazing privileges to cancellation and reduction.

Failure to remove unauthorized improvements when ordered will be treated as a violation of the provisions of the lease or permit under which grazing is authorized and of the Federal Range Code and will subject grazing privileges to cancellation or reduction.

Applications for permits for range improvements may be obtained from the District Manager, Bureau of Land Management at ________________.

Enclosure 1
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Bureau of Land Management
Washington, D.C. 20240

TO ALL HOLDERS OF GRAZING PRIVILEGES:

BLM responsibilities for resource management require that all range improvements on the public lands be consistent with multiple use needs. Recently the construction of unauthorized fences which do not meet these needs on the public lands in Wyoming received nationwide publicity. The problem of unauthorized construction, however, is not confined to fences nor to Wyoming.

In order to insure that presently unauthorized range improvements, including fences and water developments, meet multiple use requirements and to prevent such construction in the future, we have been instructed by the Secretary of the Interior to revise and clarify procedures. These revised procedures, as follows, re-emphasize existing regulations and the penalties for failure of compliance:

1. Upon receipt of this letter you are notified that any range improvement located upon public land hereafter constructed, including fences, without prior written authorization as required by the regulations will subject your grazing lease, license or permit to cancellation or reduction in accordance with 43 CFR, 4113.1, 4115.2-1(d), 4115.2-5, 4122.4, and 4122.6.

2. Applications in writing must be made not later than September 30, 1966, for the authorization of improvements, including fences, for which authorization has not been formerly sought. Failure to comply will subject your grazing lease, license, or permit to cancellation or reduction.

3. Authorization for the improvements will be granted provided the improvements facilitate multiple use management. Any modification to the improvement specified by the BLM will be a condition to the authorization.

A high and continuing priority in the Bureau will be given to the identification of unauthorized fences on public lands which will require modification to serve multiple use purposes. Your advice and assistance are most welcome.

Director, Bureau of Land Management

Enclosure 2
April 13, 1966

Director
Pacific Southwest Forest and Range
Experiment Station
P.O. Box 245
Berkeley, California

Dear Mr. McGuire:

This past month we were fortunate in getting August Hormay of your staff to assist us with a week long resource management training conference for Nevada and California BLM employees.

Gus gave his usual fine performance and we are extremely grateful that his services could be made available. We believe Gus will be interested in comments received from the conferees relative to the value of the training. These evaluations were requested to be submitted unsigned and therefore represent frank and honest opinions of the conferees.

I would appreciate your forwarding the attached copy of the evaluations to Gus along with our thanks for a job well done.

Sincerely yours,

Nolan F. Keil
State Director, Nevada

Enclosure

Good work, Gus.
BLM RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA  
MARCH 15-18, 1966

Unedited Conferee Evaluations

In general I felt too much of the information was "above" the level of the RAM. The first few days were concerned with the PSC and State Office problems and did not directly concern the RAM.

More specifically, most of the topics did not even contain any reference or relationship to the RAM, in title let alone context.

As always some of the material presented was too damned specific -- example, engineering data. Hormay was the highlight, as was Bob Wilber and his direct topic to the RAM.

In general I feel the conference was very good. As a non-range man I learned much about range management. I felt some presentations could have been better organized. The one on range studies showed far too many slides of graphs, for instance.

Good meeting -- good accommodations.

As usual, Hormay was outstanding, both in material presented and manner of presentation. Meeting started out
rather slow. Elementary manual material and too many graphs and charts on Nevada watershed study. One good example would have sufficed. A couple of speakers, particularly in the wildlife end, dwelled on past history up to the present rather than getting at the problem at hand -- how can we cooperatively manage the resource. Satterfield instilled a feeling of pride in the Resource Managers which is needed.

Ken Satterfield's very able presentation demonstrated that the Range Managers should have had a more active part in this program. He spoke directly to the point at a level which I'm sure was understandable to all us Range Managers. The other presentations for the most part were low grade that presented damned few nuggets. (This, of course, excepts Gus Hormay's excellent presentation.)

I suggest that if another such conference is called that it be organized as a Resource Managers Forum.

The presentation by Gus Hormay on rest-rotation was most enlightening as I had never been exposed to this system.

