<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Reservations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVISORY BOARD MEETING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sept. 3-4, 1969</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Barnes, Hillery  Bullhead
2. Bayer, Donald M. (For Richard Allen)  Bullhead
3. Branson, Earl  Bullhead
4. Brown, Gerald H.  Bullhead
5. Buzan, Martin  Bullhead
6. Callahan, James A.
7. Campbell, Cecil  Shinnery
8. Carpenter, John
9. Chandler, Rolla  Bullhead
10. Corlett, Ray
11. Dickinson, Lawrence  Bullhead
12. Ferris, Ross  Bullhead
13. Finlayson, Harry R.  Bullhead
14. Fischer, Virgil  Scotts
15. Fisk, Clyde
16. Gardner, Jess  Bullhead
17. Garrett, James R.  Shinnery
18. Giles, J. Kent  Bullhead
19. Golcoechea, Julian  Bullhead
20. Hess, Dennis E.  Bullhead
21. Hill, Larry
22. Hermes, Gus  Bullhead
23. Hiekins, Leonard  Scotts
24. Jamieson, Mike  Bullhead
25. Keil, Helen F.  Bullhead
26. Kinsinger, Floyd E.  Bullhead
27. Ledosquet, Richard H.  Bullhead
28. Little, Dr. H. Clay  Shinnery
29. Lundgren, Dr. Robt. H.
30. Mudge, R. D.
31. McErquiaga, Frank
32. Patterson, C. L.
33. Phillips, W. L.  Shinnery
34. Riley, Jim  Bullhead
35. Sack, Ivan  Scotts
36. Segerblom, Clifford  Scotts
37. Sorenson, Loyd  Bullhead
38. Stewart, Leslie J.
39. Unger, Bob
40. Weikel, Karl  Panderosa
41. Young, Roy
42. Forree, Wm.
43. Oxle, Bob
44. Bohmont, Dale W. (Meeting only)
September 3, 1969

A. L. Horvay  
P.O. Box 245  
Berkeley, California 94701

Dear Gus:

Enclosed is a program for the Livestock-Wildlife Conference. About the only change from the program you received with your invitation is the location. The conference will be held in the East-West Room at the Travis Student Union. The Union is on the North Virginia Street side of the campus but does not face the street. You should have no trouble finding it.

We have had good response from our invitations and anticipate good attendance. The program has been drawn to allow plenty of time for discussion and we look forward to some very instructive exchange of ideas.

I sincerely hope you will be able to be with us and that you will assist us in making the conference most worthwhile for all.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

JOHN L. ARTZ,  
Extension Specialist

JLA/In  
Enc.

University of Nevada and U.S. Department of Agriculture Cooperating
September 5, 1969

District Manager - Burley, Idaho

Chief, Division of S&F, FSC

Trip Report - Pleasant View Allotment

Attached is Don Pendleton's trip report concerning an evaluation of the Pleasant View Allotment studies program.

Also enclosed is a proposed form for recording AMP benefits. This form was discussed with Rod Harris by telephone on September 5. Please complete the portions of this form for which information is available on the Pleasant View Allotment and return it along with frequency study data on the allotment. If sufficient information is available, we plan to use it in a brochure designed to show allotment management plan benefits. This matter was discussed with you at the time of Mr. Pendleton's visit.

Attachments - 2
1 - Trip report
2 - Form

cc w/copy of trip report:
WO 330
SD, Idaho
D-330
Gus Hormay
Trip Report - Burley District, Pleasant View Allotment Range Studies Program Evaluation
by
Donald L. Pendleton - PSC Range Staff

On August 19 and 20, 1969, at the request of the Burley district office, I accompanied Rod Harris (area manager), Bill McIlvain (district studies specialist), and Ron Bean (former student assistant) on a tour of the Pleasant View Allotment. The purpose of the trip was to evaluate the intensity, completeness, and methods used in allotment evaluation studies established for the allotment. A recent history of events leading up to development of the Pleasant View AMP and the findings of this trip follow.

In 1965, a forage inventory on the Pleasant View Allotment indicated the need for a 50% reduction in livestock use. Eighty-two ranchers grazed cattle on the allotment and most of them operate small, economically marginal ranches and depend on the Federal range to round out their year-long operations. A 50% reduction in livestock use on the allotment could create severe financial hardship on these ranchers. In recognition of the problem, the BLM invited Mr. Normay to visit the area. In May of 1965, Mr. Normay toured the Pleasant View Allotment. As a result of this tour, and by letter of June 25, 1965, Mr. Normay expressed his opinion that a 6-pasture rest-rotation grazing system could be developed for the allotment which would eliminate the need for the indicated 50% reduction in livestock use, provided water would be developed and use would be made of the entire range. Mr. Normay also indicated that the management system would require considerable investment in facilities, particularly fences and water. He also suggested that artificial seeding and chemical spraying of certain localized areas would be necessary. In October of 1965, another tour was made of the Pleasant View Allotment. In addition to Mr. Normay, representation from the BLM Washington Office, Portland Service Center, State Office and District Office were in attendance. As a result of the Bureau decided to adopt Mr. Normay's recommendation for rest-rotation grazing. An intensive fencing program was initiated and a 6-pasture rest-rotation grazing system went into effect in the allotment during the 1966 grazing season.

Using temporary summer employees (for the most part), a range studies program was started in the late summer of 1965. Approximately 25 photo stations were set up using the 3 x 3-foot frame designed for use in the BLM plot frame trend study method (41612.220). A close-up and general view photo were taken at each site (several of the photos
are of such poor quality that they are completely valueless), the plot location was described, and the important forage species were mapped and numbered. No other vegetative data was recorded.

Beginning the summer of 1967, in cooperation with the University of Idaho, a graduate student of the University of Idaho was hired by the Bureau to establish and conduct additional studies in the allotment to evaluate the effects of the grazing system. The student hired was Ron Dean, who had four previous summers experience working with the BLM. Studies established and pursued by Mr. Dean included: (1) Erosion stakes; (2) Growth-in-dark studies on *Agropyron spicaturn* and *Festuca pyramidalis* from spring grazed, fall grazed, and rested pastures; (3) Species composition; (4) Phenological development of *Agropyron spicatum-Festuca pyramidalis-Festuca pratensis*; (5) 21 photo plots using the 3 x 3-foot plot frame, taking closeup and general view photos, mapping important species, identifying all species observed within the plot; (6) 21 frequency studies on acre-sized plots in the vicinity of the photo plots; (7) Browse condition; (8) Juniper invasion; (9) Extensive forage production estimates (grass species); and (10) Animal observations which included cattle grazing habits and utilization patterns and observations concerning deer location with respect to cattle location. In addition, a plant list was made wherever a permanent sample plot was established. Mr. Dean also located and repotted and identified plant species in the plots established by the BLM in 1965. It was noted that the species list on the plots established by temporary Bureau employees in 1965 seldom resembled those described by Mr. Dean in 1967 and 1968 either from the standpoint of completeness and species identification.

