

R (CAL) PUBLICATIONS.

Action by authors on comments by technical board of review on manuscript entitled "Rest-rotation grazing promises greater forage and livestock production on northeastern California mountain summer ranges" by: A. L. Hormay and M. W. Talbot

Reviewer : Robert W. Harris, Forester, Blue Mountain Research Center
Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station.

Reference: Review of "Increasing forage and livestock production on northeastern California mountain summer ranges" dated September 21, 1956

Paragraphs in above reference.

Page 1, para. 2 Table 12 omitted.

Page 1, para. 3 Section on establishment of reproduction omitted. Close cropping is harmful to the plant practically throughout the growing season. Furthermore, it has been shown that consistent close cropping of some plants cannot be avoided so long as the range is grazed. Rest is being introduced to counteract the harmful effects of grazing whether the intensity is 66 percent or 100 percent. Sixty-six percent use is prescribed for full utilization of the range as well as for trampling effect.

Page 2, para. 1 Section omitted. Time will tell

Refer from here on to specific comments.

Page 2, line 3 Reworded

Page 8, line 16 No. But it is present

Page 10, line 11 Term corrected

Page 16, Fig. 7 Six percent of the area consisted of "openings", which are favored grazing sites. Areas under trees were also grazed but much less heavily. This section reworded.

Page 27 Tables 2 and 3 omitted.

Page 36, Table 5 Table 5 revised and simplified. Yields added as suggested.

Page 37, line 14 Reworded. This thought now omitted.

2-Robert W. Harris, reviewer

Page 39, line 1 No. Section now worded differently.

Pages 49 & 51 The interpretation is essentially correct. Table 18 enlarged to provide more details.

Page 59, Table 18 Air dry weight. Pounds per acre.

Page 66, line 1 This point rechecked. Section reworded.

Page 66, line 4 Whatever it means, the use that resulted in reduction in Idaho fescue on favored grazing sites in the timber openings. The point is, that even when overall use was light, some of these favored grazing sites were grubbed into the ground. A line has to be drawn somewhere between light and moderate and close, etc.

Table 20 Table 20 too complex. Has been omitted.

Page 69, line 2 Reworded and point clarified.

Page 69, "Logging" Reworded to make the section more clear, as suggested.

Page 72, line 1 Correct. Reworded

Page 79 It is true that not everything that is reported is substantiated with measurements. A large part of the whole picture is based on observations and notes. It is only with this observational information that it is possible to get a whole picture of a workable grazing system or of range management. We believe we are indicating a sound framework for a grazing system, or method of management that will improve bunchgrass ranges. We are reporting on conditions found generally in northeastern California.

Page 81, line 12 Reworded and qualified.

Page 81, line 14 Section omitted. Subject handled lightly elsewhere.

Page 85, line 13 True. Both are encouraged. Mainly observational information but solid.

Page 85, line 19 Statement omitted. Will ^{omit} Harvey Valley results.

Page 86, line 3 Reviewer interprets use on a continuous season-long grazing basis. Misses the main point of this publication and the difference in view point of range management with resting in the picture.

3-Robert W. Harris, reviewer

Page 89, line 4 Reworded. Took different tack.

Page 89, line 17 Why place salt one-fourth mile away from water
in cases where the cattle are kept in a given locality?

Page 91, line 1 The subject omitted. Not essential.