Hi Gus!

Give me a buzz some day - I drop around. We have some gossip to catch up on.

With every good wish for a

HAPPY NEW YEAR

[Signature]

[1970, Dec]
Form 1542-4
(August 1965)
(formerly 4-1123)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>ROOM NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaga Hormay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate Action by Number

1. Necessary action
2. Approval
3. Signature
4. Prepare reply
5. Your comment and return
6. Note and surname
7. Note and return
8. Your information
9. See me
10.          

From
Ray Cleary

Date 12/170

Office
Montana State Office

Phone

Remarks
1. List of trains for Billings, Richfield, Butte, Missoula, and Great Falls
2. Distribution we made of Joint Senate
3. Briefing papers on utilization studies including Lee Sharp letter. Zuilding used this to personally brief Karamanoff on the problem at recent S. Directors meeting in Salt Lake. Ray
Briefing
Range Utilization Studies

Four types of range management studies are classified as "Primary" studies which means it is mandatory that the districts conduct them continually on all Allotment Management Plans. These four are Trend, Utilization, Actual Use and Climate.

Other types of studies are approved, but are classified as "Supplementary" which means the use of them is discretionary. These include Condition, Production and Exclusions.

A great deal of manpower is required to conduct Utilization Studies as required in the manual. We have evaluated Utilization Studies throughout Montana. On rest-rotation grazing systems the studies produce no useable information. Judging by present trends, it will be only a short time before all Allotment Management Plans in Montana are based on rest-rotation principles.

The present Utilization Studies measure the portion of a plant species, or combination of species, that are harvested. With this narrow application, they serve only to perpetuate the "proper use" myth. Unfortunately, the "proper use" myth is the greatest obstacle we have to contend with in getting our technicians to develop the most effective grazing system.1/

Thus, the drawbacks to Utilization Studies are two-pronged. The studies produce nothing useable; and they interfere with the development of the most effective type of grazing management. We submit this is a poor investment of manpower.

The Director's policy is emphatic that no new AMP's will be developed until all mandatory studies are conducted on existing plans. This further restricts the field offices.

A simple solution exists. Merely change the classification of Utilization Studies from "Primary" to "Supplemental." This proposal was made by Montana at the recent Range Workshop at Winnemucca. A lengthy discussion identified a bad split. Nevada, Idaho, Wyoming and California joined Montana in favor of the Supplemental classification. The other five states joined the two Service Centers favoring the mandatory classification.
The University of Idaho has expressed concern similar to ours as evidenced by the attached letter.

Isn't there some way to convert an identified waste of manpower into the development of productive new Allotment Management Plans?

Enclosure - 1
Encl. 1-Letter from Lee Sharp to George Lea 7/1/70

1/ By effective grazing systems we mean creating the most beneficial plant succession for all land uses. Examples are replacing Sandbergs bluegrass with Green needlegrass to increase livestock production; replacing Western wheatgrass with chokecherry for wildlife production; and replacing Cockleburs with Prairie chordgrass for control of channel erosion.
Mr. George Lea, Chief Division of Range Management
Mr. Bill Luscher, Asst. Chief Division of Range Management
Bureau of Land Management
Department of Interior
Washington, D. C.

Dear George and Bill:

Permit me to thank you both for your willingness to participate in our Range Management Workshop at Burley last May. In general, the comments on the workshop were very favorable and I will include a summary of the evaluation sheets that were returned to me. Also enclosed is a list of the participants that attended the workshop for whatever value this may be to you.

I feel the main failure in the workshop was not being able to convince you, Bill, and Duff Ross of the right solution to the fee issue!!

The main purpose of this letter, however, is to pass on my comments to you about the AMP Program and the use of utilization measurements in the evaluation of various AMP's. The AMP approach to resource management is one of the most significant advances in public land administration that has occurred in a good many years. I feel it is a sound and fundamental way of approaching the administration of the forage resource and other resource values on our public lands. I would encourage you to expand this program as rapidly as possible and make full use of the professional training of your land administrators in achieving the objective of public land management. I am very enthused about what can be accomplished under this approach to management planning.

I realize that some type of evaluation must be made of the programs that have been started if we are to gain by experience and improve the AMP approach. I question whether or not the time spent in making utilization measurements on particular allotments as an evaluation procedure will return sufficient information for management planning to offset the costs in time and manpower to obtain those measurements. There are a number of reasons why I question the value of utilization measurements and these revolve primarily around the factors which complicate the interpretation of utilization data in a meaningful way for management planning. Some of
the factors which complicate the use and interpretation of forage utilization data collected in an extensive way are the wide variation in production on range areas from year to year in the semi-arid and arid parts of the country, the lack of information about the specific requirements of individual forage plants with regard to minimum leaf surface area at various times of the year, and on the various sites that the plant occurs.

When utilization is measured at the close of the grazing season, or at the termination of grazing, is it known how the particular stubble or residue remaining was developed? There would be a different response on the part of the plants if the grazing was accomplished quickly by a large number of animals early in the growth cycle of the plant or late in the growth cycle of the plant. The residue remaining after a period of grazing that extends beyond the growing season would have a different significance to plant growth and vigor than when this same residue was obtained by grazing entirely within the growing season. In the former situation, a much larger amount of photosynthetic tissue would be functioning during the period of growth. Regrowth in the fall after utilization measurements have been taken may mitigate any depletion of reserves occurring during the grazing season. This is an area about which we have but limited information. The use of caged areas to compare the amount of use or the utilization of the forage on a range area has certain limitations in terms of growth characteristics, that occur with and without grazing.