Studies considered to be of most significance were the photo plots, phenology and frequency.

The route taken on our trip August 19 included Jensen Pass Canyon, Sublet Canyon, Morgan Jones Canyon, West Elkhorn Canyon, and John Evans Canyon. On August 20, we traversed North Canyon, Ireland Canyon, Wood Canyon, and Sheep Creek Canyon. Stops were made at most of the original BLM photo plots as well as several of those established by Ron Dean. Based on location and quality of previous photographs, the following plots are recommended for intensive data collection (in accordance with BLM Manual 4122.22G) and evaluation of the Pleasant View Area. Pasture 1 - Plots No. 25; Pasture 2 - Plots No. 20 and 21; Pasture 3 - Establish a new plot on the lower end of Morgan Jones Canyon, and use Ron Dean's Aspen Plot in West Elkhorn Canyon; Pasture 4 - Plots No. 10 and 13; Pasture 5 - Plots No. 4 (relocate a couple of feet to a more representative area), 6, and Ron Dean's Aspen Plot in this pasture; Pasture 6 - Plots No. 2 and 3. Most of these plots have 3-year photographic records. The direction from which some of
the original photos were taken was changed by Mr. Dean when he rephotographed the plots in 1967 and 1968. The continuing studies should follow these changes.

The importance of a good studies program to evaluate an allotment management plan cannot be overemphasized. It is particularly important in an area such as the Pleasant View Allotment which has received such widespread agency and public recognition. The studies program in the allotment should meet the minimum NRM allotment evaluation requirements. These are actual use (this has been accomplished in the past by means of marking cattle); utilization; trend (plots as described in previous paragraph); and climate. Phenological data should continue to be collected for key species at each opportunity. It is also recommended that supplementary studies include periodic collection of frequency data on plots established by Ron Dean in 1967. Plots should be read on rested pastures. Photo plots established in 1965 and 1967 which are not included in the trend studies should be rephotographed periodically.

Although the primary purpose of this trip was to evaluate the studies program, the tour pointed out some serious problems or defects in the application of the grazing system. The primary area of concern is the lack of adequate distribution of livestock water. Evidently, the livestock operators have been very cooperative and interested in making the grazing system work. They have been continually hauling water to accessible places with two tanker trucks. Serious problems have been encountered in the water hauling system, these include the limited accessibility for vehicle traffic and equipment failure. At the time of inspection, many of the livestock licensed to graze on the allotment had drifted down to the lanes leading into the allotment for access to water. Numerous other livestock were observed in private fields adjacent to the allotment. Many of the livestock haggled up in the lanes appeared to be in extremely poor condition, however most of these were older animals. Another observation which might be a function of the grazing system was the number of young calves, some of them only two to three weeks old. District personnel stated that according to ranchers in the allotment, the calving percentage was down and many calves were being born later in the summer since the grazing system has been in effect. Adequate water distribution could help solve these problems. Several dead cattle were also observed on the allotment. Cause of death is not known.

The forage supply on the upper slopes and ridges in the pastures scheduled for use this year appeared adequate to carry the livestock throughout the licensed grazing season, however water facilities must be developed in order to allow livestock access into these areas.
The Pleasant View Allotment has received wide recognition and publicity for a real test of rest-rotation grazing. Research people from Utah State University, Colorado State University, and the University of Idaho are extremely interested in following the results of rest-rotation grazing in the allotment. Prior to and since the initiation of the grazing system, Bureau officials have committed the Pleasant View Allotment to putting rest-rotation grazing to a test. Since the grazing system was designed in 1965, fence construction has been completed (except for recommended elevational control fences in longer canyons), continued progress has been made on artificial seeding and chemical spraying of selected areas, but water development has been minimal. Because of topography and distance from water, it is impossible for the livestock to utilize the forage available in the pastures designated for use in a given year. In order for the grazing system to work properly, water must be developed.

The former Burley district engineer (Dave Wickard) designed a water system to adequately provide livestock water in the Pleasant View Allotment. The estimated cost of his proposal was approximately $150,000. The present district engineer (Bob Boyce) is investigating possible alternatives to the system proposed by Mr. Wickard. In any event, the cost of developing adequate livestock water in the allotment will be considerable.

In addition to testing rest-rotation grazing under severe conditions, the interest of research people in this system, and Bureau commitments, the local communities around the Pleasant View Allotment are in an economically depressed condition. The economy for Malad, Idaho and surrounding small communities is based on agriculture and livestock. Projected forecasts from the Bureau of Census and from a study conducted by the Malad high school indicate the population and the per capita income for the future will be downward. If the grazing system does not work on the allotment and, as a result, the operators are subjected to a 50% reduction in livestock use, the local economy could suffer a severe setback.

Lack of adequate funds for development of needed livestock water appears to be the only item inhibiting results and severely testing the principles of rest-rotation grazing in the Pleasant View Allotment.

Donald L. Pendleton
Range Conservationist
Mr. A.L. Hormay  
Bureau of Land Management  
P.O. Box 245  
Berkeley, California 94701

Dear Gus:

This past winter I had the opportunity to attend your 2 day session at Boise. All of our permittees were invited to attend, but the long travel distance and their current calving operations prevented them from attending. I have had a session or two with almost every permittee, passing on your practical information. Acceptance has been fair with most of the fellows at least thinking possible application. A one or two day session similar to the one at Boise, will more completely answer our permittee's questions and provide a better background.

Several Forests in Region 2, 4, and 6 have been contacted in trying to locate some photo point pictures similar to ones you showed at Boise. However, I have been unsuccessful. Has your publication you spoke of in February been printed and made available?

I understand that if enough lead time is provided, you may be interested in holding a local session. This is certainly what we desire if you could work us in your schedule. December is somewhat the slack time for our ranchers. Riggins lays in a good location with permittees available from both directions. No problem is anticipated in recruiting the quota of 50 which the Boise session aimed for. A good facility is also available. Riggins is in west central Idaho, 150 miles north of Boise.

