Memorandum

July 2, 1975

To: District Managers (in demonstration area program).

From: A. L. Hormay, Range Conservationist

Subject: Multi-Use Land Management Demonstration Area Program, Format of

In my memorandum of June 5, 1975, I asked you to send me a copy of the first rough draft of the text of the management plan for your demonstration area. I believe preparation of a draft will take more time than you can afford at this time. An outline of your plan will suffice to give me the information I need, namely your ideas of what should be included in a multiple-use plan and the organization of the material.

I received a copy of a plan from one of the districts even before the second half of the format reached the district. So the plan does not give me all the information I'd like to have. The district worked hard to complete the plan by early this spring so it could proceed with management this year. I am glad it did because as you know we want to get with management on these demonstration areas as quickly as possible. Perhaps other districts have completed such starting plans. Good.

These plans and the others to be developed will all be cast into consistent form according to the format. Please send me an outline of the plan for your demonstration area, in the next two or three weeks at the latest so I can finalize a format for use in connection with the six demonstration areas presently in the program.

cc: D.P. Brubaker,
    Lander Res. Area Manager
    State Directors,
    Idaho; Montana; Oregon; Wyoming
    G.D. Fulcher,
    Denver Service Center.
United States Department of the Interior
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.  20240

July 9, 1975

Instruction Memorandum No. 75-326
Expires 12/31/75

To:    All SD's

From:  Chief, Office of Public Affairs

Subject: Grazing EIS Public Affairs Plan

The enclosed Public Affairs Plan was prepared as a guide for the
Idaho State Office. Idaho has the responsibility for developing
the first of 212 EIS's covering BLM lands affected by the livestock
grazing program. The first scheduled EIS covers the Challis Planning
Unit. This is in accordance with an agreement approved by the D.C.
Federal District Court, as a result of the NRDC suit.

By design, the Public Affairs Plan is flexible in order to take into
account changing situations as time progresses. It is also adaptable
to meet the needs of other States. Therefore, it is forwarded to you
as an aid in the development of your own plans.

Your attention is called to several key elements of the Plan and some
elaboration of them.

The Introduction attempts to establish the general climate and
situations which confront BLM as a result of court suits and various
other actions, some of them having an effect on the livestock industry.
However, it should be recognized that consideration for other values
such as wildlife habitat, recreation, cultural, or mineral are equally
relevant. Consequently, other user groups and special interests will
also become an important part of the public affairs mix in the
overall Public Affairs Plan. Therefore, consideration for the
balanced use of our resources and enhancement of these values, as
appropriate, should be a part of our long and short range objectives.

The Public Affairs Plan makes note of special considerations with regard
to sensitive issues in the Challis Unit. Although, fundamental to the
development of a plan, such issues should be identified and thoroughly
examined in order to ascertain their real significance and potential
countervailing effects.

Save Energy and You Serve America!
Initially, some clearly written background material needs to be prepared for field use and presently the WO (PA & Range) are working together on it.

Here are some examples:

1. Q & A for broad use.

2. Press release announcing commencement of work on the first EIS (Challis) with further details on other planned State actions. This will be an amplification of the initial release June 20.

3. Statement by the Director regarding same for the Department's radio service (Spotmaster).

4. Proposed radio script adaptable for State and local use.

As we progress, these and other materials will be made available to State Public Affairs Officers for direct use, or adaptation.

Please keep this office posted regarding feedback, suggestions or comments which may be useful.

Enclosure
Encl. 1 - Public Affairs Plan
PUBLIC AFFAIRS PLAN

Challis EIS

1. Introduction:

The NRDC suit and the agreement by the Department to prepare 212 detailed environmental impact statements has a profound effect on BLM's overall management responsibility for the public lands. This responsibility is further complicated by the effects of the Nevada Report, the Senate Range Condition Report, grazing fees, the reorganization of advisory boards, proposed new grazing regulations, the constitutionality issue of the Wild Horse and Burro Act, and the court action which voided ORV regulations.

Users of the public lands, particularly livestock operators, see in this series of events an erosion of traditionally accepted uses, as well as an invasion of their rights. Threatened by economic consequences, stockmen generally view the agreement with skepticism and concern.

