August 1, 1975

Memorandum

To: District Managers (in demonstration area program)

From: A. L. Hormay, Range Conservationist

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

Please refer to my memorandum of July 2, 1975, and try to get the outline of the plan for your demonstration area to me no later than August 8, 1975. I have not received an outline from any district yet.

We are falling behind schedule in development of plans for the demonstration areas due in large part to my delay in getting the first rough cast-up of the planning format to you. I would like to see a plan in the hands of the members of the formal planning group for their consideration and input at the earliest possible date.

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
Idaho State Office
Room 398 Federal Building
550 W. Fort Street
P. O. Box 042
Boise, ID 83724

August 4, 1975

Mr. A. L. (Gus) Hormay, Range Conservationist
Bureau of Land Management
Pacific SW Forest & Range Experiment Station
1960 Addison St., Bx. 245
Berkeley, CA 94701

Dear Gus:

Since the Herd Creek Allotment Management Plan was completed and signed by everyone concerned we feel that it would be difficult to now follow your suggested format in this case. As you know, the Forest Service took the lead in preparing the plan and we are reluctant to make changes in the format with the possibility of other changes being suggested by the EIS effort.

The plan was implemented this summer with cows going into the Herd Lake Pasture first and the Lake Basin Pasture second. The Fox Creek-McDonald Creek Pasture will be rested this year. Fences are not completed yet, but the Ingrams do lots of riding, so lack of fences has not been too much of a problem. We do have a problem about a bridge location on Herd Creek and a trail into the Fox Creek-McDonald Creek Pasture. We need the bridge and trail before the Fox Creek-McDonald Creek pasture can be used first in the spring.

As a result of the court decision on the NRDC suit, the Challis Planning Unit is the first of 212 Bureau areas on which EIS's are to be prepared to evaluate the impacts of grazing on the human environment.

Even though we have signed the Herd Creek AMP with the Forest Service and have started to follow the plan, we may find a need to modify the plan to conform to the restricted criteria established by the district court and the NRDC for the preparation of AMP's and EIS's on livestock grazing. The Herd Creek AMP and the AMP's for the other 14 allotments in the Challis Planning Unit will be completed by the end of August. Shortly before this time a multi-resource team will have started to prepare the EIS. The first draft must be completed by January 1, 1976 for us to meet our schedule.

CONSERVE AMERICA'S ENERGY

Save Energy and You Serve America!
As part of the procedures in our current AMP effort we will be meeting frequently with the livestock operators and all the other interests involved. Further multi-public contacts, and perhaps in more detail, will be necessary in preparation of the EIS. There may be considerable change from presently conceived management decisions as a result of the new AMP's and the EIS, particularly the EIS.

Hopefully we will be able to retain the grazing schedule designed for the Herd Creek Allotment, but it appears we should mesh our public contact plans pertaining to your multiple-use demonstration area program with the current AMP-EIS effort. To the various publics two separate programs would be confusing, and there will be ample confusion with our having to abide to the criteria established by the court and the NRDC.

One of the criteria established is that no new AMP's be initiated until the EIS has been prepared. The cutoff date for initiation of new AMP's without EIS's was June 30, 1975. We had initiated the Herd Creek AMP prior to the June 30 deadline. This stipulation may pose some problems on the West Bellevue Allotment since we were unable to move ahead in developing the AMP as we would have liked because of an appeal. Within the next two weeks we will try to get some clarification on what we can do - or can't do - on this second multiple use management demonstration area.

We are enthused about the possibility of you providing assistance in the review of our proposed AMP's. It is imperative that we develop AMP's that are effective and practical in meeting multiple resource needs. Your great expertise will be very helpful.

We are enclosing a copy of the outline to be followed in preparation of the EIS.

Sincerely yours,

Wm. L. Mathews
State Director

Enclosure
Challis EIS Preparation Plan (Draft)

cc: WO (330)
DSC (D-300)
Shoshone DO
Salmon DO
August 5, 1975

Mr. Robert H. Teichert
Piute County Courthouse
Junction, Utah 84740

Dear Bob,

You catch me off base. I have neither experience nor authority in employment matters so am hardly the one to advise you on your quest for the District Manager position with Bureau of Land Management in the new district office in Richfield, Utah.

To be considered for such a position I understand you will have to submit applications to: Washington Area Office, U.S. Civil Service Commission, 1900 E Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20415. I have taken the liberty to send you application forms should the closing date of the vacancy announcement be imminent. Enclosed are forms (SF-171, and supplement, CSC-5001 ABC, and CSC-226). You should indicate the title and grade level given in the District Manager job vacancy announcement on line 1A in the "Personal Qualifications Statement."