Otto Aho's talks were also of most importance and presented in such a way they could be understood.

Bob Wilber was excellent.
My evaluation of the conference has to be somewhere between very good to excellent. I was highly impressed with the speakers and the apparent work each had put into his topic. In fact, I resist singling out anyone speaker as the best, as I'm sure this would be gaged on the training needs of each of us that attended. As a District Manager my need was different than possibly the Resource Manager but by the same token many of the topics brought me up to date or they served as a good review. I want to express my thanks to the Nevada State Office for the invitation extended California. Possibly next year California should hold the conference. Your RAMs might benefit from such a session.

Meeting was too large, too diverse and too general. In almost every instance, not enough time was allowed, nor was questioning & discussion encouraged. Many presentations were too elementary. Good thought and action prorating presentations were on Hearings Procedures, Trespass, Range Research programs in Nevada, Contracting Procedures, Public Relations, Technology in Game Range Improvement and Rest-Rotation Grazing. The Hormay presentation was the highlight of the conference.
I feel that the conference tried to cover too much ground in too short a time. There was not enough time to allow discussion of some of the ideas presented by the group. The best topic both in material and presentation was Gus Hormay. Several of the speakers did not stick to the subject on the agenda. The idea behind the conference is excellent and badly needed. However, I would like to see fewer topics with adequate discussion periods at the end in any future conference. Also, Otto Aho's talk was excellent, would like to hear more like it.

The highlights of this conference in the following priority: (1) Public Relations, by Bob Wilber. This was the most valuable talk. I also appreciated a copy of his talk for my records. (2) Rest Rotation by Gus Hormay and the discussion by Ken Satterfield was very enlightening. (3) Perry Plummer's discussion was very interesting. (4) I believe less material should be covered and more time devoted to each subject.

Should have had some people from Washington for a general question & answer session. Hormay's session was tops. Baker and Aho were also good. Most of the other sessions were pretty dry.
A very good training conference, much needed, bringing a wider exposure to various aspects of resource management; necessity of coordination and cooperation, etc. I especially appreciated the counsel of Otto Aho and thought excellent and informative presentations were made by Hormay & Satterfield.

Did not have opportunity to review Hydrology in Watershed Management handbook. Therefore, most of the discussion went over my head. Frail lands --? seemed to miss the point there too. (And this was before night life time). To hell with Portland Service Circus. Good Public Relations sessions -- to paint a better image, one needs a better image. Could have used one week of Hormay R-R system. This looks like something good and needed. We could get our desired image with a good Rest-Rotation System. Hoory for Hormay!

I found the meeting informative yet "draggy". Much of the information presented could have been left out, particularly those dealing directly in progress reports. The meeting did fill a long existing need for assembling newer employees and disseminating information to them. I felt the best speaker was Otto Aho both in method of presentation as a speaker and material. He presented the type of information
RAMs require, was specific and dealt with a familiar problem.

Mr. Hormay used visual aids most effectively. I do feel
the BLM and State is conveying the idea that the only
acceptable grazing system is Rest-Rotation through its
repeated emphasis at conferences, sessions and discussions.

The range conference in my opinion was very good.
Some of the speakers should be a little better prepared.
All material presented was very informational and the conference
should be continued yearly.

Program was timed and carried out well. The best
speakers were Gus Hormay, Bob Wilber, and Carl McCrillis.
Each of these talks were well organized and informative.
Talks by Service Center personnel and regulations were
inconclusive. I don't know any more about how management
plans tie in with the brown book than when I leave. No one
seems to know the answers as usual.

The conference was very well planned and for the most
part the subject discussed were of great value. However,
more time should have been allowed for presentation and
discussion and part of the conference should have been an
actual problems within the Districts. Range studies and
management of crested wheat could have been omitted. The topics were too general.

One of the best, if not the best, BLM conferences I have attended. With but few exceptions, all presentations were pertinent and were very well prepared. In my opinion the most pertinent were: (a) Rest-Rotation - Hormay & Satterfield, and (b) Uniform Project Records - panel at breakfast. Best presentations: Hormay, Bob Wilber, Ken Satterfield, Carl McCrillis.