This is the climate in which the Bureau must proceed.

2. General Theme:

Preparation of acceptable EIS's for 34 specific units in Idaho has been ordered by the Federal Court. BLM multiple use management of these units cannot proceed in a full sense until these statements are completed and accepted. Accordingly, accomplishment of this court directed task has been given high Bureau priority. One requirement of an impact statement is public participation in the fact gathering, report preparation, statement review and acceptance. This plan is to serve as an outline to be followed by those in the Bureau responsible for statement
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preparation to assure the fullest and most effective public participation practicable.

3. **Long Range Goals:**

To obtain range conditions that are satisfactory on all ranges used by livestock and to demonstrate on the ground that proper livestock grazing can be a management tool to improve rangelands and produce benefits for other resources on National Resource Lands.

**Short Term Goals:**

To respond in a positive manner to the Federal Court order to develop a comprehensive EIS discussing the environmental effects of livestock grazing, and alternatives thereto, for the Challis Planning Unit of the Salmon, Idaho District.

4. **Description of Current Situation:**

For the purpose of clear communications with a broad statewide audience the area to be considered (Challis) and the rationale for its selection as the first in the Bureau needs to be explained. A brief statement which identifies the area, its size, the resources it holds, the number of licensees - is a part of the basic information necessary to encourage public participation. The description should include a map.

5. **List of Special Considerations:**

Restrict to sensitive issues, for example:

a. Uniqueness of Challis EIS as Nation's first.

b. Lack of understanding of NRDC suit and fear of potential negative impact on users.

c. Increases in wild horse numbers affecting range conditions.

Conflicting opinions on wild horse management.

d. General support in area for development of AMP's.
e. Special (National) concern for bighorn sheep habitat in this area.

f. Impact of management upon spawning areas for anadromous fish at a time when perpetuating such runs is in serious jeopardy.

g. Revision of State Advisory Boards.

h. MFP recently completed.

i. Wildlife is of major importance to area.

j. Rare and endangered wildlife species present.

k. Conflict between livestock grazing and Big Horn Sheep.

l. Potential conflict with Tuscarora Mining operation re access and grazing.

m. Implied tenure on public lands by local citizenry. Anti-Federalism.

n. No evidence of unusual congressional concern expressed to date.

6. **List of organizations concerned:**

   --government and subdivisions thereof

   --private groups (League of Women Voters, Keep America Beautiful, etc.) & professional societies

   --environmental groups (Sierra Club, etc.)

   --user related groups (economic)

   --activity related groups (ORV, rockhound, etc.)

   --educational

   --other

   --(congressional delegation - incl. in #1)

7. **Media List** (for communicating with those in #6)

   --list newspapers and periodicals

   --list radio & TV stations
8. **Communications to be Transmitted:**

**Washington Office**

a. Statements of policy re NRDC agreement

b. Interpretation and definition of terms

c. Special aids, such as:
   --question and answers (for public use)
   --visual presentations for employees and public

d. Public Affairs program direction as it pertains to grazing EIS program

**State Offices provide to Districts**

a. Copies of WO materials and SO prepared material (if any)

b. Public participation outline for typical EIS effort by unit

c. Counseling

d. Special aids

**Districts develop for AMP & EIS Teams**

a. Public participation plan especially for unit

b. Special aids

9. **Public Affairs Action Elements:**


b. Develop check-off chart to assign roles, to start action, to record action and to document completions.

c. **Sequential Release of Information**

   WO - Announcement by Director that work is underway in Challis on the first of 212 EIS.
SO - Elaboration of Director's comments as applicable to Idaho.

DM - Reiteration and further elaboration by DM, citing local significance, and steps for public involvement.

Special Contacts - Prior to State & District news releases, Bureau personnel should be briefed on pending actions by State Director or DM.

Brief State and local government officials, as well as resident congressional offices.

Brief congressional delegation by Director and/or WO congressional liaison.

Time Frame:

1.) First general news break - Idaho Falls - June 18 - WO (Completed)

2.) SO Break - June 21 - Statesman (Comp.)