I am attempting to locate a well organized permittee stock association with an effective constitution or by-laws, which spell out members responsibility etc. In your contacts, perhaps you could refer me to a couple of such associations, as the information is needed to try and activate two old associations which we have and need to improve for intensive management.

We will certainly appreciate hearing from you and some consideration of holding a session here, if you can work us in.

Sincerely yours,

LARRY DANIELS  
Range Forester
Memorandum

To: Jerry Hillier, BLM, Billings

From: A. L. Hormay, Range Conservationist, Berkeley

Subject: Rest-rotation training

I plan to attend the Montana Association of Cooperative State Grazing Districts meeting, November 14 and 15, 1969 at Sidney, Montana, as outlined in Mr. Newell's memorandum of May 28.

I will let you know of my travel plans the latter part of October.

A. L. Hormay
P. O. Box 245
Berkeley, Calif. 94701

September 3, 1969

Memorandum

To:    Paul Leonard, State Office, Santa Fe, N.M.

From:  A. L. Hormay, Range Conservationist, Berkeley

Subject: Rest-rotation training

In reply to your telephone call of September 2, 1969 while I was out.

I am completely obligated with training sessions, field trips, research, and other matters the remainder of the fiscal year, so do not have time to conduct the training session you propose. I could schedule one for next fiscal year, however. If you wish such a session, please let me know at an early date.

cc: Lea, Wash., D.C.
P. O. Box 245  
Berkeley, Calif. 94701

September 10, 1969

Memorandum

To: Chief, Division of Range Management (712a) Wash., D. C.

From: A. L. Hormay, Range Conservationist, Berkeley

Subject: Monthly Report, August 1969

I conducted range training sessions for the Forest Service at Springerville, Arizona (Apache National Forest) August 4-5, and at Cloudcroft, New Mexico (Lincoln National Forest) August 7-8. All trainees showed great interest and enthusiasm. See attached attendance lists.

I visited the Eureka cattle and sheep allotment near Eureka, Nevada, Battle Mountain District on August 18 and 19. In the group touring the allotment were Harry Finlayson, District Manager, Jim Lambert, Area Manager, Phil Zieg, technician, Martin Buzan, State Office, and Phillip Echervary, permittee. The allotment is about 227,000 acres in size and over-all is in fair to poor condition. Better management of the allotment is sorely needed. Wildlife, recreation, watershed, as well as livestock grazing values, are greatly depreciated.

From a quick appraisal the allotment appears to breakdown into three practical management areas. A 3-treatment rest-rotation grazing system seems feasible on each of these areas. The permittee shows willingness to go ahead with management on the westerly area which is based on the 3-Bar Ranch headquarters. With a few miles of fence and additional water, this area could probably be brought under management by next year.

I visited four cattle allotments on the Elko District, Nevada, August 21-23, the first was the Stonier Allotment in Ruby Valley, south of Elko. Daryl Short, Area Manager, Don Rhea (District), Cliff Gardner, rancher, and Jim Stonier, permittee, were on the trip. Fences and water developments on the allotment are now being completed. I suggested changes in the grazing formula and in a fence location.

I toured the Gibbs Allotment, southwest of Jackpot, Nevada, with George Ramey, Area Manager, Don Rhea, former Area Manager, Eyer Boise, neighbor rancher, and Bill Gibbs, permittee, the morning of August 22. The area
manager has worked out a 3-treatment rest-rotation grazing plan for the allotment. The plan is excellent. The whole setup is close to ideal and can be a showplace from the time management starts.

In the afternoon we visited the Horace Smith Allotment. Eyre Boise left the group and Wayne Phillips, representative of neighboring ranch interests, and Horace Smith, permittee, joined. The Smith Allotment is under a 4-treatment rest-rotation plan. Management was started this year, and is being applied in good form. Mr. Smith shows understanding and is cooperative.

On Saturday, August 23, George Ramsey, and Art Tait and Phil Range of the District, Mr. J. K. Wheeler, permittee, and I examined the Wheeler Allotment. I recommended two, 3-treatment rest-rotation grazing management setups on the area. Fencing and water development programs on the allotment are well along. Management on at least a portion of the allotment could probably be started by next year.

I gave a 2-day range training session for stockmen at Murphy, Idaho (Boise District) August 25 and 27. Attendance at the meeting is shown on an attached sheet. The stockmen and others were greatly interested. I'm sure they got a different view of range management and the role of livestock in multiple-use land management.

In a 2-hour session on September 3, I outlined the principles of rest-rotation grazing management to the Nevada BLM State Advisory Board and others at Winnemucca. See attendance list. On September 4, the group toured the Little Owyhee Allotment and Sagehen Unit of the Stewart Allotment north of Winnemucca. Rest-rotation grazing management is in effect on these two areas. Explanations of results by Area Manager, Ken Satterfield, and District Manager Gene Moore, were excellent. Rest-rotation grazing is being practiced on these two areas with flexibility and realism that comes from a clear understanding of rest-rotation management principles.
Memorandum

To: A. L. Hormay, Range Conservationist (Berkeley, California)

From: Chief, Division of Range

Subject: Your Monthly Reports

I appreciated your August report. It was excellent. Your coverage of the important findings and your recommendations were great.

I circulate the reports, like the August one, to the Directorate, including Mr. Rasmussen, to keep them informed of the good work you are doing for resource management and BLM.

We are still looking, and I hope you are also, for an assistant for you. Your September travel schedule surely shows up the need for help. In addition, I hate to see you have to turn down requests because of your full schedule. The new cuts in personnel ceilings will make our job harder in getting you help. But, I feel confident that we can do something before too long yet this fiscal year.

You probably won't see this until October 1 since you are traveling all of September. I leave next Tuesday for South Dakota with Boyd to meet with the Wool Growers and Cattlemen at their annual Public Land Committee Meeting. I will then be in Alaska for two weeks and then take in our semi-annual Service Center coordination meeting at Portland. Sorry your schedule will not permit you to be there. I am going to stop at Moscow, Idaho, for a day and be back here October 13.

Keep up the good work, Gus.