Good points -- Covered material vital to RAMs in their job; Bob Wilber's talk especially good - PR work very vital and needed; All but one or two speakers had a good talk and appeared to know subject well. Not so good points -- Too much material in too short a time; each speaker remarked he was hurrying and couldn't develop subject fully; discussion time lacking. Suggested improvement -- let's tear each of the "hurried over" points apart and develop a uniform approach to the problems. Standardize procedures within the state or states. Could these conferences be scheduled in the winter so as to not interfere with field work. Enjoyed the conference and the Early Times and water.
Best talk was Rest-Rotation by Gus Hormay; reasons; knowledge of subject; easy to understand, well organized.

Best day was Friday. Generally I did not get all of the information that I came for because the talks were too generalized and had poor organization. In most cases there was just not enough time to develop the subject. The conference did move along on schedule and cover the material on the agenda.

Most interesting: Hydrology by Lipscomb. Best speaker: Otto Aho. General critique: Too much jammed into available time. Hydrology for instance is a 6 hour subject but received one hours time. Several papers, however, could have been omitted or reduced in time. Apparently, eloquence and delivery are not automatically bestowed by promotion. Some practice is needed by most speakers. Although theoretically for the RAM, only a few of Monday and Tuesday's presentations were specifically addressed to RAMs point of view.

The selection of topics and speakers was very good. Generally, it is difficult to pick out the best speaker. For the most part all the participants did an exceptional job and were well versed on their subject. Understandably
many of the topics were covered on quite a broad scale for a conference of this nature. Some of the material covered was beyond the level of the unit manager. Reference to the conference as RAM "training" may be a nuisance since we more covered the broader interrelationship of the various activities. It is quite evident that BLM activity is becoming more complex. The schedule could have been arranged to speed up the coverage and presentation so as to terminate the session earlier. Reception rapidly deteriorates towards the end of conference of this nature and length.

Best presentations: Hormay and Aho. Reason: (1) they presented needed info on the interesting subject for which they are top sources; (2) they knew their subject so they were comfortable and relaxed in presentation; (3) they were given ample time to develop their subject and bring home the point; (4) Hormay used visual aids effectively.

Room for improvement -- (1) too wide a subject field covered; should have been limited to grazing, wildlife, and watershed; (2) much info given was too elementary and was generally available in manual form; (3) people with excellent material such as Glen Lipscomb should have had time to develop it properly. Perhaps 1/2 day; (4) a workshop approach could have been used to better advantage. The RAMs should have been
forced to participate more; (5) Hormays presentation was probably the peak. The other presentations should have been scheduled so his session was last. A very good one to end on; (6) time should have been given Moore's and Satterfield's subject to include more systems and a comparative analysis.

Conference well presented. Topics for consideration well thought out. Best presentation by Bob Wilber. Review of Hormay system of rotation grazing by Gus Hormay excellent. Also presentation made by Ken Satterfield added much to the program. Presentation made by Fish and Game Dept. left something to be desired but was okay from PR standpoint of the Bureau. Fish and Game desires not necessarily in keeping with optimum desire in multiple use mgmt.

Since I am a District Manager in California, my remarks should be considered in that light. First, let me compliment you on the excellent organization of the topics and on the quality of the outside speakers. The time allotted to each speaker was about right. Also, each speaker was prompt in staring and finishing his topic. The motel accommodations were excellent and the price was reasonable. I thought the meeting room was adequate. However, the seating arrangements
were not to good because many people could not view the visual aids very well. The addition of California personnel might have aggravated this condition but still the seating arrangements could have been changed to minimize the problem. I understand this was a Nevada conference with California as a visitor. Much of the subject matter was applicable to both states, but with more preparation in advance could have had even more mutual application. We in California have a completely different scope of problems associated with people scattered ownership and high land values. It might have been interesting to the Nevada people to learn some of our problems. In summary I thought it was an excellent conference and well worthwhile for the California people. We should not minimize the value of a weeks cross pollination so that we get to know each other and find that we do share many common problems. I recommend that the next conference be held in California with invitations extended to Nevada people.