It would seem to me that if the premise in the rest rotation system is correct, then the necessity for measuring utilization is negated. The requirements of the plants, presumably, have been taken care of in the development of the particular system. I can see no value, then, in spending the time and effort to make such measurements in the evaluation program.

I am sure that you both appreciate the fact that if measurements are to be taken, those people taking the measurements must be convinced that they will serve a useful purpose. If this is not the case, then I am sure that the data obtained will be haphazard and shoddy and of even more limited value in your evaluation program. Through conversation with your people and comments that I have heard, apparently a good number of your district managers and area managers are not convinced that utilization will serve a useful purpose in the evaluation program.

If an AMP Program is not working and we have data on utilization levels throughout, can a decision be made concerning the livestock use of this area? In other words, was it level of use or timing of the use or a combination of level, timing, and a particular set of environmental conditions that created the unsuccessful results of this particular plan. I am fearful, that as in the past, utilization data will be used as a crutch to prevent a more detailed analyses of the causes for the failure or success of a particular
program. There was a time in the development of range science when utilization measurements served a useful purpose in directing attention to the fundamental basis of management -- that is, plant requirements and needs. Unfortunately, this became the primary criteria on which management programs were judged and was solely used for decision making when more basic reasons should have been searched for in selecting alternatives to reductions in time or numbers of animals.

I am not sure that I have made a particularly good argument against the use of utilization data in the foregoing discussion but, prior to the time that you establish this permanently as an evaluation procedure, you might be well advised to get a group of people knowledgeable about the value of utilization measurements and discuss the whole subject in depth.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Lee A. Sharp, Professor
Range Management

Enclosures
Memorandum

To:  District Managers - Montana; Area Manager - S. Dakota

From:  State Director - Montana

Subject:  Annual Convention of the Montana Association of Cooperative State Grazing Districts

The 23rd Annual Convention was held at Chinook, Montana on November 20-21, 1970.

Gus Hornay was invited back for the second successive year. He spoke for one-half day and was enthusiastically received by the 75 ranchers who turned out.

For your information we have enclosed a copy of the program.

We have also enclosed a copy of the remarks given by Jim Linne during the business meeting. We invite your particular attention to the portion on flexibility of AMP's. This conveys our views on the subject for all AMP's, not just in State Districts.

Enclosures - 2

Encl. 1-Program
Encl. 2-Remarks by Jim Linne

cc:
Director (330) w/enclosures
PROGRAM

23rd Annual
MONTANA ASSOCIATION OF
STATE GRAZING DISTRICT
CONVENTION

November 20 and 21 1970

CHINOOK, MONTANA

Officers and Directors
President - - - - Randall Brady
Winnett, Montana
Vice President - Lewis Archambeault
Fort Peck, Montana
Secretary-Treasurer - Inez Hammond
Saco, Montana
Director - - - Myron Hammond
Saco, Montana
Director - - - Bill Brown, Jr-
Sand Springs, Montana
Director - - - Dean Kienenerger
Dodson, Montana
Director - - - John Grierson
Hysham, Montana
Director - - - - Reg Davies
Chinook, Montana
Friday, November 20th

REGISTRATION
Starting at 12:00 Noon—At VFW Hall

1:00 - 5:00 P.M.—
Gus Hormay from Harvey Valley, California, noted authority on range rehabilitation presents the Rest-Rotation System of Grazing. Hormay has completed many years of research work in this field and the Bureau of Land Management uses his method in Management Plan Units in Montana.

3:00 P.M.—
Coffee Break — Compliments of Chinook Chamber of Commerce

5:30 P.M.—
Social Hour at VFW
Hosts: MONTANA ASSOCIATION OF PCA's
FEDERAL LAND BANK OF HAVRE

7:00 P.M.—
ANNUAL BANQUET AT PARISH HALL
Master of Ceremonies Bob Inman
Menu
MONTANA BEEF
GUEST SPEAKER, MONS TEIGEN
Executive Secretary:
Montana Stockgrowers Association

ENTERTAINMENT
WESTERN MUSIC
Russell Unruh (member of the North Fork Grazing District) with Dale Butcher and Willie Hellman
BARBERSHOP QUARTET
FOUR GONE CONCLUSIONS
Fort Benton, Montana

Saturday, November 21st

8:30 A.M.—
CALL TO ORDER AT VFW HALL
—Grass Commission Report
—Public Lands Council Report
—Mont. Stockgrowers Association
—Bureau of Land Management
—State Fish and Game Department

10:00 A.M.—
COFFEE BREAK
Compliments of Chinook Chamber of Commerce
—Business Meeting
—Elections

12:00 (Noon)—
DINNER AT METHODIST HALL
—Songs by David Doughten
Convention ends with tour of Rest-Rotation Pasture a few miles out of Chinook towards Harlem

Saturday
Special for the Ladies

Continental Breakfast Saturday at 9:00 A.M. at Harry’s Cafe - Compliments of North Fork, Cherry Ridge, Coal Creek and Lohman Cooperative State Grazing Districts. Then to Ceramic Shoppe for Demonstration by Dona and Audrey and Wigs by Ruby.
Remarks by James M. Linne
Montana Association of State Grazing District Convention Chinook, Montana November 20-21, 1970

Cooperative Agreements

I will bring you up-to-date on negotiations between the Grass Commission and the Secretary of the Interior concerning new agreements between the BLM and the State Districts.

After the Public Hearings last April, the Secretary requested the State Director to prepare draft agreements for his consideration. We transmitted the drafts to the BLM Director on October 2, 1970. We proposed one agreement between the Grass Commission and the State Director which deals mostly with policy. Additionally, we proposed an agreement between each State District and the BLM District Manager which deals mostly with operating procedures.