[Signature]
September 15, 1969

Mr. A. L. Hornay
Bureau of Land Management
P. O. Box 245
Berkeley, California 94701

Dear Gus,

I want to express my gratitude for your time and attention to Filbert Etcheverry's allotment. Your presence has made my planning effort less burdensome because of his improved confidence. A measure of this was seen the following week when we sat down together and layed out the pasture system. Without your final instruction of the basic principles and the assurance of flexibility in the system I am certain that many additional hours would have been spent in training.

I am hopeful that as we progress you will direct other stockmen to Filbert for his advice. I know he thrives on being a leader in new and successful ventures and his opinion among his own should expedite our management efforts.

We invite you, of course, to visit us as often as you can to check our progress. It is doubtful that much can be done about our driving habits but maybe with each exposure we will become better rest-rotation managers.

Best Regards,

James S. Lambert
Eureka Resource Area Manager
GENERAL OUTLINE OF WORKSHOP

I. Watershed Processes and Problems

II. Watershed Studies

III. Field Examination of Watershed Problems and Treatments. Tour of workshop study allotment.

IV. Objective of Watershed Program

V. Treatment Alternatives

VI. Evaluating Alternatives

VII. Plan preparation by buzz groups

VIII. Plan presentation by buzz groups, and discussion
**Watershed Planning Workshop**  
**FT. MEADE, SOUTH DAKOTA**  
*September 16-20, 1968*

### Monday, September 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 to 8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>RPM Staff, Montana State Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 to 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Erosion and Sedimentation</td>
<td>Norman King, USGS Water Res. Div., Denver, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Erosion and Sedimentation (cont’d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 to 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Soil, Vegetation, and Water Interrelationships, and Effect on Land Uses (infiltration, compaction, soil moisture under different vegetative types and land uses, etc.)</td>
<td>Dr. David Thorud, Watershed Mgt. Dept., Univ. of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 to 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Soil, Vegetation, Water Relationships (cont’d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 to 5:15</td>
<td>Runoff as affected by grazing intensity in the Northern Plains</td>
<td>Armine Kuhlman, ARS, Newell, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tuesday, September 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 to 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Estimating Water Yields and Peak Discharges</td>
<td>Ron Kuhlman, BLM Washington office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 to 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Estimating Soil Losses from Surface and Channel Erosion</td>
<td>Gene Allison, BLM, DSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 to 11:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Soil Surveys--Use and Application</td>
<td>Lyle Linnell, BLM, DSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Soil Moisture</td>
<td>Dr. Thorud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 to 2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Use and Application of USGS Stream Flow and Sediment Data</td>
<td>Gene Allison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 to 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Intra-red Photography to Determine Sediment Loads and Sources</td>
<td>Leon Logan, USFS, Bozeman, Montana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3:15 to 4:30 p.m. Soil and Watershed program objective relationship to other components of the Bureau planning system Ed Spang, BLM, Washington office

4:30 to 5:15 p.m. Estimating discharge in ephemeral streams from particle settling time Norman King

At meeting room Philtown Inn, Sturgis:

7:00 to 8:00 p.m. Artificial land treatments--their selections, use, and limitations F. A. Branson, USGS, Water Res Div., Denver, Colorado

8:00 to 8:30 p.m. Presentation of agenda of field tour and data on study allotment Joe Wichman, BLM, Belle Fouche South Dakota

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18

FIELD TRIP: Ft. Meade area
Newell Station, ARS and S. Dak. Ag. Exp. Station
Crago Bros. Allotment
Moreau Allotment on Alkali Creek (study allotment)

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19

8:00 to 9:00 a.m. Use of water yield, sediment, and discharge frequency data in decision making Earl Neff, ARS, Sidney, Mont.

9:00 to 10:00 a.m. Vegetation management and manipulation as a watershed treatment practice A. L. "Gus" Hormay, BLM, Berkeley, California

10:15 to 11:00 a.m. Vegetation Management (cont'd) "

11:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. Structural treatments--their selection, purpose in watershed rehabilitation and limitations. Small structures vs. large structures. Norman King

1:00 to 2:00 p.m. Artificial vs. Natural revegetation in watershed management A. L. Hormay

2:00 to 3:00 p.m. Evaluation of Alternatives and decision-making using studies of soil, vegetation, and moisture deciding what to do from a technical standpoint Dr. Thorud
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Plan preparation by buzz groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Plan presentation by buzz groups; 1 hour each group, including critique and discussion. Order of presentation by drawing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Plan presentation by buzz groups; 1 hour each group, including critique and discussion. Order of presentation by drawing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 to</td>
<td>Plans to be prepared by 8:00 a.m. by all groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Plans to be prepared by 8:00 a.m. by all groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 to</td>
<td>Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Malta District

- **Dick DeVries**
  - GS-9
  - Range Conservationist
  - BS Forestry(Range) U. of Mont.
- **Lowell Brown**
  - GS-11
  - Area Manager
  - BS Range Management, Colo. State
- **Ron Kalcso**
  - GS-9
  - Range Conservationist
  - BS Range Management
- **Wayne Zinne**
  - GS-11
  - Area Manager
  - BS Forestry (Range), U. of Mont.
- **Jim Hicks**
  - GS-9
  - Area Manager
  - BS Range, U. of Wyoming
- **Art Halvorson**
  - GS-11
  - Chief, Div. of Oper.
  - BS Ag. Engin., Mont. State U.
- **Ron Younger**
  - GS-12
  - Chief, Div. of Res. Mgmt.
  - BS Range Mgmt., Utah State

### Miles City

- **Willie Peterson**
  - GS-11
  - Area Manager
  - BS Range Mgmt., S. Dak. State
- **Clyde Brewer**
  - GS-11
  - Area Manager
  - BS Range Mgmt., Mont. State U.
- **Don Nelson**
  - GS-11
  - Area Manager
  - BS Range Mgmt., Mont. State U.
- **Ken Rhea**
  - GS-11
  - Area Manager
  - BS Range Mgmt., Mont. State U.
- **Jim Anderson**
  - GS-9
  - Ag. Engineer(Div. of Oper)
  - BS Civil Engin., N. Dak. State
- **Christian Vosler**
  - GS-12
  - Chief, Div. of Res. Mgt.
  - BS, MS, Range Mgmt U. of Wyoming