Also enclosed is a statement on--"How jobs are filled in the competitive federal service," and Announcement No. 421, Professional Careers in the Biological & Agricultural Sciences with the Federal Government.

Please read "Your chances for employment" on page 1 of the announcement.

I suggest you contact the nearest Bureau of Land Management district office or the state office in Salt Lake City on how to proceed on this matter. I hope the foregoing gets you started in the right direction.

The best of luck.

Sincerely,

A. L. HORMAY, Range Conservationist

Enclosures

CC: District Manager, Richfield, Utah
    State Director, Utah
    Glen D. Fulcher, Denver Service Center, Colo
Memorandum

TO: A. L. Hormay, Range Conservationist,
P. O. Box 245, Berkeley, CA 94701

FROM: State Director, Wyoming

DATE: AUG 7 1975

SUBJECT: Hall Creek AMP

The following is in response to your memorandums of June 5 and July 2, 1975. As you are aware the recent BLM-NRDC agreement has set priorities for AMP and EIS preparation on each state. In Wyoming the Hall Creek allotment falls into the Green Mountain EIS area, which is the number three priority area in Wyoming. This EIS is scheduled for completion during FY 1979. The Hall Creek AMP will be prepared prior to the EIS; however, man power availability will determine whether or not your procedures can be followed when the AMP is developed. Hall Creek will be one of 66 AMP's which will be prepared for the Green Mountain EIS. As the deadline for preparation of the EIS approaches, Dale Brubaker, Lander area manager, will be better able to determine if time will be available to follow your procedures.

Every effort will be made to meet Wyoming's commitment to complete the Hall Creek AMP following your new procedures. However, we must use our man power as efficiently as possible to meet the deadlines placed on us by the court and NRDC agreement.

cc: Director (330)
United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Billings District Office
P. O. Box 2020
Billings, Montana 59103

August 7, 1975

Mr. A.L. Hormay
PSW Forest & Range Experiment Station
Post Office Box 245
Berkeley, CA 94701

Dear Gus:

As you probably know, according to the terms of the agreement between BLM and the National Resources Defense Council, we cannot implement any new AMP's until an EIS has been prepared for that designated area. This has been expanded also to deny any project development on allotments that are not currently under an implemented AMP which precludes any project development geared toward implementation of an AMP. The Billings District is not scheduled to have the EIS completed until at least 1981.

However, since considerable time and effort has already been expended gathering data, etc., we have requested permission to proceed with the plan on the demonstration area, and this is where we are presently waiting for a reply to our request. It is for this reason that we have "drug our feet" and have not proceeded to develop an outline of the plan. If we should receive permission to proceed, we will get on it right away and prepare an outline of the plan for you.

If you have any questions, we will try to help in any way possible.

Sincerely,

John F. Bowers
Acting District Manager
Information Memo No. 75-145
Expires 6/30/76

To:       SD's, SCD

From:     Chief, Division of Range

Subject:  Contacts and Inquiries by NRDC

Since the court order of June 18, 1975, NRDC has made several inquiries to the various field offices regarding our ongoing programs in range management. This is an indication of NRDC's desire to monitor our programs. As we become more involved in the EIS program this could add substantially to our workload. We must develop procedures for handling these inquiries which will be responsive, but which will not impact our program. Enclosed is an instruction memorandum from Nevada, NSO 75-167, and accompanying correspondence with NRDC, which provide one approach to handling this situation that appears to have merit.

Kay W. Wilke

2 Enclosures
Encl. 1--Instruction Memo, NSO 75-167
Encl. 2--NRDC correspondence
Instruction Memorandum No. NSO 75-167
Expires 12/31/75

To: District Managers, Nevada

From: State Director, Nevada

Subject: NRDC-ELM Livestock Grazing Administration Agreement

Attached is a copy of a letter from the Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., and our response thereto which attempts to clarify our position with regard to range improvements scheduled for FY 1976.

We have advised NRDC that, if possible, you will furnish information directly to them on the range improvement projects that will be undertaken. If you prefer to have NRDC representatives collect this information at the district level, please advise them accordingly.

You can see that NRDC plans to monitor our range management program quite thoroughly. I am sure that as we go along, they will be requesting additional information on many of our actions; consequently, we should be prepared to show that actions taken by us are not in violation of the agreement. The court order was forwarded to you by NSO Information Memorandum No. 75-84.