We understand the Solicitor's Office is reviewing the drafts now. We look for the drafts to be returned to us within two or three weeks incorporating whatever changes are made by the BLM Director, the Secretary, and the Solicitor. When that occurs, we will be able to go ahead and resume negotiations with the Grass Commission; hopefully, early in January.

I want to mention how cooperative Bob Randall has been as Grass Commission Secretary. He is doing a commendable job.

The designation of Ted McIntyre and Gene Etchart to negotiate with the BLM on the new agreements is welcomed. The choice of Gene Etchart to represent the Association of State Districts is well advised. Gene and his brothers have an intimate knowledge of State Districts, and Gene is quite familiar with BLM procedures. Gene is presently Chairman of the National Advisory Board Council.

Allotment Management Plans

In Montana, BLM's work emphasis has been rapidly shifting to allotment management plans in the recent years after adjudication.

As of last June 30, 159 NIP's had been agreed to by the 229 ranchers involved. These plans embrace roughly 2.1 million acres including 1.3 million acres of public land and .8 million acres of private and state land.

We have copies of the list of these completed plans with us if anyone is interested.
Intensive vs Custodial Management

To help us set our work priorities, we inventoried all the ranch units that include public lands. In this inventory we identified those allotments where we will work with the ranchers and State Districts to develop allotment management plans. Approximately 1200 allotments involving some 1500 ranchers presently fall in this category.

Montana has approximately 4500 Federal Range licensees and lessees, so the balance, or 3000, fall in the custodial management category. This means the ranchers will be simply charged for the estimated forage produced with no designation of period of use or numbers of stock.

To illustrate that we have put our money where our mouth is, I will quote from an instruction memo we recently sent to our District Managers concerning this inventory:

"The selection criteria. If circumstances are such that the vegetation can and should be enhanced by the BLM managing the numbers of stock and periods of use, then the allotment should be included in this inventory to indicate it will eventually need an AMP.

"Just as importantly, if you judge that an allotment does not meet the above criteria, then a carrying capacity type ten-year permit or ten-year lease should be issued. Grazing a piece of land for the same period of time each year, regardless of the stocking rate, can be the most detrimental use of the land. As a long-range policy, we do not want any restrictions on numbers of stock or periods of use unless we eventually plan to give the piece of land the benefit of an Allotment Management Plan.

"We need to eventually plan on doing the job properly, or quit wasting manpower on licenses which restrict the rancher to continuous grazing. The chances are high that the land would be better treated if he were allowed to practice some haphazard variation in period of use, rather than be locked into a continuous grazing pattern."

Circumstances commonly change, so the inventory is updated at least annually to reflect the changes and recategorize some allotments if necessary.
Billing After the Fact

Last year was the first full year we had the options to bill according to actual use in Allotment Management Plans. At the time of last year's Sidney convention, the "after the fact" bills hadn't been issued yet so we couldn't report to you. Many of you may be aware that in AMP's, the District Manager has two options for billing for the exact amount grazed.

The first is to issue a bill at the beginning of the season for a normal operation level. Then at the end of the season, the rancher reports the amount of his actual use and the District Manager either issues a supplemental bill or a refund, so the fees collected are for the exact amount grazed.

The second option is to issue no bill at the beginning. Then after the rancher reports his actual use at the end of the season, a bill for the exact amount of grazing use is issued.

The latter option is rather novel in view of Uncle Sam's usual position of insisting on payments in advance.

As an example, last year the Malta District tried about half with one option and half with the other. They found mostly favorable reactions from the ranchers and the State Districts to the option of billing totally after the fact. They also found many advantages from an administrative standpoint. Based on this favorable experience, Malta shifted to billing totally after the fact for all AMP's this year.

The other Montana districts are still trying both options this year to gain more experience on the relative advantages and disadvantages of the two options.

We are interested in getting all the feedback possible concerning the rancher and State District reactions to these two options.

Flexibility

You had the opportunity to listen to Gus Hormay briefly explain the principles of rest-rotation grazing management yesterday afternoon. A large number of the 159 AMP's in Montana include rest-rotation grazing systems. These rest-rotation systems are working so well and producing so much more forage, and so much higher quality forage, that we are taking a new look at our flexibility policy.
We find that in rest-rotation systems we can forget about a percentage flexibility as has been the common practice. In other words, presently a normal operation of 300 cows for six months may be specified in the plan; plus authority for the rancher to deviate plus or minus 25 percent without requesting approval from the area manager. Now we find that what Gus has been telling us all along is actually happening on the ground. With a rest-rotation system we can let the rancher decide when he wants to turn out initially, how many cows he wants to run, and how he wants to use the various pastures once the gates have been opened.

All we need to ask is that the rancher do his very best to not open the gates to the various pastures until the grass in each pasture has reached a predetermined growth stage such as flowering or seed ripe. I hope you noticed I said a growth stage and not a fixed date. The growth stages vary from year to year and are something the rancher can determine himself.

Needless to say, this is a bold new look at flexibility. The rancher can have the complete discretion as to how many cows he runs. But, I want to emphasize that the rancher must accept a great deal of responsibility along with his freedom of judgment. It is his responsibility to do his best to stock the allotment so that he doesn't run out of feed prematurely in any pasture. In our experience so far, this hasn't been a problem.

After the rest-rotation system has been working a very few years, the problem is more commonly one of finding enough livestock to eat the additional forage; rather than running out. The Milk River Association near Malta is an example. They had so much feed this year they were reluctant to move into the seed trample pasture. When you drive through you can hardly tell the early use pasture from the rest pasture.