### Billings

- **Bruce Daughton**
  - GS-9
  - Area Staff
  - BS Farm Opr., Iowa State, BS Range Mgmt., Mont State U.
  - BS Range Mgmt., Utah State
- **Birrell Hirshi**
  - GS-11
  - Area Manager
  - BS, MS, Range Mgmt., Ft. Hays (Kansas) State
- **Duane Sonnenberg**
  - GS-11
  - Area Manager
  - BS Wildlife Tech., Mont. State U.
- **Duane Whitmer**
  - GS-7
  - Area Staff
  - BS Wildlife Tech., Mont. State U.
### Dillon District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Anderson</td>
<td>GS-9</td>
<td>Area Staff</td>
<td>BS Range Mgmt., U. of Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Short</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>BS Range Mgmt., S. Dak. State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Barnes</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>BS Range Mgmt., New Mexico A&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Dale</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Chief, Div. of Oper.</td>
<td>BS Forestry, U of Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Larson</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Chief, Div. of Res. Mgmt.</td>
<td>BS Range Mgmt., U. of Wyoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lewistown District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Cutler</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>BS Range Mgmt., Mont. State U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolland Jorgensen</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>BS, MS, Range Mgmt., U. of Wyo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Sharp</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>BS Wildlife Mgmt., Utah State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Eichhorn</td>
<td>GS-9</td>
<td>Res. Mgmt. Staff (Wildlife)</td>
<td>BS Forestry (wildlife) U. of Mont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nesselhuf</td>
<td>GS-9</td>
<td>Area staff</td>
<td>BS Range Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orien Grover (Sid)</td>
<td>GS-9</td>
<td>Area staff</td>
<td>BS Range Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Jonart</td>
<td>GS-5</td>
<td>Area staff</td>
<td>BS Forestry (Range) U. of Mont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Buck</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Chief, Div. of Res. Mgmt.</td>
<td>BS Range Mgmt., Texas A&amp;M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missoula District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Lovell</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Chief, Div. of Res. Mgmt.</td>
<td>BS Forestry Mgmt., U. of Mont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Betts</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>BS Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Lotvedt</td>
<td>GS-9</td>
<td>Area Staff</td>
<td>BS Range Mgmt., N. Dak. State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Montana State Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed Croteau</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>BS Civil Engin. N. Dak. State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Conference
on
September 18, 1969

Place : Nevada East-West Room, Travis Student Union, University of Nevada, Reno

Sponsors : Nevada State Committee on Federal Land Law; and the Cooperative Extension Service of the Max C. Fleischmann College of Agriculture, University of Nevada, Reno

Purpose: To bring prominent Nevada sportsmen, ranchers and specialists together to consider and seek solutions to problems affecting use of public lands by livestock and wildlife.

Objectives : 1. Improved public land policy and management
2. Improved public land user relations and practices

Invited Participants: All members Board of Fish and Game Commissioners - 9
Representatives of Nevada Farm Bureau - 3
Representatives of Nevada Woolgrowers Association - 3
Representatives of Nevada Cattle Association - 3
Speakers and Public Agency Specialists - 14
Total - 32

Agenda: 8:30 AM - Introduction and statement of conference objectives
9:00 - Range Forage Use by Livestock and Big Game in Nevada. - A. L. Lesperance, Univ. of Nevada
10:00 - Management of Bitterbrush Ranges. - A. L. ("Gus") Hornay, Bureau of Land Management
11:00 - Discussion - Dr. P. T. Tueller, University of Nevada, Moderator
12:00 - Lunch (facilities available at Student Union)
1:00 PM - Public Land Law Review Activities on the State and National Level - Norman Hall, Nevada Dept. of Conservation and Natural Resources.
1:30 - The Public Land Law Review Commission's Study of Fish and Wildlife Resources - Glen Griffith, Nevada Fish & Game Dept.
2:00 - The Public Land Law Review Commission's Study of the Forage Resources - John L. Artz, University of Nevada.
2:30 - Discussion - What actions can we take as individuals or as a group towards improving public land policy and management and public land user relations and practices? John L. Artz, Moderator.
4:30 - Adjourn.
The Forage Resource Study is one of some 34 studies and analyses undertaken by the Public Land Law Review Commission (PLLRC). Most were performed by independent contractors. In this case, the contract was awarded to the University of Idaho with Pacific Contractors, Inc. in January 1968 and completed in June, 1969. It comprises over 100 pages in four volumes and eight chapters.

To me, the title "Forage Resources" is a misnomer. Actually, it was designed and is a study of livestock use of public lands. Little consideration is given directly to wildlife, and equally important forage user. Since a separate study covers wildlife use, I think this study would have more appropriately been called a livestock use study. I mention this only so you realize the deliberately limited scope of the study and of my summary.

I should mention one further qualification before continuing: The studies undertaken by the contractor do not represent opinions or conclusions of the Commission itself. The studies are simply a collection of information for the use of the Commission and others. Study contracts make clear that the Commission does not seek specific recommendation from the contractor.

A THIRD OF OUR TOTAL LAND AREA IS RANGE AND PASTURE.

For openers, let's look at the size of our forage resource. AS IT WORKS OUT, ABOUT A THIRD OF OUR TOTAL RANGELAND IS FEDERAL AND A THIRD OF OUR FEDERAL LAND IS RANGELAND.

Where is the federal land? About 47% is in Alaska. Another 47% is within the 11 Western States and the remaining 5% is in the other 38 states. Ninety-six percent of the grazed public lands are in the 11 Western States and 96% of these are administered by either the BLM or USFS. It is clear then that forage lands make up a major portion of our total land area and of our federal lands but that the federal forage lands are very largely within the 11 Western States under the jurisdiction of the BLM and USFS.

So, for the purposes of the study our focus is on those National Forest and BLM grazing lands in the Western States. Here grazing lands make up nearly two-thirds of the total land area. About one-half of this grazing land is federally owned and nearly three-fourths of the federal land is used for livestock grazing. Closer to home, in Nevada, grazing lands make up 56% of the land area, 83% are federally owned and 90% of the federal lands are grazed.

Considering the amount of federal grazing lands, their contribution to the total livestock forage needs are not as great as one might think. The study shows that federal forage lands produce only 3% of the national livestock forage requirements and 12% of those of the 11 Western States. Even in Nevada, federal lands furnish slightly less than half of the requirements. However, the statistics may be misleading. They reflect only the forage taken from the federal lands. However, if the federal lands were to be "locked up", a substantial part of the forage produced on the interdependant private lands would also be adversely affected.
Another important factor brought out by the study is this: THE WESTERN STATES, AS A REGION, ARE MEAT IMPORTERS - NOT EXPORTERS. Therefore, if livestock declines in the west, it is the western consumer who would be most affected.