3.) DO Break - June 26 - Newspapers & Radio, Challis and Salmon


4.) Staff Briefing

SO - June 26

DO

5.) Formal Position Statement - letter to: - July 1

State and local government offices

Community leaders

Congressional Delegation

6.) NR (General - SO) Bring up to date, announce teams,
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work schedule, completion dates. July 10.

d. Public Meetings - Schedule indefinite

This is a most sensitive area and care should be taken to select the most judicious way in which the people in the community should be involved. Challis licensees should receive personal letters.

The first meeting could be a Q & A affair. Aug. 1. Record input. Second meeting could be a progress-feedback meeting prior to completion - Feb. 1 '76. Third meeting for presentation of final draft. July 1.

10. Issue periodic reports of progress.

11. Announcement of conclusions and end of exercise.

12. Announcement of consequences of all of the foregoing (if actions follow; e.g. suspension of grazing).
July 16, 1975

Instruction Memo No. 75-335
Expires 12/31/75

To:    SD's; DM's—Las Vegas, Safford, & Roswell; and SCD

From:  Associate Director

Subject: Development of the Prototype EIS for Livestock Grazing on National Resource Lands

The Challis Planning Unit in the Salmon District has been designated as the area to develop the Bureau's first EIS for livestock grazing. Since this EIS will provide useful information for some 211 EIS's to be prepared in the next 13 years, it is vitally important that we prepare a timely, quality product.

In order to accomplish this task, Idaho has made numerous shifts in manpower; however, additional assistance is still needed from other States and the Service Center.

I am, therefore, assigning the following persons to intermittent detail for 6 weeks to assist Idaho in the preparation of the AMP's and the EIS in the Challis EIS area. This effort is not just one way. The experiences these individuals gain from developing this EIS should prove invaluable to your State in preparing EIS's.

AMP Team

Terry Driver
Hollis Fuchs
Charles E. Shannon

Las Vegas District Office
Safford District Office
Roswell District Office

EIS Team

Mayo W. Call
William F. Leifeste
Reginald A. Ross
Bill Hoeft

Service Center
Service Center
Oregon State Office
California State Office
Those individuals assigned to the AMP team are expected to be in the Idaho State Office on Monday, July 21, at 9 a.m., to participate in an AMP training session prior to the field assignment. Those assigned to the EIS team will be notified by the Idaho State Office as to their reporting date. For further details regarding these assignments, contact Rex Colton, Chief, Division of Resources, Idaho State Office, FTS Telephone No. 208-342-2484.

George M. Truett
Instruction Memo No. 75-315, Change 1  
Expires: 6/30/76  

To:        SD's, SCD, BLM D-BIFC, WO Officials  
From:      Assistant Director, Administration  
Subject:   Delegation of Personnel Management Authority  

This memorandum revises the organizational areas for which personnel authority has been delegated as follows:  

Service Center Director:  DSC, Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, and BIFC.  

[Signature]
Acting
Form 1542-4
(August 1965)
(formerly 4-1123)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
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3. Signature        8. Your information
4. Prepare reply    9. See me
5. Your comment and return 10.  

From  

P. J. Hornby  

Date: July 21, 1975

Office  Berkeley

Phone  

Remarks  

You may not have seen the attached. A ray of sunshine on benefits to stockmen. Multiple use benefits not stressed enough.
Much Progress Made At Morgan Creek

By Gale Chambers

A COUPLE of years ago there were some rather grousing cattlemen in and around Challis. They were the object of a rather imaginative program made by national magazines. They stood accused of destroying valuable big horn sheep grazing with their cattle operations.

In the middle of the controversy was a Fish and Game biologist named James E. Morgan who fueled the episode with his comments and accommodated the national media with flamboyant leaps from helicopters to build the starving big horn sheep.

It was a stirring time for the cattlemen and the environmental interests. It was also rather difficult to obtain unemotional comments on the issue. The years have passed, the cattlemen rolled up their sleeves to correct the matter. It is now time to revisit the controversial Morgan Creek Agreement.