The conference was very well organized. I was pleased to see how well each person held to his time limit. The program that was put on was very well prepared and I would not make any comments on what one was the best. Although I was very much impressed by the presentation of Bob Wilber.
The week was successful for me in that my range experience and knowledge was practically nil upon arrival. I am responsible for what range is in my resource area, although it is a secondary resource. The most vital thing that hit home is the fact that vegetation is basic to the maximization of the utilization of the resources in the area of my responsibility. Of course, it is always useful to get the views and opinions of others who are doing Bureau jobs of a similar nature in other areas. This might be maximized in future sessions if people from the same Districts are not quartered together in the future.

The meeting in general was good. The last day has been superior. Mr. Hormay was excellent. I derived more from his presentation than any other. Mr. Aho presented his text just as well. About half of the topics were presented like machine-gun fire. In other words I couldn't take decent notes. How about sending abstracts of all presentations to the conferees? You range types seem to have your eyes closed to the other programs of the Bureau and it appears that you hope they will go away like a bad dream. I'm a lands type, of course, and too am biased. However, we are trying to see the big picture. I hope. I wouldn't have missed the conference. I needed the education and really need more.
I'm more interested in range work now and have a beginning in understanding it. Thanks for letting me be here.

The meeting was well organized and was carried out smoothly. It would have been very helpful if some of the speakers had provided outlines of their talks. This was one of my first real exposure to range problems and techniques. Though I am from a desert area, Section 15 type leases stems from each talk, applied to my Resource Area. A few times this boy was snowed though.

This type of conference fills a need evident after about one year's operation and questions. This conference seems to be well organized and information packed.

The subject matter of the conference as a whole was very comprehensive. It dealt with several subjects with which the resource manager is concerned and provided a chance to have certain activities and ideas more thoroughly explained as to their purposed. Several speakers tended to be too technical for people with only a general or brief knowledge of a particular subject.
I felt that the discussion were to be towards efforts to better coordinate communications between Washington, Service Center, and State Office and the District. In many cases these lines of coordination were not clear. On the whole, the majority of topics were oriented toward the RAM. The first day, however, was an exception. The hydrology and engineering discussions were of little value. Illustrated discussions were of most use. Otto Aho was especially informative as was Dr. Hormay.

Too much extraneous material without immediate practicability for the RAMs. Not directed toward the RAMs enough. Too much stuff covered here that could have been decided between State Office's, Service Center's and Washington Office. Didn't go deep enough into the stuff the RAMs really needed. (Needed to spend enough time to get some serious discussion or argument going). Tried to cover too much in too short a time. We haven't had a session on Range or S&M for so long that we could have profitably spent the entire week on one or the other.
Meeting was generally well handled and material well presented. I think Hormay's presentation perhaps dwarfs all others so we can take a good lesson from his strategy -- Don't try to cover too much territory in a single presentation -- go a little slower and cover the subject better -- use visual aids to best advantage. Since this meeting was primarily for the RAMs some of the most basic material might have been better to have been put on early in the session, i.e. Hormay and Satterfield. I thought Satterfield had a very good presentation.

----------

Convincing presentation by Gus Hormay and follow up by Satterfield or Hormay system successfully operating under BLM was highlight of the entire meeting. Believe it inspired RAMs and DM bringing some semblance of order to present chaotic organization. Evidence of confusion between range management plans and planning unit plans understanding by people involved. Lack of uniformity in thinking indicated.

----------

This has been an excellent conference. All subjects were developed fully and time well spent. A big job was defined in the development of range management plans. It was very apparent from the remarks made that the thinking
of the Washington Office is still fuzzy. No one seems
to know this job can be done with the man power available.
I am fearful that the technicians from service centers
will make additional work for the Districts rather than
bringing in assistance. Gus Hormay's presentation was
very interesting and should prove helpful.

Good conference -- Long overdue! Greatest value
was opportunity to associate with other RAMs. Would
like to have had more time for discussion of subject matter
as it related to specific situations and problems. The
public relations session was very good considering the
time allotted to it, but I would have liked to hear Wilber
speak longer -- particularly on specific problems.