Now, what does the study report about the condition these lands and the trend in forage production and consumption? I have summarized this as follows:

PUBLIC RANGELAND CONDITION AND TREND

1. 81% is classified as in "Poor" or "Fair" Condition

2. On public lands, livestock use has declined 9% since 1947
   On BLM lands, game use has increased over 200% since 1947
   On USFS lands, game use has increased over 500% since 1923

3. Lands needing improvement practices
   Expected increased Capacity with Improvements

   BLM  USFS
   70%  86%
   1967 1287

4. Federal grazing receipts
   Cost of Improvement Practices
   Improvement cost borne by users
   Expenditures for federal cost-sharing programs on private rangelands

   $ 7.3 MM  $ 5.0 MM
   $12.0 MM  $ 4.2 MM
   15%  21%
   $10.1 MM  $ 6.5 MM

How do we interpret this data? (1) The determination of range condition certainly is not an exact science and the figures presented here are only agency projections. However, there is little doubt that a great portion of the public grazing land is not producing the quantity or quality of forage or the watershed protection that we believe it should and could.

(2) The decline in livestock use, based on agency licensing records, is probably reasonably accurate. There is some indication that the decline may be at least tapering off unless (a) grazing regulations make grazing uneconomic or (b) other uses for the lands eliminate grazing either by decree or untenable conditions.

The data indicating wildlife increases is not as soundly based as the livestock decreases. There is little explanation or interpretation provided in the study. However, we can assume that this data furnished by the land managing agencies, that only game species are considered, and that the information is based on estimates which may not be fully comparative over the years. Therefore, increases stated may be misleading. Most experts do agree, however, that game generally has been on the increase during the past few decades. There is also good evidence that livestock grazing has been complimentary to, or compatible with some of the major game species. Carrying this further, the study finds little adverse effect on livestock grazing from other rangeland uses except certain types of recreation and
and timber management practices. Conflicts with other uses, they conclude, are presently more vocal and anticipatory than real.

(3) The figures showing lands needing improvement practices and the expected carrying capacity increases are again agency furnished. This is probably the only available data but it leaves much to be desired. For example, the study presents no evaluation of the economic feasibility of such a large scale program. Improvement program costs are presented in the study (4) but there is no indication of the rate at which present levels of spending are reducing the proportion of lands needing improvement. The other important points made here are: (a) that annual improvement costs exceed grazing fee receipts allowing less than nothing for administration, fire protection and the like (study data indicates these more than double federal costs); (b) that range users participation in range improvement is decreasing, and that the federal government is spending nearly as much on private rangeland improvement through cost-sharing programs (ASCS-SCS) as it is on federal lands. There are two major reasons for decline in rancher participation in public land improvement programs: (a) rancher reluctance to invest without greater security, and (b) agency desire for "no strings attached" control of the land.

Considerably more original study was put in by the contractor on the livestock operators using public range, and on the economics of the individual operator, the livestock industry and the communities where public land livestock grazing is significant. One of the local areas selected for detailed study was Elko County, Nevada.

Economic studies indicated that the breakeven point for livestock ranches is about 200 animal units, slightly less in the Plains and Rocky Mountains, slightly more in the Great Basin and Southwest. The breakeven point is that sized operation where the costs of producing a pound of meat equals the sales price of a pound of meat at the ranch. The study found that from agency data, that the average Forest Service permit was for 75 annual units and 159 for BLM - far below the economic breakeven point. There is some question about the meaningfulness of these averages, however. For example, two-thirds of all Forest Service permits, are for free-use for a few milk cows or saddle horses. Clearly this distorts the picture if you think of the average Forest range-user as one making substantial use of the National Forest as part of his commercial livestock operation.

The present average market place value of a grazing permit was also determined by the study. This was $14.41/AUM for BLM permits, $19.42/AUM for F. S. sheep permits, and $24.69/AUM for F. S. cattle permits. Data collected from the detailed ranch studies indicates that:

1. 75% of all income is from livestock
2. 2.5% are still operated by the original "homesteader"
3. Since federal administration,
   a. 3% have had permit increases
   b. 34% have had permit decreases, and
   c. 40% have purchased additional federal grazing privileges.
Economic data was developed for the eleven Western states on the importance of the livestock industry in comparison to the other industries in the state. Three commonly accepted economic "yardsticks" were used -- "investment", "labor", and "value added". By at least one "yardstick", the livestock industry rated among the top three industries in each of the states.

The first chapter of the study is a legal review of the history, statutory authorities, court rulings, policies and regulations of the agencies administering public lands. I have saved this as the last item of my summary because one important section nicely sets the stage for a consideration of issues relating to the future of the public lands in relation to livestock. Obviously the legal status of present public land range users is an important consideration when we examine alternatives for change. The section I refer to is a review of "The Nature of the Grazing Privilege". I have summarized the review as follows:

1. It is something of value
2. It is subject to protection from an illegal act
3. Its source is in the enactment of the Congress
4. It is a "right" against another individual, not against the government
5. It gains no interest in the land itself
6. It is revokable without right to compel compensation
7. It may be subject to state and local taxation

The Forage Study concludes with a section analyzing the data presented and a section considering a number of alternatives to present systems in relation to livestock.

The analysis section makes several important points:

1. The objectives of public land management in relation to livestock grazing are changing. Until fairly recently, objectives have had to do with maintenance and improvement of the range; orderly and equitable use and development; and stability of ranches, the livestock industry and local communities. Emerging objectives involve:
   a. **Flexibility to meet changing needs.** This is reflected in reluctance of agencies to recognize, or provide security for, rancher investments.
   b. **Landlord rather than custodial management.** Federal management for profit. Considered here are higher grazing fees, competitive bidding for grazing privileges, and other programs aimed at maximizing direct federal returns.
   c. **Integration of public policy with general agricultural policies.** Here would be considered such overall policies as agricultural production controls.
   d. **An aid in alleviating rural poverty.** This objective is presented but no applications are suggested.

2. The analysis concludes that the new grazing fee structure initiated this year will have a depressive economic effect. The "break-even" rancher will sustain an annual operating loss of about $600, plus losing the market value of his permit. In the "range counties" studied, the impact of the full fee increase on county income
will vary from slightly less than one percent to nearly four percent. There will be little, if any, effect on meat prices, and ranches will be further discouraged from investing in range improvements.