On the other hand, any other type of grazing system such as a deferred rotation is another story. With these systems we are quite reluctant to grant very much flexibility. The reason is they don't have the built-in insurance for seedling establishment and successful reproduction of the more vulnerable and desirable plant species.

**Fences and Waters**

I believe our largest single problem in Range Management today is the shortage of funds for fences and water developments.
Let me put it in perspective. You heard Gus Hormay explain the principles of good grazing management and all the benefits that result. What is needed to get this going on the ground? First and foremost are fences and waters.

As I told you earlier, 1200 allotments require Allotment Management Plans in Montana. Of these 1200, 159 are presently completed and agreed to by the ranchers. This leaves 1041 more to be planned.

Approximately 25 of the 159 completed plans are just sitting on the shelf because of no funds to build fences and water. On top of that we have 102 firm requests from ranchers to develop Allotment Management Plans for them. Again with no funds for fences and waters.

What is our present rate of funding for fences and waters? This year we have approximately $500,000 for the state, which has been enough to implement only about 15 Allotment Management Plans.

Now let me focus on the Malta District for a more specific example. Malta has added up the fences and water funds they need to implement the plans already signed plus their firm requests. It amounts to $500,000 in Blaine County, $750,000 in Phillips County, and $1,000,000 in Valley County, for a total of $2,250,000. This year we were able to give Malta only $150,000.

That is our greatest range management problem. Gus has taught us how to do the job to everyone's benefit, but no fences or waters. And that is where a group such as yours could help by trying to get more fence and water money for Montana.
PARTICIPANTS

REST-ROTATION TRAINING
By Gus Hormay

December 7-9, 1970
Northern Hotel
Billings, Montana

Malta BLM District

John Barnes  
Ray Brossart  
Bud Brown  
Lee Chamberlain  
Malcolm Charlton  
Dick Cosgriffe  
Dick DeVries  
Jim Hicks  
Lee Holden  
Jack Jones  
Jerry Knoll  
Glen Stickley  
Neil Talbot  
Hal Vosen  
Terry Wilson  
Ron Younger

Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana  
Malta, Montana

Total - 16

Miles City BLM District

Herb Allard  
James L. Clark  
John F. Fields  
Jerry R. Hawkinson  
Claude D. Roswurm  
Jack L. Schield  
Jerry A. Skroch  
Vern Thompson  
Hyrum Wilson

Miles City, Montana  
Belle Fourche, South Dakota  
Miles City, Montana  
Miles City, Montana  
Belle Fourche, South Dakota  
Miles City, Montana  
Miles City, Montana  
Belle Fourche, South Dakota

Total - 9

Billings BLM District

Richard Bertolino  
Dean Bibles

Billings, Montana  
Billings, Montana
Earl Cox
Bruce Daughton
Ron Hall
Birrell Hirschi
Duane Hosterman
Dominic Obert
Horace Saunders
Duane Sonnenburg
Duane Whitmer

Total - 11

Dillon BLM District
Scott M. Anderson
Jesse F. Barnes
Wallace E. Elliot
Sam L. Short
Paul E. Sladish

Total - 5

Lewistown BLM District
John Buck
William J. Cutler
Larry C. Bichhorn
Oren S. Grover
Eugene A. Jonart
Rolland D. Jorgensen
George W. Nelson
John W. Nesselhuf
Allan W. Strobel

Total - 9

Missoula BLM District
Donley M. Lotvedt
Keith R. Mosbaugh
Leo A. Rhein

Total - 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montana BLM State Office</th>
<th>Billings, Montana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rex Cleary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Hillier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Kemmis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don McIntosh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Pickett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montana State Forester's Office</th>
<th>Missoula, Montana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl Salmonson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montana Fish and Game Department</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wynn G. Freeman</td>
<td>Helena, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph L. Egan</td>
<td>Helena, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merle J. Rognrud</td>
<td>Helena, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard P. Weckwerth</td>
<td>Kalispell, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuel G. Janson</td>
<td>Missoula, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold J. Foss</td>
<td>Bozeman, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L. Mitchell</td>
<td>Great Falls, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. O. (Buck) Compton</td>
<td>Billings, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard W. Trueblood</td>
<td>Glasgow, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil S. Martin</td>
<td>Miles City, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Cada</td>
<td>Bozeman, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Bruce Campbell</td>
<td>Libby, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard R. Chrest</td>
<td>Sheridan, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James H. Cross</td>
<td>Kalispell, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles D. Eustace</td>
<td>Forsyth, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert Ellwein</td>
<td>Great Falls, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis G. Feist</td>
<td>Great Falls, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John E. Firebaugh</td>
<td>Hamilton, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. L. (Jack) Foster</td>
<td>Townsend, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert A. Goodman</td>
<td>Augusta, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd A. Gordon</td>
<td>Big Timber, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert J. Greene</td>
<td>Warm Springs, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred L. Hartkorn</td>
<td>Missoula, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill E. Hirsch</td>
<td>Fairfield, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. R. Martinka</td>
<td>Harlowton, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan M. Neal</td>
<td>Ovando, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Montana Fish and Game Department (Cont.)