Best speaker, Otto Aho. Kept audience awake and interested
in subject. Presented direct answers to questions.
Best presentation of interest and needed for RAMs was the
presentation by Gus Hormay. More emphasis needed on multiple
use management by supervisory personnel or staff people giving
presentations. The overall presentation was too general in
nature. We need better instructions on tying all of various
programs into the working everyday activities of a District. Theories and plans are fine, but must be basic to the working conditions and personnel in a District. I believe more time should have been spent on details. Overall the meeting should have been very beneficial in training of new personnel. Well handled for time schedule, etc. Need more work type projects explained, such as the one by Satterfield. Much can be learned by others experience.

---

Tried to accomplish too much in this meeting. Every speaker had to hurry. Group was too large and too formal for a good discussion to develop. By making the speakers have an abstract of their speech you invited speech reading and therefore a dull session. Good and well prepared topics were given by Hormay, Plummer, Kastelic, Griswold and Aho.

---

Training session was very good especially for new men who have not gone through these before. Visual aids are good but should tell story. Charts and graphs should be used sparingly and then well explained. Pictures, slides and similar illustrations are better. If going, give minutes with papers do not need to show dozens of charts and graphs that nobody has time to analyze. Speakers should concentrate on showing accomplishments instead of what they
were unable to do unless this is important to the problem. Think attempted cover too many subjects and did not allow enough time for each. Each topic should be assigned time in accordance to needs not evenly divided among group, i.e. Hormay had much more time than others which was good. I think speakers like Hormay, Aho, and Whitney were more effective in getting their subjects across to the group. Primarily because they kept their speech simple or explained the technical things well. Although I like good shows, bright lights, etc., I felt that a less interesting place would be a more productive site for this type of program. If possible to get more group type of participation we should do so. This creates more interest among the group and keeps them from letting their mind wander to other things.

The overall conference has been very good. All individuals participating in the conference did a very good job in their presentation. The hydrology portion could have been shortened as all the graphs did not convey very much of a message. Mr. Gus Hormay's presentation was by are the best and should be given an opportunity to make more presentations to BLM as well as ranchers. The second best presentation was on safety. Jack Griswold did a very good job in his presentation as well as preparation.
Sixty percent of the speakers had something to say and contribute to this conference. The remainder were fair to zero. Of the 50%, good use was made of slides, board illustrations and other media.

Subject conference material was well worth the time. Some speakers were very good others were lousy in presentation of data. More training is needed on presentation. Overall I enjoyed and feel the conference was worth the time.

The meeting provided ground for meeting many different employees. I think Otto Aho was the best and most interesting speaker. Although some other subjects were interesting -- the Service Center presentations (as a rule) seemed to be lacking in interest and content. Very few presentations were orientated along reorganization lines although many mentioned it. The public relations presentation was orientated this way and effective too. The direct to RAM approach was most impressive to me. Improve by committee presentation and more questions and answers.
Not enough time to develop some of the subjects. Am highly impressed with Nolan Keil. Think we have a long way to go in watershed management. Should listen more closely to Hormay. Think we could very well get along without much of the research we are getting. What is the matter that we can't go ahead and solve our own problems? Would like more from Aho. He knows his stuff and now seems to fit into the outfit. Hormay should be asked to do the lecturing on the game situation. He has best dope yet. Management of crested wheat should be dealt with more illustrations, slides, etc. I am quite enthused with Hormay. He is quite controversial. Looks good though. Satterfield seems confident. May be he should be sent along through the Bureau selling Rest-Rotation grazing system.

The training from the manual portion on grazing was a waste of time. I think that problems and discussion of alternate solutions would have been beneficial. In general the topics presented were fine and the material covered well. The session on hydrology should have more definitions before going into technical data and etc.
More practical examples and emphasis on actual results. Service center and thinking of superiors should be derived as much as possible from the field. RAMs and other field personnel should have more flexibility, such as was brought out Friday afternoon, providing they are heading the right direction. Eliminate repetition of material that everyone should know (taken from the manual).

I was able to attend Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday of the conference and enjoyed it very much. A lot of valuable information was given in my line of work. The Tuesday forenoon session could have been omitted with no loss to the conference in my opinion.

The meeting was not geared for the RAMs and problems. Questions avoided and not answered. Visual aids were good. Many of the prepared speeches rambled and were not clearly outlined.