2 Enclosures (one ea. to ea. addresses)
Encl. 1 - Ltr from NRDC dtd 7/21/75
Encl. 2 - Our response to NRDC dtd 7/24/75

Distribution (wo/encls.)
WU-442 = 2
D-531 = 5
CA-020 = 1
WO-530 = 1
Mr. E. I. Rowland  
State Director, Nevada  
U. S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Room 3008 Federal Building  
300 Booth Street  
Reno, Nevada 89502

Dear Mr. Rowland:

We would appreciate it very much if you would amplify a statement which appeared in an article published in the June 23, 1975, issue of the Nevada Appeal. The article, entitled "BLM agrees to work with environmentalists on livestock grazing impact statement reports," states:

"In areas already covered by intensive grazing plans, amounting to about five million acres in Nevada, projects such as fencing, water developments, and the like will continue on schedule."

We would appreciate it if you would supply us with full details concerning the projects referred to in that quotation, including the number of AMP's involved, their names and locations, as well as the location, cost and size of the projects themselves. In addition, we would like to know whether you, or any other BLM official, has concluded that these projects have no significant environmental effect, either singly or cumulatively, and whether any environmental analysis report(s) documenting this conclusion has been prepared. Finally, if any such report(s) has in fact been prepared, we would appreciate it if you would send us copies thereof.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Johanna H. Wald

JHW:kc
Nevada State Office
Room 3008 Federal Building
300 Booth Street
Reno, Nevada 89502

Ms. Johanna H. Wald
Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.
664 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Dear Ms. Wald:

In response to your recent letter requesting clarification of an article published in the Nevada Appeal, I will expand on our position with regard to range improvements.

As you know, we have a number of Allotment Management Plans that were signed and implemented prior to Judge Flannery's order of June 18, 1975. We are very much aware of the court order and intend to follow it to the letter of the law. However, we feel that on those AMP's that have been implemented, it would be in the best interest of resource management to continue with construction of necessary facilities such as fencing and water developments, provided that these improvements are first subjected to an environmental analysis to determine whether or not they may have a significant impact on the human environment. If such is the case, no improvements will be considered until an Environmental Impact Statement is completed pursuant to conditions of the court order. Those range improvements that do not have a significant impact on the human environment will be constructed with proper mitigating measures for lesser impacts that may occur.

We have asked our Districts to provide directly to you specific information on FY '76 range improvements for the Allotment Management Plans involved. Unfortunately, the additional workload initiated by your request places another burden on an already over-obligated staff at the District level. Consequently, some Districts may request that you visit the District Office and review the available records to obtain the information you have requested. In such cases, those Districts will notify you accordingly.

In addition to the improvements connected with implemented AMP's, there will be other improvements directly related to wildlife and watershed habitat improvement and control of livestock in response to recommendations contained in the Nevada Report ("Effects of Livestock Grazing on Wildlife, Watershed, Recreation and Other Resource Values in Nevada"). Information on those projects will also be made available to you.
August 14, 1975

A. L. Hormay
P. O. Box 245
Berkley, CA. 94701

Dear Gus:

Due to late receipt of your format, and illness in my family I will not be able to get you the desired information until the week of the 25th. Sorry for the delay.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred Y. Corville
For A. K. Majorowicz
Area Manager
Lakeview District
Evaluation of AMP Objectives

During June and July of 1975, I have attempted to review the existing data found in the Wells Meadow AMP case file. Purpose of the review was to analyze the existing data along with the new information gathered in 1974 and the spring of 1975, then to make a determination as to whether the objectives as stipulated in the AMP file are being met.

A point by point analysis of these AMP objectives follows:

**Objective A** - To determine if livestock (cattle) use can be beneficial on deer winter range, to increase vegetative composition and alter growth forms.

**Analysis** - Heavy cattle grazing can and has altered the growth form of the bitterbrush plants on the Wells Meadow Allotment. Increased vegetative composition has not been realized.

Discussion on trend and condition follows under Objective B.

**Objective B** - To improve the vigor and growth form of the existing bitterbrush plants from tall, decadent plants to a vigorous and hedged form that can be utilized by both cattle and deer.

**Analysis** - This change of growth form has taken place as evidenced from slide studies on the 150 Putr plants within the allotment. This change in growth form has not taken place on the 50 study Putr plants (#200-250) outside the allotment.