John M. Ormiston
Gerald J. Salinas
Allen D. Schallenberger
Thomas P. Schurr
Robert L. Varner
Claude Smith
Robert C. Watts
Harold J. Wentland
Thomas W. Mussehl
Kenneth R. Greer
Eugene O. Allen
Duane B. Pyrah
Philip Schladweiler
John P. Weigand
Richard Mackie
Richard O. Wallestad
Don L. Brown
Walter J. Everin
LeRoy J. Ellig
Nels A. Thoreson
Fletcher E. Newby
Thomas R. Hay
Keith G. Seaburg
Kerry Constan
Joel G. Peterson
Alfred H. Wipperman
H. Max Stone
Otis Robbins
Robert A. Rothweiler
Roger Fliger
Dave E. Wedum
Harley W. Yeager
Stephen R. Bayless
Craig A. Whitney
Vincent D. Yannone

Butte, Montana
Charlo, Montana
Choteau, Montana
Cameron, Montana
Utica, Montana
Corvallis, Montana
Lewistown, Montana
Glendive, Montana
Bozeman, Montana
Bozeman, Montana
Bozeman, Montana
Lewistown, Montana
Bozeman, Montana
Choteau, Montana
Bozeman, Montana
Winnett, Montana
Kalispell, Montana
Missoula, Montana
Bozeman, Montana
Great Falls, Montana
Billings, Montana
Glasgow, Montana
Miles City, Montana
Townsend, Montana
White Sulphur Springs, Montana
Townsend, Montana
Helena, Montana
Kalispell, Montana
Bozeman, Montana
Great Falls, Montana
Great Falls, Montana
Billings, Montana
Havre, Montana
Miles City, Montana
Helena, Montana

Total - 61

Colorado BLM

Jerry Goodman
Don Smith

Canyon City, Colorado
Grand Junction, Colorado

Total - 2
Wyoming BLM

Leroy L. Delaney
William H. Mortimer
Joseph K. Nielsen
Philip M. Rutledge
Patrick J. Larsen
Patrick J. Wendt
Robert L. Boedecker
Phil Range
Richard Wheeler
John McCormick
Jon Dolak
Verden Lavin
Roger Inman
William Miller
Verlyn Pindell

Worland, Wyoming
Worland, Wyoming
Worland, Wyoming
Worland, Wyoming
Lander, Wyoming
Lander, Wyoming
Rawlins, Wyoming
Rawlins, Wyoming
Rock Springs, Wyoming
Rock Springs, Wyoming
Rock Springs, Wyoming
Casper, Wyoming
Casper, Wyoming

Total - 15

Idaho BLM

Clair Whitlock
Dick Thompson
Max Bruce

Boise, Idaho
Boise, Idaho
Burley, Idaho

Total - 3

Montana Department of State Lands and Investment

Wilbur Erbe
Ed Marker

Harlowton, Montana
Billings, Montana

Total - 2

Ranchers

John Morse
Bill Brown, Jr.

Dillon, Montana
Sand Springs, Montana

Total - 2

Lewis and Clark National Forest

Geoffrey Greene
Ron Nordberg
Howard Challinor
Ed Kinsman

Great Falls, Montana
Augusta, Montana
Stanford, Montana
Neihart, Montana

Total - 4
Custer National Forest

Gwen McKittrick
Timothy (Stu) Burns
John Uivery
Ernest Kehrberg
Bob Storch
Vaughn Mattson
Richard (Ike) Ellison
Darrol Harrison

Total - 8

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Ellis Klett
Hugh Cosby
Bill Krantz

Total - 3

Soil Conservation Service

Mitchell Boken
Earl Love

Total - 2

Grand Total - 161
December 7, 1970
Glasgow, Montana

Mr. A. L. Horman
Range Conservationist
Bureau of Land Management
Box 215
Berkeley, California 94701

Dear Mr. Horman:

Thanks again for being the "star of our program" at the annual convention.

We are truly grateful to have you come and help us at the grass roots level and especially so when we seem unable to muster a very large representation of our members from around the state. But I believe the message is getting through, even though it is slow. It seems that either our timing or the weatherman's is off, every time we go to Chinook or Malta for a convention, we get a bad storm.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Inez J. Hammond, Secy.
Box 422
Glasgow, Montana 59230
December 11, 1970

Mr. A. L. Hormay
Range Conservationist
P.O. Box 245
Berkeley, California 94701

Dear Gus:

I was pleased to know from your November 10 letter that you will be instructing the two groups in Utah January 27, and 29, even though our request was "aced" out by the BLM here.

Seriously, I have been in contact with Nick Cozakos (BLM-Salt Lake City) and am planning with him to help the people in the vicinities of the two Utah meeting places to make the greatest beneficial use of your visits. There are other places in the state that need help so I hate to abandon the hopes of having you meet with the people in those areas sometime during the late winter or spring. I do know that your schedule is full.

I am putting a reminder in my calendar to write to you in late May or early June of 1971 to see if we can schedule you for additional meetings here in Utah.

At this time, I would like to ask your advice as to whether or not you feel we should obtain the video tape you prepared in cooperation with the BLM at the Denver Service Center. We have in mind using it on T.V. here in Utah, if you feel we should. I haven't previewed the tape, and for that reason, would like to have first hand suggestion from you as to whether or not you feel it would be applicable for T.V. programming in Utah during the early spring months.

Yours very truly,

Karl G. Parker
Extension Range Specialist

KGP:je

cc: Nick Cozakos
December 14, 1970

James M. Linne,
Acting State Director
Bureau of Land Management
316 No. 26th St.
Billings, Mont. 59101

Dear Jim:

I am sorry I was unable to attend the training session conducted by Gus Hormay at the Northern Hotel recently. I was in the hotel at the time, however, our Executive Committee was in session at the same time and it was impossible for me to sit in with you folks.

