

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE--FOREST SERVICE  
 PACIFIC SOUTHWEST FOREST AND RANGE EXPERIMENT STATION  
PERFORMANCE RATING SHEET AND NOTICE TO EMPLOYEE

Name August L. Horney Rating Period 1/1/61 to 12/31/61

Title and Grade Range Conservationist (Res.) (GS-12) Unit RMSLWR, Berkeley

A. Your rating is based on task numbers below (See your Task and Performance Requirements sheet.)

Check the following responsibilities which were considered in making this performance rating:

- (a) Organizing and training subordinates. Maintaining high morale.
- (b) Gaining the understanding, confidence, and cooperation of the community and its leaders in all aspects of the Forest Service program.
- ~~(c)~~ Gaining cooperation and support of fellow workers.
- ~~(d)~~ Practicing safety.
- ~~(e)~~ Observing hours of work, rules of conduct, punctuality, industry, dependability, and loyalty.
- (f) Caring for motorized and other equipment and facilities for which responsible.

Symbols = + for strong    ✓ for adequate    - for weak (explain minus rating on reverse side)

<u>Task</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Task</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Task</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Task</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1	<u>✓</u>	4	<u>✓</u>	7	<u>    </u>	10	<u>    </u>
2	<u>+</u>	5	<u>    </u>	8	<u>    </u>	11	<u>    </u>
3	<u>+</u>	6	<u>    </u>	9	<u>    </u>	12	<u>    </u>

B. This is your rating:

- Outstanding Plus on all elements, with justification statement - for approval of Director.
- Satisfactory ✓ Performance generally meets or exceeds requirements. (Weak performance compensated by strong or adequate performance in other tasks.)
- Unsatisfactory Minus on one or more underlined elements, not compensated by strong or adequate performance. (See Over)

C. Rating discussed \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

D. Position No. PSW-9756 reviewed 1-10-62 (Date). Duties statement found  adequate  inadequate. (Check one.) If inadequate send redescription of duties, with SF-52, to Station Management within 30 days from date of review.

August L. Horney Employee's Signature      E. J. Wadsworth Supervisor's Signature

## SPEED-MEMO

11 Jan. 1962

1

<b>TO</b> A. L. Hormay Division of RM & WHR	<b>SUBJECT</b> Grazing capacity values on the 1949 Harvey Valley map.
<b>FROM</b> Raymond D. Ratliff SRC	

**MESSAGE** (Write concise message. Sign and forward parts 1 and 2 to addressee. Retain part 3)

Gus:

This past year Bill Sanderson completed his toe-point survey for grazing capacities on Harvey Valley. We are contemplating making a comparison of the figures Bill comes up with and the original capacities in 1949.

We have the over-all capacity for the allotment, but do not have the capacities for the individual units. If these figures are available, may I have a copy of them?

Also, we will need answers to the following questions.

1. What degree of forage utilization was used in the determination of the grazing capacities shown on the 1949 map of Harvey Valley?
2. How were the basic figures of forage production determined?
3. Are utilization adjustments for distance from water etc. involved in the map figures, or was an over-all adjustment made for each unit?
4. When we say that the unit is 33% used, do we mean that 33% of the herbage has been taken and that 100% of the available AUM's have been used?

**SIGNATURE**

AUM's have been used?

*Raymond D. Ratliff*

**REPLY** (Use this space for reply. Sign and date. Return part 1 to sender. Retain part two)

5. When we say that the unit is 66% used, do we mean that over 100% of the available AUM's, based on a proper use of 33% of the herbage, has been used?

Any help you can give us on the above will be very much appreciated.

**SIGNATURE**

**DATE**

Ray Hilding, Supervisor, St. Joe N. F.  
St. Maries, Idaho

4210 *General*  
January 11, 1962

A. L. Hornay

Range and Wildlife Habitat Programs

Dear Ray:

I am just now describing the photographs I took last summer on my swing around the West on rest-rotation grazing, and recall I promised to send you shots I took of a forage production cage on your forest. These are enclosed. Neither the black and white nor the color ones are the best in the world, but they may give you ideas on getting better ones. The second black and white shows four good-looking ~~men~~ Region 1 men pondering range problems on the St. Joe.

I have prepared reports on my trips and sent them on to Washington. You will receive a copy in time, I'm sure.

Enclosures  
ALHornay:ls

W. W. Dresskell, U. S. Forest Service,  
Federal Bldg., Missoula, Montana

4210 / 2270  
January 11, 1962

A. L. Hormay

Range and Wildlife Habitat Programs

Thanks very much for the photograph taken on the Bull Creek allotment of the Beaverhead forest. I am just getting around to working on the photos I took last summer. Enclosed are some kodachrome shots you were interested in, taken in Hughs Meadow (Kaniksu). Barely had enough light, as you can see, to get color photos but perhaps they will serve.

I enjoyed my trip in your region and will say again that I was impressed by the solid, vigorous approach you are taking to improve range management. I have sent my reports to Washington and you will receive copies in time, I'm sure.

Enclosures  
ALHormay:ls

## SPEED-MEMO

15 January 1961 *mb*

2

FROM E. J. Woolfolk, Chief. Division of RM & WHR.	SUBJECT <i>Reference to Ratliff</i> Forage Utilization Harvey Valley
TO Raymond D. Ratliff SRC.	

## MESSAGE

Joe:

Here is the data I have worked up from our past seasons utilization surveys. I am including copies of the standards used.

Note that I have weighted the utilization of the major types by their percentages of the total unit AUM's. The AUM's are based on the 1949 map figures. Per cent utilization for each major type was determined by the per cent ungrazed plants method, using the chart in the field guide of region 5.

Except for unit 5, I have given percentage composition figures for the various areas, as far as possible. These areas are the ones on the new map.

We can still obtain the following from the surveys.

1) Plant density (units 1&3). 2) Ground cover (by use of plant diameters) for units 1&3. 3) Stubble heights for all 3 units. Also, when we develop height-weight tables for the various species, we may be able to obtain a measure of production from such data.

I feel that we can obtain considerable useful data from this type of survey, but the method needs to be refined on the basis of the past seasons data.

I am sending copies of the data to Mert Reed.

SIGNATURE

*Raymond D. Ratliff*

REPLY

SIGNATURE

DATE

Raymond Ratliff, SRC

4210  
January 17, 1962

A. L. Horney

R&WH Programs

Attached is a reply to your memorandum of January 11 on grazing capacities for Harvey Valley. Hope it is clear. I'd be interested in the comparison you mention.

Attachment  
ALHorney:ls

*Eq No bed*

January 15, 1962

Estimated grazing capacity  
Harvey Valley allotment - 1949

<u>Range Unit</u>	<u>Grazing Capacity</u>
1	AU mos. 5474
2	3502
3	4546
4	3448
5	<u>4872</u>
Total	21,842 = 546.1 AUs for 4 months June 1 - Sept. 30

Answers to questions:

1. Average 25% for timber types; 40% for meadow and sagebrush types. This averages about 33% for all types.
2. No figures were used to get at capacity. The above use was observed at Burgess Spring over a period of years. These were applied to Harvey Valley adjusted for estimated differences in forage density at Burgess Spring and the particular type or area on which capacity was estimated.
3. Adjustments were made for each type area within units.
4. Thirty-three percent use means 33 percent use of the present available forage or herbage of forage species.
5. Sixty percent use and thirty-three percent use do not refer to proper use, simply to the amount of available herbage of forage species utilized.