I feel that in general too much time was spent on unimportant general material. I was much impressed with the type of material and presentations of Mr. Aho and Mr. Hormay. I think more time should have been spent on discussing problems and a relationship between policy and regulations. In general the time was well spent.
The meeting was good. The meeting was well organized. Some of the participants in the program were pulling different directions. Some of the material was old hat. Some of the new material is heading us down some of the same old ruts. Strong points of meeting were Malencik, Otto Aho and Hormay.

As a whole excellent. Some of the technical people lacked fire in their presentation. In some of the topics only generalities were covered. In most cases this is a waste of time. Three stars for Aho, McCrillis, Tueller, Eckert, Plummer, Luscher and Hormay. These were excellent.

I feel the goals and objectives of the conference should have been more clearly defined during the opening statements on Tuesday morning. Mr. Hormay's session was excellent, as usual, but too short for him to give his best effort. He should have at least one day. More emphasis should have been placed on planning the various talks into the total Bureau system.
In general liked entire conference. Thought in many cases slides and flip charts were worthless due to poor definition and considerable distance from many viewers to screen. Best speaker was Dr. Hormay. Thought that this conference was to be RAM oriented and that majority of speakers did not accomplish this. Several -- Ron Bartley took this away from me here.

The main thing wrong with this conference was that they did not go into enough detail on some topics that the RAM will be expected to perform. Such as contracting and improvement programs. The best topics discussed were those by Otto Aho and Gus Hormay. These did go into detail on the ground work. Although these topics did lend themselves to being most interesting. The conference on a whole was very good coupled with individual talks with various people on off-hours.

I would rate the overall conference as good. The revised agenda as set up was fairly well adhered to. The discussion on the Program Planning and Annual Work Plan was well presented but at this time I don't feel that the RAMs have had enough background to know what it all means.
AIRMAIL

John C. Clark, District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
Glenwood Springs District Office
P. O. Box 1009
Glenwood Springs, Colorado 81601

Dear Mr. Clark:

I tried to visualize the layout of a 3 unit and a 4 unit pasture setup for the Kremmling RCA after our telephone conversation this morning. At least on paper both look feasible (see attached sheets).

Strive for the 4 unit plan. If you can't work it out, settle for the 3 unit plan using the 3 treatment formula outlined in my letter of August 5, 1965. The grazing sequence in the 3 units through two grazing cycles is shown on an attached sheet. The grazing formula for the 4 unit plan as well as stock movement among pastures are also diagrammed out on attached sheets.

Either plan should give good results.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. HORMAY
Range Conservationist

Enclosures

A1Hormay:etm
Range Training Conference
Boise, Idaho, April 23-26, 1963

Gerald B. Young
Bill Bredbey
Fred Marshall
Dean Stepanek

Boise Range Coop.
Boise Range?
Boise
Boise

Boise 8 AM
Boise Range Coop.
Boise Range Coop.

Boise, Boise
Boise
Boise

Ex-AM
Mgt. Analyst

Forest
Forrest
Range Specialist, for.
Range Specialist, ass't.

M. B. Radmacher
G. L. Steiner
M. R. Martin
B. R. Phifer
B. R. Philip

Dick Page
Edward E. Fives
James B. Fulker
May Macfarlane
Dean Bibles - Burley

Delbert Faller - Boise

Bud McAdams - Burley

Jim Redman - Burley

Lewis Martindale - Burley

Edward D. Safina - Idaho Falls

Roy Beck - Burley

Jack Wilson - Burley

Dell Whiddups - Burley

Allan W. Strobel - Idaho Falls

Don Sweep - Burley

Lloyd H. Ferguson - Idaho Falls
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.A. Gentry</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Shoshone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Harrison</td>
<td>Dist. Cons.</td>
<td>Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Haight</td>
<td>AM, RM</td>
<td>Shoshone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldon Beus</td>
<td>Div. of Oper.</td>
<td>Shoshone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gecald Quinn</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Shoshone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold D. Sherrets</td>
<td>Realty Manager</td>
<td>Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Shedd</td>
<td>Realty Specialist</td>
<td>Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Swoe</td>
<td>Dist. Mgr</td>
<td>Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orllion T. Mabbitt</td>
<td>Dist. Mgr</td>
<td>Shoshone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren R. Brezis</td>
<td>Range Cons.</td>
<td>Shoshone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrel T. Tolton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boise, ID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>