In a nutshell, the cattlemen solved the problem with Rest-Rotational Grazing. They brought in the varity by inviting Gus Hurnay into the region. Hurnay, the father of rest-rotational grazing in both the BLM and the U.S. Forest Service, helped the ranchers put together a program to aid all parties involved. The programs required cooperation between the ranchers, the BLM, the State of Idaho Department of Public Lands, the U.S. Forest Service, and the State Fish and Game Department.

It’s too bad that Life magazine (for one) didn’t stay in business long enough to bear witness to the real story—the recovery of the range.

One ordinarily thinks of the Challis area as lush, rugged and primitive. A lot of it is. The Morgan Creek area doesn’t quite fall into that category. The history of the allotment actually started a few miles north of Challis along side the major highway. It’s a long narrow allotment and it sits under a rain shadow. Annual precipitation is 1 ft to 2 ft. In 1975, the Idaho Cattleman reported that some 137,000 acres in the allotment which stretches northward for about 20 miles.

Livestock have grazed all or parts of the area for more than a century. There had been long grazing by large bands of horses in the late 1800s. Some of the first grazing permits issued in 1907 allowed use by cattle, horses and sheep. Competing in the same area were big horn sheep, mule deer, antelope, some elk, and lambing and mining interests. Tradition had set the stage for some sort of showdown.

Until the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, there was some unregulated grazing and until there was enough manpower to enforce the grazing laws, there was trespass by unlicensed livestock.

Moreover, much of the allotment was not fenced nor were watering areas provided. In the battle of survival of the fittest, the big horn sheep ended up with the least. Big horn sheep numbers declined dramatically, all of an estimated 200 head in 1903 to 100 in 1970. Mule deer populations estimated at 2,000 or more were high and some 1,400 head of cattle also competed for the forage. To compound matters for the cattlemen, there was a lot of poison Larkspur on the allotment

To quote Dr. Lee Sharp, University of Idaho Range Management Professor, in his report on the situation—"Conflicts existed." It was obvious that changes would have to be made; someone would have to take some cuts. In April of 1969, the ranchers and agency people got together to try and resolve the matter.

Concerning the big horn sheep problem, the recommendations were made in three parts: (1) Remove livestock from big horn range; (2) fence the deer; (3) fence the deer numbers. (Evidently there was a double problem with deer. There were 10,000 mule deer and 10,000 elk. Each hunter banged away at and a migrant herd which came into the area after normal hunting

Objectives of the Morgan Creek program one spelled out on this sign. Pictured is Bryant Christensen, Forest Service range specialist.

Fencing was aided by cattlemen Del Hughes, left, and Bud Nelson.

So far as the cattlemen were concerned, the big horn sheep was one of the "trainee" species of the range. Cattleman Bryant Christensen still believes that the changes are working. He agrees that the population on the range is growing. He "wants" the big horn back and that we are on the right track.

How about the ranchers who use an allotment?

"Well, I must admit that it was easier to just turn them out in the spring and go get them in the fall," says Bud Nelson of Challis. "But that won’t work any more. We know we are going to have to manage that range and change our cowboy- ing ideas, or we’re going to lose our range.

"Yet, there is a benefit; his calves come off in better shape than before.

"The handwriting is on the wall," says Del Hughes, the tools to show that cattleman can manage the range to the benefit of all are there—we are doing it.

Both Nelson and Hughes were active in various meetings and negotiations. Both have a passion to keep control of their land. Both are well-versed on the range management.

"Well, I must admit that it was easier to manage them in the spring and get them in the fall," says Bud Nelson of Challis. "But that won’t work any more. We know we are going to have to manage that range and change our cowboy- ing ideas," he says.

Yet, there is a benefit; his calves come off in better shape than before.

"The handwriting is on the wall," says Del Hughes, "the tools to show that cattleman can manage the range to the benefit of all are there—we are doing it."

Both Nelson and Hughes were active in various meetings and negotiations that were formed to keep the cattleman in business. They would need special funding for problems like Larkspur, fences, water, management assistance, and some public support to help patch up their black eyes.