3. Primarily, both the BLM and the Forest Service manage forage from the view of condition and sustained yield, rather than optimum forage production. The study suggests that as much as 36% of Forest Service land and 70% of BLM lands can be improved for forage production through economically sound investment, and that maximum production may sometimes be obtained through a system of improvement-heavy use and "rehabilitation" rather than through sustained yield. Such a system might be appropriate for agriculture but would be a dubious role for government. Before better management and development plans can be initiated, there is need for:
   a. Better methods of land classification
   b. More economic information
   c. Improved means of matching and evaluating alternative land uses against public needs.

In reviewing alternatives the contractors have considered the first charge made to the PLLRC - which of the lands "--shall be (a) retained and managed or (b) disposed of --" but, as directed, present no problem. They also consider a number of alternatives under retention. Included are such elements as:

1. Obtaining optimum maintenance and development through greater incentives to range users. (lower fees, greater security, etc.)

2. Proprietary management by government to maximize direct returns. (higher fees, competitive bidding etc.)

3. Bringing fees to full market value in a manner fair and equitable to present user. (four possibilities mentioned. None appear workable to me.)

4. Efficiency of forage use through elimination of certain regulations. (commensurability, upper limits)

5. Priority of use to livestock plus user fees for non-forage users.

6. An independent public land advisory planning body, directly responsible to Congress.

This concludes my review of the Forage Resource Study. As personal comment and summary I would add this:

As I see it, there are really two basic questions for the PLLRC to resolve:

1. SHOULD THE FEDERAL GRAZING LANDS BE DISPOSED OF OR RETAINED AND MANAGED?

2. WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE IN PRESENT POLICY TO OPTIMIZE BENEFITS FROM PUBLIC GRAZING LANDS.
I would not presume to provide solutions for either question. However, I would like to offer several concepts which, I believe, should be considered in any practical or philosophic attempt at resolution:

1. Disposal of public lands should not be conditioned upon terms of existing laws; it need not necessarily be terminally completed, or only to private ownership; and hence in the future recovery should not necessarily be the primary objective.

2. Multiple use land management is possible without federal ownership or federal agency administration of land.

3. Assignment of administrative responsibility should not be made only on the basis of the agency or level of government presently best financed or best staffed to accomplish the objectives.

4. The land disposal policies of the nation have created a crazy-quilt pattern of land ownership in many parts of the western grazing region. Much of the best land within areas of predominantly federal rangeland is owned and operated by private ranch enterprises. This land pattern has created an interdependence between the public lands and private lands. Not only are the ranch enterprises dependent on the public lands for a year-round operation but the public lands cannot be used to their full potential in providing public benefits - including, but not limited to, forage production - without the intermingled and adjacent private lands.

5. If private enterprise is to share in the maintenance and development of our lands and our economy, it must be offered reasonable security of investment and protection against arbitrary regulation. 'Special interest legislation' is not necessarily bad legislation and "the public good" may sometimes be linked as closely to interest group proposals as to those of public agencies. Good public policy can be blocked by unnecessary conflict among interest groups.

With this bit of philosophy I conclude and we may get on to the discussion announced in our conference program - "What actions can we take as individuals or groups towards improving public land policy and public land user relations and practices?"

John L. Artz, Extension Specialist
RNR Center, College of Agriculture
University of Nevada
Mr. Larry Daniels  
Range Forester  
Nezperce National Forest  
Riggins, Idaho 83549

Dear Larry:

Four one-day range training sessions for stockmen in Idaho are being planned now. The Idaho Cattlemen and the Idaho Chapter of the Society of Range Management are the sponsors. Tentative times and places are the week of December 15, at Weiser, Boise, Montpelier, and Malad. Final dates and places will probably be announced within a month. Perhaps your people can attend one of these sessions. I am committed solidly with other services and other work and could not conduct a course for you until after July 1970.

The publication on my course should be out any day now. About a month ago Washington told me it was about to go to the press.

Last May Region I made a video tape of the course. A sound tape of my descriptions of the slides was also made. The region has still not asked for copies of the slides.

Copies of the slides and tapes can be made available to agency people and others but the mechanics has not been worked out yet. The video tape and the sound tape for the slides are in the Regional Office in Missoula.

I suggest you contact the State Office of the BLM in Boise about permittee stock associations.

Sorry for the delay in replying to your letter. I have been in the field most of the month. In fact I just returned from Idaho where I looked at ranges in the vicinity of Emmet and Horse Shoe Bend.

Sincerely,

A.L. Horrey  
A.L. Horrey  
Range Conservationist
Memorandum

To: Director (330)

From: State Director, Colorado

Subject: Request for Training Session by A. L. Hormay

We would like to hold a Hormay training session in our Canon City District with the livestock operators for the purpose of generating additional interest in the application of AMPs.

If possible, we would like to hold this session Monday, February 16, 1970.

Please advise if this can be arranged.

cc: Canon City District
Memorandum

To: District Manager, Winnemucca, Nevada

From: A. L. Hormay, Range Conservationist, Berkeley

Subject: Rest-rotation grazing management suggestions - Granite Peak Allotment

A satisfactory and apparently practiced management formula for the Granite Peak Allotment is the straight 3-treatment formula:

A

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was not clear on the boundaries of the allotment and assumed low lying spring, fall, winter areas around the south and east sides as shown in the attached diagrams. If any appreciable amount of this low area is public domain, consideration should be given to bringing it under management in conjunction with the higher summer range area.

Two 3-treatment systems seem to be workable on these low areas—one covering pastures 4, 5, and 6 and the other pastures 7, 8, and 9. The summer range area can probably be divided into 3 pastures of about the same capacity by running a fence north from the existing east-west fence through the middle of the allotment.

Two different ways of handling the livestock in these pastures are shown in the attached diagrams. There may be other ways. It may be possible to effect direct connections between pastures where the dashed arrows are shown.

If the low lying areas are used both spring and fall (winter) the pasture getting treatment A would be used in spring and the one getting treatment B
would be used in the fall. If fall use is not contemplated, treatments A and B would be applied in springtime. The animals would probably move up onto higher range before seed ripe time on the lower range. In this case grazing in the pasture getting treatment B would be started about half way through the spring period.

Lacking phenology data, a contour map, and other information, I cannot be more specific in my suggestion. Three-treatment formulas should do the jobs. The location of fences should be worked out with great care and by one means or another with the permittees.