At our meeting we did discuss the possibility of training sessions such as you suggest and similar to those held in Idaho. After considerable discussion it was decided that in view of the number of meetings that have already been held in Montana at which Hormay's system has been discussed, it is gaining quite a bit of publicity at the present time. The suggestion was made that possibly Gus could have a spot on our convention program. The only problem with that, however, is that the time would be limited to probably 30 minutes and there is some question as to whether the subject matter could be dealt with adequately in that short a period.

Anyway, thanks again for the invitation and we will keep the matter under consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Bill Cornwall

WKC:mlt

Walter K. Cornwell, President
TO: Mr. A. L. Hormay, BLM
Berkeley, California

FROM: State Director, Nevada

SUBJECT: Request for Training

The Ely District Manager has requested me to try and obtain your services for a one-day training session next spring, as well as one or two days of field time in the Ely area. He would like this training and field time to be scheduled as soon as possible after May 15, 1971.

This will also serve to confirm that room reservations have been made for you at the Pioneer Inn, Reno, Nevada for the nights of February 16-17, to facilitate your attendance at the ASRM National Convention.

cc: Ely DM (N-500)

(Pollard's signature)
Acting
December 17, 1970

Memorandum

To: State Director, California

From: Acting Chief, Division of Range

Subject: Request for Assistance of Gus Hormay

This is in reply to your memorandum of December 2, 1970, requesting a one to two hour presentation on rest rotation grazing by Gus Hormay.

We are pleased to approve your request. As you state in your memorandum, this does provide a good opportunity to give allotment management plans and grazing systems a strong boost. You should work directly with Gus on scheduling his presentation. We are sending him a copy of this memorandum so he will be aware of your contact with this office.

Sanctuary in June '71

[Signature]

[Name]

Mr. A.T. Hormay
December 21, 1970

Mr. Robert Blanford
Chairman, Ad Hoc Study Group
American Society of Range Management
49 Starlit Circle
Sacramento, California 95831

Dear Bob:

In reply to your letter of November 23, 1970, I believe the section should pay travel expenses of its president (or delegate) to national meetings if the section expects the president to attend such meetings. It is a matter for the section to decide. The president should not be asked to shoulder this expense. I'm sure it would be a great burden to some office holders.

Sincerely,

A. L. HIRWAY
Range Conservationist
Instruction Memorandum MSO 70-4
Expires 12/31/71

To: District Managers - Montana
    Area Manager - S. Dakota RA

From: State Office - Montana

Subject: Montana State Office Policy on Flexibility in Allotment Management Plans

Consistent with the fundamental principles of rest-rotation grazing management, we establish the following policy for flexibility in AMP's which include a rest-rotation grazing system.

The rancher may commence grazing in the first pasture at his discretion. Consequently, the initial turn in date does not have to be specified in the AMP.

The rancher may run as many cattle as he wants. Consequently, the number of stock does not have to be specified in the AMP.

The rancher may use the pastures in whatever fashion he pleases once the gates have been opened. He can move the cattle and close the gates if he prefers, but the AMP does not need to require this. If you are concerned about getting enough trampling to plant seed, bringing in additional stock is just as desirable as moving the existing stock.

The significant variable in a rest-rotation system is the point in time that the second and succeeding pastures are opened to use. It is more relevant to describe these points in time by plant growth stages rather than fixed dates, since growth rates vary from year to year.

We encourage you to grant this degree of flexibility in all rest-rotation grazing systems. However, along with this grant you need
to fully educate the rancher to the principles of rest-rotation grazing so that he comprehends his related responsibility. The responsibility we refer to is the use of careful judgment to avoid running out of feed in a pasture before the succeeding pasture is scheduled to be opened.

The "Standing Haystack" in the rest pasture is available to him in the event of a serious drought, but this should not be a frequent necessity.

By contrast, the flexibility allowed in any other type of grazing system such as a deferred-rotation will be quite limited and relatively rigid. The reason is the other systems do not have the built-in insurance for seedling establishment and successful reproduction of the more desirable plant species.

In all other types of grazing systems, all opening dates will be specified as well as the number of animals to be grazed. Some flexibility can be granted, but it will be with a specified percentage leeway, either in time or numbers, or a combination of the two.
Memorandum

To: District Manager - Miles City

From: State Director - Montana

Subject: Cedar Creek AWT Review

We have attached a copy of the comments prepared by the Denver Service Center following the September 9-11, 1970 review.

We will add our views on three of the subjects raised by Denver.

1. Denver questioned the objective to reestablish Chokecherry, Buffaloberry, and Wild plum.

   We understand that you included this objective in the context that the species are adapted to the allotment and there may be some remnants within or adjacent to the allotment. We disagree with DSC and feel this is a worthwhile objective in that context.

2. Relative to trend studies, Denver stated, "With proper stratification and the vegetative uniformity that exists between pastures, one or two sets of trend plots may be adequate in one pasture for the entire allotment, 4412.21D1."

   We do not agree that the vegetation is that uniform. Furthermore, there is no way of knowing how much soil deterioration varies throughout the allotment which influences plant responses. Therefore, we feel you are fully justified in having photo stations in each pasture as you have done.

   The more efficient means of reducing the picture taking workload would be to only rephotograph the stations in one pasture per year. The pasture to photograph is the one that has reached the peak in the grazing treatment cycle. In other words, if you were using a three pasture rest-rotation grazing system in this case,
then you would take the pictures in the rest pasture each year sometime after the plants had reached full growth.

On this subject of photo stations, we feel you should have one or two additional stations involving the remnants of Sideoats grama and Big bluestem that exist.

3. Relative to wildlife studies Denver stated, "The wildlife studies data now in the AMP file should become a part of the HMP for the area."