The support was there and in July of 1970, Hurnay inspected the range. He contacted the participating individuals and agencies drew up a three pasture rotation program. One of the problems with a three pasture program is that it takes three full years to really notice the differences. To the trained eye, some differences can be detected in the first year of operation.

"I have to say it is working," says Rex Christensen, BLM’s allotment counterpart, Bryant Christensen with the U.S. Forest Service. "We are on the right track.

The ranchers in cooperation with USFS and the BLM attack the problem of adequate grazing with rest-rotational grazing. They also sprayed sagebrush areas. They chained and replaced. They fenced, and dispersed water via under 7,000 acres. They constructed enclosures to measure and monitor growth.

Once the first areas fenced was some 3,500 acres for big horn sheep. That acreage is exclusively theirs—the cattle are fenced out. It’s possible to get up on top the allotment, climb out on the crags and view those rams with high powered glasses.

Ranchers seemed to have bottomed out," says range manager Christensen. "Our position seems to be under control although some sportsmen will argue this point. Some 120 livestock watering developments have been installed on the allotment. They are designed so game and birds can also use them. More than 8,000 acres were treated for brush control. About 300 acres were reseeded. Fences and natural boundaries keep cattle under control and this helps manage people in the region.

At stake is the way we make our living," said Nelson. Hughes would like to see the cattleman get a little credit for his effort.

To some the term "cattleman" confused visions of a large enterprise. Most of the operators grazing Morgan Creek land are modest size operators. The average permit would be 126 animal units. None of the dozen or so permits grazed more than 300 animal units. A couple were under 100 units. In other words, they were some very ordinary cattlemen.

We feel that we’ve come quite a ways," says Nelson. He says that they don’t have all the problems solved. "But we know we can solve them," Hughes adds.

When you take a critical look at the Challis big horn range management, you begin to see the benefits. The Larkspur range problem. To date the best program going is an allotment and abruptly change it you create problems not originally envisioned. One the Larkspur range problem. To date the best program going is an allotment and abruptly change it you create problems not originally envisioned. One the Larkspur range problem. To date the best program going is an allotment and abruptly change it you create problems not originally envisioned. One the Larkspur range problem. To date the best program going is an

The three major goals as outlined by Jim Morgan have been essentially attained. In fact, in a communication to the BLM in late 1973, Morgan called a follow-up trip to the area "rewarding."

With the grass recovery in the already reserved big horn pasture.

No, he didn’t buy the entire place, but he did buy enough to establish a big horn population. Considering the status of events in the summer of 1970, this is quite a story.

There’s a possibility that sprinklers will be utilized to establish a habitat for both domestic and game animals.

Both the ranchers and the agencies are proud of what they accomplished at Morgan Creek. They have a right to be.
July 31, 1975

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

Dear Mr. Hormay:

I'm writing to ask for some help or advice or both. The B. L. M. is advertising for applications for a District Manager in the Richfield Office to manage the new district in this area created by their recent reorganization. As you know, I have been and am very concerned about putting Uncle Sam's share of this land into more productive use for the good of this land and especially for the good of the areas where vast acreages of government land exist.

I believe that I know as much about range improvement, production, erosion control, good grazing principles, wild life management and any other related practices as any generalist they could find, and that I know how to enlist the help and to use the specialists in all those fields who know more than I do. I know that this is essentially range country and that I can be an outstanding manager of Uncle Sam's resources for that purpose. I also realize that there is mineral wealth in this area that is becoming more important daily. I believe that I can help to make this land more productive in that way and have an important input into the preservation of the other values of the land. In short, I would like to have the opportunities and responsibilities that this job offers, but I don't know just how to secure the position.

I have engaged rather freely and enthusiastically in arguments over the use and improvement of range lands in this part of the State and I wouldn't dare ask for a job with the Forest Service, but I don't believe that I have alienated anyone in B. L. M.

What or who would I need to help me in securing this position? Would you be willing to write a letter of recommendation for me and support my candidacy if I were to apply for the position? Are there any specific things I should do if I were to actively seek it?
I would certainly like to have an active part in the management of B. L. M. lands but I don't want to waste my time on an impossible dream. What advice do you have for me?

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert H. Teichert

RHT/as