Conclusions on Objective B. Cattle grazing can be used to effectively change the vigor and the growth form of decadent bitterbrush plants. This change results in a more productive (as far as pounds of forage matter available on individual plants) bitterbrush plant.

There are limits as to what the cattle grazing pressure can do, however. Some old large trunk Putr plants remain relatively unchanged since this AMP was implemented.
Objective C - To increase forage for the G. B. Vogel livestock operation by increasing forage production sufficiently to provide an operation for 100 head of cattle to graze from 4/1 to 10/15.

Analysis - This year (1975) is the first year the operator has run 100 head. As of July 21, 1975 the operator reports that the livestock are gaining at a good rate, and that distribution on the pastures being used is good.

This "heavy use" may not be continued, however, in an effort to reverse the declining condition of the allotment.

Objective D - To increase reproduction of bitterbrush plants and increase the percent composition from 15 to 20 percent.

Analysis - It has been generally accepted that this area is presently in a drought cycle. However, in 1969 an unusually heavy snowfall resulted in large deer winter kill and a significant increase in Putr seedlings.

Transact readings on 150 selected Putr plants on the allotment and 50 plants outside the allotment resulted in the following seedling counts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#Seedlings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136 (No measurement)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, it can be assumed that under the present climate regimen there isn't sufficient moisture available to result in Putr seedling establishment.

Seedling counts comparing the 150 Putr plants on the allotment and the 50 plants outside the allotment indicate the livestock grazing has no effect on seedling production and establishment, but rather, the key factor for seedlings germination and establishment is above normal precipitation.

Historical precipitation records indicate fluctuation in precipitation cycles. From 1883 to 1943 these cycles ran approximately 13 years of below normal precipitation, then approximately 8 years of above normal precipitation.

Since 1945, however, shorter cycles appear to be the general rule, with above average precipitation occurring in one or two years cycles and below average precipitation occurring for two or three year cycles.

Age sampling tests conducted in 1967 indicate that most of the Putr plants sampled were from 15 to 75 years old with the majority of the plants around 30 - 40 years old.
Climatological records suggest that the years 1935 - 1938 were above average in precipitation. This was the last extended "wet" cycle this area has undergone. This cycle has a strong correlation with the majority of the Putr plants now found on the allotment.

Conclusions on Objective D. It appears that precipitation (above average) is the single most important factor in seedling germination and establishment. Comparing the data collected so far on this "test" AWP indicates that (the allotment-grazing system vs. transect outside the allotment)...no significant difference between seedling germination and establishment on the two areas has taken place and an increase in percent composition and reproduction in Putr has not taken place, but rather has declined.

The key element in the germination appears to be above average precipitation, combined with several above average precipitation years to ensure seedling establishment.

**Objective E** - To increase the composition of desert needlegrass from 18 to 25 percent.

**Analysis** - In July of 1975 transects were run on the three vegetation types shown in the appendix and tabulated in Table 3 of the AWP. Method of sampling was identical to the initial vegetation measuring—that being transects of 100' long and recording the hits at one foot intervals for the entire 100'. No information in the allotment file indicated where the initial 100' transects were located. As a result in 1975, several transects were run in each vegetation type. Values listed as type composition, for 1975, were mean values of two transects run in each vegetation type.

These vegetation type - composition values are shown in Table 1 in a tabulated form, compared to the 1965 values.

Stipa speciesia plants have decreased in percent composition from a mean in 1965 of 13.3% to a mean in 1975 to 4.2%.

Observations on Stsp during field checks to the allotment during 1974 and 1975 indicated heavy utilization (80 - 90%) on Stsp plants in pastures 1, 4, and 3. Seedlings are almost impossible to find, many areas are completely lacking Stsp plants in the brush interspaces, and only an occasional Stsp can be found growing and when found it is usually growing in the understory of a shrub. Those Stsp plants that can occasionally be found in brush interspaces are old decadent plants with dead centers.