We disagree. We view these studies as just another technique for monitoring the influence of the grazing system on the overall vegetation. They are just as important as any other vegetation study and should be kept with the balance of the vegetation studies for the most efficient evaluation of the grazing system. We suggest you continue to file the wildlife studies with the range studies.

Relative to the deferred-rotation grazing system you are presently using on this allotment, we are disappointed. The allotment has a significant amount of remnants of two valuable grass species - Sideoats grama and Big bluestem. These are both highly productive warm season grasses that have been virtually eliminated from the northern great plains through continuous grazing practices. These remnants constitute a compelling reason to apply the degree and timing of rest in the grazing system necessary to assure successful seedling establishment and survival of these species. Additional reason exists in the objective you identified to reestablish the highly valuable browse species - Chokecherry, Buffalograss, and Wild plum.

The three pasture deferred-rotation system you are presently using lends itself ideally to converting to a three pasture rest-rotation system without any expense. Simply change the formula.

A three pasture rest-rotation system offers several advantages that you should consider. Only one move is necessary each summer. Less fencing is required. Three pastures are easier to arrange so that cattle will not have to be moved across a pasture compared to a greater number of pastures. You still have the opportunity to devise a formula with a full year's rest. In any one pasture, a full year's rest is accomplished every third year as opposed to less frequently when larger numbers of pastures are utilized. Close to 100 percent of carbohydrate
reserves are stored two out of three years in each pasture as opposed to a lower degree and frequency in systems with larger numbers of pastures. The early use pasture always contains all the old growth from the previous season providing roughage and all the associated components of a well-balanced livestock diet.

A disadvantage is that no early growing season rest is provided the year before seed production and trampling as a source of vigor to produce more viable seed. Another disadvantage is that no early growing season rest is provided the year following the full rest year as a further aid to seedling establishment. We have been closely observing the Lee Iverson three pasture rest-rotation system in the Lewistown District for its three years of operation and these considerations do not seem to be any problem. However, there was no opportunity to observe Sideoats grama and Big bluestem, so you should be particularly alert to the responses of these two plants.

Lee Iverson now has so much forage being produced that it is difficult to tell the early use pasture from the rest pasture. The three pasture formula is also what the Winnemucca District is using with tremendous success on most of the million and a half acres it has under rest-rotation grazing.

We strongly urge you to convert to a three pasture rest-rotation system. We understand you have a meeting with the Grazing Association coming up in January. If you so desire, we will be happy to furnish assistance at this meeting on the subject of converting. Rex Cleary has slides of both the Lee Iverson Allotment and some of the Winnemucca Allotments if you think they would be helpful.

Your existing AMP does not specify numbers of stock. We encourage this high degree of flexibility in a rest-rotation system. However, it is not an acceptable practice in a deferred-rotation system as we stated in Instruction Memo MSO 70-4 on the subject, "Montana State Office Policy on Flexibility in Allotment Management Plans."

We note in the records that you are having some difficulty in documenting accurately the yearling factor and all its relationships to billing, actual use, etc. This is another advantage of rest-rotation. Since it does not make any difference to the vegetation how many stock are run in a rest-rotation system, you do not have to fuss with a yearling factor at all. Whereas in any other type of grazing system, you have to go through the ordeal of computing allowable yearling factors in the futile effort to obtain proper use.
We bring to your attention the option to waive the requirement for an annual grazing application provided the stipulation is made in the Allotment Management Plan. See Manual 4112.15B5.

The AMP does not contain the statement that billing fluctuations will not modify the Class I qualifications. All AMP's should definitely contain this statement. Without it, grazing use fluctuations will modify Class I unless the differences are either shown as non-use or temporary non-renewable. Once this is done, you are relieved of the burden of documenting the temporary non-renewable use as you have been doing. This is particularly important in connection with a high degree of flexibility. See Manual 4115.21C2b(2) issued in Release No. 4-41 dated 6/3/70.

The actual use record was not signed by the operator. This constitutes the obligation for payment of fees and should always be signed.

The exchange of use situation relating to this allotment and the neighbors is a mess. It is impossible to determine who has what qualifications, where they are located, or what properties they are attached to. This needs to be cleared up and the records set straight through the use of conventional exchange of use agreements on the standard Bureau form.

Relative to qualifications, the Dependent Property and Adjudication Summary sheet shows 2,918 AUM's of qualifications. This conflicts with the Qualification paragraph in the AMP which indicates 2,660 AUM's. The two items are not only in conflict, but they are also silent on the foregoing subject of exchange of use qualifications. The whole subject of qualifications needs to be reconciled within this allotment, and with adjoining allotments, and clearly documented.

It was apparent throughout the review that you have developed an excellent spirit of cooperation and understanding with the Grazing Association and the PHA. We congratulate you on this.

Enclosure - 1
Encl. 1-DSC Comments dated 10/29/70

cc:
Director (330) w/enclosure
Director - DSC (D-330)

bc:
Gus Hormay w/enclosure
Memorandum

To: State Director, Montana

From: Director, Denver Service Center

Subject: Cedar Creek AMP Review, Miles City District

Review was conducted September 9-11, 1970, by Thane Johnson, DSC, S&T Range Staff. Personnel participating were Rex Cleary, Rex Colton, Don Nelson, Dennis Jones, Ron Bartley, Loyal Haun, Vern Taylor, Jerry Hawkinson, Jack Schield, Norm Bower, and Jerry Schroch. The following comments are a consolidation of the review discussions, as well as a more thorough review of the written plan.