A. L. Hormay

Enclosures
TO: Director

FROM: State Director, Nevada

SUBJECT: Rest-Rotation Grazing Management Training Sessions

Requests have been received by the Ely and Las Vegas District Managers from stockmen, State Fish and Game, Forest Service and Extension Service personnel, for training sessions on rest-rotation grazing management. It is apparent that word is being spread by State Advisory Board members, of the outstanding results being achieved in the Winnemucca District from rest-rotation management.

We would like to have A.L. "Gus" Hormay put on two one-day sessions; one at Pioche or Caliente and one at Ely, in either March or April at dates convenient to him. If you approve, please advise and we will make arrangements direct with Mr. Hormay.

cc:
A.L. Hormay
Ely (N-500)
Las Vegas (N-600)
Memorandum

To: State Director, Colorado

From: Acting Chief, Division of Range

Subject: Request for Training Session by A. L. Hormay

Reference is made to your memorandum of September 22, 1969, requesting a Hormay training session in the Canon City District. Your request is being forwarded directly to Mr. Hormay; since he is responsible for arranging his own training schedules.

Carl P. McCullough

A.L. Hormay
Rest Rotation Training Session
Logan, Utah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nick J. Cozakos</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary E. Sayer</td>
<td>U.S.F.S.</td>
<td>Randolph, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. E. Tippets</td>
<td>U.S.F.S.</td>
<td>Paris, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan R. Thornton</td>
<td>U.S.F.S.</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. Roberts</td>
<td>U.S.F.S.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Nebeker</td>
<td>U.S.F.S.</td>
<td>Ogden, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick J. Coyne</td>
<td>Range Science Dept. USU</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl G. Parker</td>
<td>Ext. Service USU</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Price</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>Malta, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald M. Walters</td>
<td>Forest Service</td>
<td>Malta, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack F. Hooper, Economist- Range Science Dept. USU</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Kimber</td>
<td>State Fish &amp; Game</td>
<td>Snowville, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl J. Baird</td>
<td>Forest Service</td>
<td>Ogden, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman E. Blaser</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Workman</td>
<td>USU Range Scientist</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway E. Parry</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Brigham City, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce W. Reise</td>
<td>Forest Service</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan Adams</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>Randolph, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Huffaker</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Woodruff, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy D. Hoffman</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Randolph, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Hoffman</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Randolph, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Hopkin</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>Woodruff, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delmar Kearl</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Laketown, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiel A. Zollinger</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>Malta, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orson Zollinger</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Parker</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>Malta, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese D. Warburton</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Grouse Creek, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Cowley</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Smithfield, RFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman E. Weston</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Laketown, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Mott</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Park Valley, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don C. Nye</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Paris, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Proctor</td>
<td>Forest Service</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wally Larsen</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kamas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler St. John</td>
<td>Wasatch N. F.</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. F. Savage</td>
<td>Uintah Natl. Forest</td>
<td>Provo, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Bruce Perry</td>
<td>Uintah N. F.</td>
<td>Orem, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Brook</td>
<td>Forest Service</td>
<td>Heber City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mervin Miles</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ames Harrison</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan M. Smith</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl W. Hickerson</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vann M. Bennett</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Salt Lake DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil W. Vance</td>
<td>Forest Service</td>
<td>Evanston, Wyo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. G. Parker</td>
<td>USU Extension Service</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick J. Cozakos</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijah L. Cook</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Carpenter</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell Balls</td>
<td>U.S.D.A. A.R.S.</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Heywood</td>
<td>U.S.D.A. S.C.S.</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Steve Scheldt</td>
<td>U.S.D.A. S.C.S.</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deane Harrison</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anselmo Valverde</td>
<td>BTA</td>
<td>Ft. Duchesne, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Poowegup</td>
<td>Ute Tribe</td>
<td>Ft. Duchesne, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen E. Graft</td>
<td>U.S.F.S.</td>
<td>Tooele, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max R. Kutch</td>
<td>U.S.F.S.</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rae Eyre</td>
<td>Utah Wool Growers</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Mike</td>
<td>Natl. Wool Growers</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lael J. Baird</td>
<td>Forest Service</td>
<td>Ogden, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Adair</td>
<td>KSL Farm Dept.</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan C. Johnson</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>Grantsville, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis R. Lewis</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kamas, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Gibbons</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kamas, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delbert Chipman</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>American Fork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clair Winterton</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Roosevelt, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euray Allred</td>
<td>Sheep raiser</td>
<td>Fountain Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Polson</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>Mt. View, Wyo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Reid</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Tugaw</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Woodruff, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Frazier</td>
<td>Sheep raiser</td>
<td>Logan, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd V. Israeison</td>
<td>Livestock farmer</td>
<td>Mendon, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Hibner</td>
<td>Livestock breeder</td>
<td>330 W. 21st So., SLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. K. Wheeler</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant Olsen</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>Peo, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Marchant</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dan Freed
Thornley K. Swan
J. Glen Beach

Rancher
""
"

P.O. Box 2009, SLC
60 N. 2nd E., Kaysville
Mt. View, Wyo.
September 30, 1969

Mr. Gus Hormay  
Pacific Southwest Range and Forest  
Experiment Station  
Post Office Box 245  
Berkeley, California 94704

Dear Mr. Hormay:

We would like to get several copies of your publication, "Rest-Rotation Grazing...A New Management System for Perennial Bunchgrass Ranges." Occasionally we need copies of this report to give to individuals or groups as we discuss rest rotation grazing. Also, some of our employees need copies. If possible, we would like to receive twelve copies, and preferably twenty copies. We will be glad to pay whatever charge is involved.

Can you tell us if the publication is still available on order? Does the U.S. Government Printing Office have it or what would be our best source?

The Advisory Board meeting and field tour here early in September apparently had real impact. We are getting some feedback which indicates that it was very well received.

Sincerely yours,

Gordon A. Frashier  
Acting District Manager
Memorandum

To: Director (330)

From: State Director, Colorado

Subject: Request for Hormay Training Session

If possible we would like to have Mr. A. L. Hormay conduct a training session in our Grand Junction District for the benefit of the users.

We have already requested Mr. Hormay for February 16, 1970 in Canon City. It might be convenient for him to hold both sessions in the same week. If not, any date is acceptable with us.

cc: Grand Junction Dist.