Conclusions: Rather than increasing the composition of Stsp the exact opposite is happening. The percent composition of Stsp has declined from 13.3% in 1965 to 4.2 in 1975.
These vegetative type composition values are shown and compared to the 1965 values in Table #1 tabulated form below: *1975 data based on 2, 100' transects. 1965 ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Species</th>
<th>16 Fran - Stsp</th>
<th>16 Epne - Putr</th>
<th>16 Cagr - Stsp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Δ in %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stsp</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brte</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>&gt;13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orhy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care-D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>&lt;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gili</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>&lt;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oseo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pran</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cagr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epne</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1975 Composition measurements were taken during July and August; this could account for the low forb % compositions measured.
Dear and Cattle Relationships

Several factors must be considered in evaluating the amount or degree of competition between deer and cattle on this allotment. These factors are considered in the following section:

1. **Area Overlap** - Deer and cattle use the same area of the allotment. However, deer seem to concentrate on the higher elevations of the allotment and D.D.A. (deer/day/acre) use during the winter of 1974-75 averaged 26.5 D.D.A. on this higher Pram Step vegetation type, as opposed to an average of 2 D.D.A. on the lower elevation City of L. A. lands (Cora Step) vegetation type. The intermediate elevations (vegetation type Epna Putr) averaged 10.5 D.D.A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pram Step</th>
<th>Epna Putr</th>
<th>City of L. A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A 21</td>
<td>1B 3</td>
<td>DE-A 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A 20</td>
<td>3A 19</td>
<td>2A 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B 30</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 10.5) D.D.A.</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 2) D.D.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\bar{x} = 26.5\) D.D.A.

This indicates that deer range over the entire allotment but the majority of their use "Area-wise" is in the higher elevations (within 1/2 mile of the steep eastern slopes of the Sierras) on the Pram Step vegetation type.

This area contains approximately 50% of pasture 1, 100% of pasture 4, and 20% of pasture 3.

Cattle graze at least two of these three pastures each year.

2. **Time Overlap** - Deer normally arrive on this allotment around the first of November and stay until the first or the middle of May, depending upon the severity of the winter. Peak deer numbers occur during the months of January, February and March.

Cattle are on this allotment from 4/1 to 10/15.
Cattle and deer are on the allotment together for approximately 1 month to 1.5 months each year in the spring. This period of time, April 1 to May 15, corresponds with the most critical period for the grass and shrubs on the allotment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start Growth</th>
<th>Flowering</th>
<th>Seed Ripe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grasses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stsp</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>5/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orhy</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>5/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td>4/1</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>6/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is at this period of time when carbohydrate reserves are at their lowest point in the plants and at this time grazing is most damaging to the vigor of the plants.

Forage Competition: Deer selectivity seek Putr plants (and by comparing the transect outside the allotment where there is deer use only)!

Utilization during the winter of 1974, 1975 on Putr by deer was 46.86%. Cattle utilization for 1974 grazing season of Putr plants (measured inside the deer exclosure) was 72.17% overall. Cattle use within 1/4 mile of water average approximately 85 to 90%. 6
Step utilization by both cattle and deer averages 70-80% (from visual observations). Deer use is not known but spring use of grass by deer should be expected to be at least moderate.

Conclusions

Cattle and deer competition on the Wells Meadow Allotment can be considered moderate to heavy. There are special, time and forage overlaps between deer and cattle.

The above facts may explain why the objectives, in part, of the AMP are not being realized as anticipated.

Overall Conclusions

1. This grazing system has changed the growth form of the majority of the Putr plants on the allotment. This change in growth form has resulted in existing Putr plants with better production and vigor than was the case before AMP implementation.

2. Putr seedling germination and establishment is not being realized, as was predicted in the AMP goals.

   The most significant factor for Putr seedling germination and establishment appears to be precipitation rates below average for two or three successive years.

3. Although this system has altered growth forms of existing Putr plants, the consequence has been an overall deterioration of the range condition. Artemisia tridentata has increased dramatically, Bromus tectorum has increased almost as significantly. Stipa sp. has decreased sharply, with little if any new seedling observed. Festuca octoflora has also increased significantly. Forb production on the majority of the allotment has declined.

Suggested Recommendations

Continue cattle grazing following present rotation system; however, reduce cattle numbers. Attempt to maintain present Putr growth forms by lowering utilization rate on Putr from the present situation of 60% or greater, to approximately a 50% desired utilization rate.

To obtain this desired utilization, follow ELM Manual 4413.31A. Allowing for at least 168 AUM's for deer use each year and a desired utilization of 50% on Putr, the maximum AUM's taken each year should not exceed 339 AUM's. Of these 339 AUM's, 168 AUM's go for the deer leaving 171 AUM's for cattle use.
Using the operaors current season of use (6.5 months) April 1 -
October 15, this would result in 26 head of cattle.

26 Cattle from 4/1 to 10/15 = 169 AUM's.

Continue the studies as outlined in the AMP.

B. Hines:pe 9/4/75