The Cedar Creek allotment, located 15 miles south of Glendive, Montana, is licensed to a 20-member FHA Grazing Association. It is a 3-pasture allotment containing 14,008 acres of Federal range with 2,660 AUMs and 2,900 acres of private land with 685 AUMs. The AMP was approved July 28, 1968, and is currently in the process of being revised.

Beneficial results of controlled livestock use through intensified management is evident by on-the-ground inspection. However, the following comments are offered to assist in developing more concise, clearly written action plans.

General Information:

The suggested manual outline was generally followed. Section V, Other Considerations (Recreation) and Section VI, Fire Protection, would be more appropriately included under the Correlation (Coordination) section. There is some elaborate prose included that is extraneous. The last sentence on Page 2 discussed major grass species present on the allotment, but leads into an inclusion of forbs and shrubs. This needs clarification.

Existing and Proposed Projects and Needed Improvement Practices sections need clarification. Include all the proposed projects under the appropriate section. It appears one section or appendix includes Federal range projects and the other includes private land projects.

Qualification and Livestock Management items do not include those items suggested by the title. Qualifications and other arrangements with FHA and the grazing association should be included that are germane to the plan. This may be an appropriate place to explain why the AUMs vary from 2,660 AUMs to 3,216 AUMs.
Objectives:

Some of the objectives are good and quantitative. There is considerable unneeded elaboration again. What increase is expected for snowberry and rose? The objectives state the following present and proposed percent vegetative compositions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetative Composition</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Agsm</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Ancs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease Artr</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease Bogr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Forbs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Sppe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>75%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total vegetative composition is reduced 40% but increased only 15%. What becomes of the other 25%? The sixth objective, "Integrate the grazing system ---," would be more appropriately included under Coordination, and then to explain what is particularly meant by the statement. A common goal for all grazing systems and livestock management is to attain a desired compatibility.

The 9th objective concerning recreation is more appropriate to include under Coordination. The reestablishment of chokecherry, buffalo berry, and wild plum arouses some questions. Indications are that these species are not there now. Should they be? How are they to be reestablished and to what extent is the potential? Is this something that will be accomplished through grazing manipulation? If not, this is not an appropriate objective to be included in the AMP.

Grazing Management System:

This section was discussed in detail during the closeout session. There is much unneeded material. It was determined that the grazing schedule did not depict the intent of the grazing formula outlined on Form 4112-2. Basically, there is a different formula for each pasture. There must be the same number of pastures as treatments in the formula, 4112.16B8. Thus, the formula and resulting grazing system need to be revised.

Although the season of use is noted elsewhere in the plan, it and the numbers of livestock were not included under this section. The normal operation must be outlined as to numbers and season of use, 4112.15C3b and 4115.21C2b. Use allowed over the recognized qualification is identified as "non-renewable licenses," 4115.21A7.

Range Studies (Evaluation):

Stratification and selection of the key areas can be improved. The trend section alludes to stratification being done by soil stratum
with two in each pasture on the key range sites. Actually, one plot was established on each range site per pasture. With proper stratification and the vegetative uniformity that exists between pastures, one or two sets of trend plots may be adequate in one pasture for the entire allotment, 4412.21D1.

The plan identifies six different key species on the two distinct range sites. The selection of so many key species creates an unduly great effort required to monitor progress of the AMP. More than one key species may be selected on an allotment or stratum. However, a careful analysis and stratification may eliminate too great a number. Select those that, when monitored, would provide for the physiological requirements of others.

If phenological dates are quite comparable for a group of species, a lesser number could be selected and thus take care of the requirements of others. Select the most important one(s) that serve the purpose desired for which selected.

The wildlife studies data now in the AMP file should become a part of the HMP for the area. Make reference to the wildlife resource activity under Coordination.

Should a definite number of years be stated for a study to continue, such as six years duration for utilization studies? You may wish to reduce this effort following an evaluation to be conducted only in sequence with the grazing cycle.

In order for the trend studies schedule to be evaluated at the same grazing treatment in the cycle, trend would have to be measured on the 7th year rather than the 6th as shown in the plan. A 3-treatment system more normally would be set up for reading year 0, 3, and 6.

The studies schedule could be simplified if set up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pasture</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Meas. or</td>
<td>1966-1972</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>seq. with grz. cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several appendices (1, 3, 4, and 7) which are not referred to in the body of the plan, are attached to the plan. If they are important to the plan, there should be a reference. Appendices 3, 4, and 7 may be nice to have, but do not add much to a plan. These could be issued as information handouts to interested parties.
We appreciate the opportunity to visit the Miles City District and to review the Cedar Creek AMP in the Prairie Resource Area. Personnel are very interested and enthusiastic toward the AMP program. We hope that the DSC comments will help to improve AMP quality.

cc:
W.O. (330)
December 24, 1970

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

Dear Gus:

The Forest Service, BLM personnel, and the livestock men in the Riggins, Idaho area asked for a chance to have you conduct a school at Riggins about a year ago. Because of previous commitments we were unable to work this into your program in Idaho.

I talked to Delbert Fallon regarding this and he in turn called Washington. They advised him to suggest that I get in touch with you relative to the possibility of conducting a two day school at Riggins sometime between January 1 and April 1, 1971.

If it would be possible for you to work this into your busy schedule we would make the necessary arrangements at Riggins and would also notify our members in Nezperce, Idaho valley and Adams County.

We sincerely hope that you would be able to do this and it would be appreciated if you could let either Delbert or myself know at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Leon L. Weeks
Executive Vice President

cc: Larry Daniels
    Delbert Fallon
    Walter Sundell