

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Department of Agriculture—Forest Service

San Francisco, California 94111

Memorandum

TO : E. G. Dunford, Assistant Director, PSWF&RES File No. 2210

FROM : E. R. Doman, Assistant Regional Forester Date: December 10, 1965

SUBJECT: Analysis and Plans - Studies (Harvey Valley Demonstration Allotment) Your reference: 4210(2200) 11-26

Jack and Ray have done an excellent job in preparing the outline for the Harvey Valley Evaluation report. Most certainly all facets have been included. Adequacy and availability of data for some points raised in the outline may not be readily interpreted as supporting evidence.

Our comments may not be too constructive inasmuch as many of them would no doubt be covered in the report proper. However, they may be useful as a reminder of points that should be given consideration. Comments will be tied to the outline items.

- I A. Under this item (or perhaps Items II A and B) some discussion may be in order treating the grazing schedule of pastures as it actually occurred. Since the planned sequence could not be maintained for various reasons, the system could possibly be construed as deferred rotation as much as rest rotation.
- II A. Is this to include background material from Burgess Springs?
- C. To include cost data? The system's value in facilitating cultural improvement work should be brought out either here or in II B.
- III A. Background information on outside allotments is apt to be very inadequate for such comparison. Quality of utilization data has materially improved in recent years. However, if obtained at all during most of Harvey Valley's history, it would be more of the "eyeballing" nature. The influence of weather, fencing, etc. would be conjectural at best.
- B. It would be most worthwhile to come up with some positive findings from transect data. Especially since NFA is using this means of evaluating range condition and trend. This may be premature, however. It is our understanding that Jack's assignment with the Rocky Mountain Station will be concerned with the analysis of such transect data.
- C. We agree that maximum use should be made of the Station's transect data. Past discussions have questioned its value. Perhaps some means of utilizing these data has been determined. If not, further efforts to do so do not appear justified.

D. Relating weights to influencing factors indicated is most important.

IV B. C&F transects do not provide basal cover data per se. If a comparison of Station and Lassen transect data is contemplated, it will have to be on the basis of composition, plant density indices, and amount of litter.

D.- 2. What, if any, consideration should be given to factors that may have had a bearing on animal weights within and outside Harvey Valley? Such items as water availability, terrain, etc. Perhaps none since this is a comparison of management systems.

V A. This will have to be treated with discretion. The system as practiced entailed a number of items that were research-oriented and would not be required in normal allotment administration. There may be some merit in having two sets of costs: (1) gross costs since the effort was undertaken and (2) costs that would be incurred to practice rest-rotation management without research implications.

It would be desirable to at least comment on two other items (possibly under IV Results of Studies) recognizing that information may be lacking.

It is reasonable to assume that forced feeding under rest-rotation would likely result in heavy browse use by cattle. Thus a competitive situation between livestock and deer would be created. This, of course, would be of particular significance on critical deer ranges and a factor to consider in selecting allotments on which to practice rest-rotation grazing. Were any browse utilization measurements made (for cattle, deer or both)? *Consider a ¶ on this subject*

This next point has been previously discussed but is worthy of repetition. Is there any possibility of determining the extent of range improvement that can be attributed to management and that to cultural treatment? We realize that the original concept of rest-rotation management at Harvey Valley considered the cultural aspect as part of the system. However, it would be desirable to differentiate between the two if at all possible.

We appreciate the opportunity of commenting on the outline and hope the foregoing will be helpful in the report preparation. Let us know if we can be of assistance.

Dunford

4200

December 17, 1965

Mr. Fred LaBarber
Route #1, Box 277
Westwood, California

Dear Fred:

I want you to know that both Ray Ratliff and I feel we were fortunate to have your help at Harvey Valley this past season. You understood the urgency of the work and were most conscientious in doing whatever was required. Thanks so much for a fine job.

Ejo

Sincerely,

JACK N. REPERT
Project Leader
Management Bunchgrass Ranges

cc: Dunford
Ratliff

Memorandum

TO : Raymond D. Ratliff

File No. 4210(2200)

FROM : Jack H. Reppert

Date: Dec. 14, 1965

SUBJECT: Range Programs (Harvey Valley Evaluation)

Your reference:

Last week I talked to Bosworth and Lord and later to Elwin Roney about the Outline for the Harvey Valley Report.

The main criticism expressed by Bosworth was our idea to include benefit and shortcomings in future-planned evaluation at Harvey Valley. He thought this might be better as a separate report. I explained why I thought both parts should be in the report, but offered to consider his views in light of comments by others. I saw Roney a few days later and found that he thought that both the evaluation and reasons for our future plans belonged in the same report.

Bosworth and Lord discussed economics to some extent. The subject was extra costs chargeable to rest-rotation. Examples were division fences, increased need for allotment boundary fence, extra water developments. Other items not particularly chargeable were holding fields, revegetation or spraying, corral for gathering and loading. May, you will need to make a trip to Susanville before March 1, get with Phil, Irwin and Fred and get some data on fence costs, etc. Also determine dates when fence was constructed and length of it. I suggest you see Gus Hornay on the same subjects before you go up--keep good notes and between the two sources get something reliable. Consider cornering McConnen a couple of hours and let me know of our problem and what sort of data we intend to gather and for what purpose.

Bosworth asked for information as to whether grazing late in the season (specifically October at Harvey Valley) hurts range plants, etc. more or less than grazing early in the season. You should write him at my request by January 15 as he has immediate use for this dope. Ask Gus what he thinks. Elmo Brough says late season grazing is o.k. except when cattle preference changes from grass to bitterbrush in critical deer range, or where at high elevation fall storms may wipe you out.

One other thing, Elwin Roney may request that you and Dunford be present when he meets with the Lassen Forest to make plans for 1967. This is a tough one. I guess our only reason for being involved is to see how these plans will affect our comparable plots and perhaps offer a word of caution for certain plans that might greatly change or junk rest-rotation. However, be sure that Dunford keeps in touch with Bosworth if such a request should be made.

cc: Dunford

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

Name August L. Hornay Rating Period 1/1/65 to 12/31/65

Title and Grade Range Conservationist, GS-12 Unit Mgmt. of Bunchgrass Ranges

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	✓	4	+	7	_____	10	_____
2	+	5	_____	8	_____	11	_____
3	+	6	_____	9	_____	12	_____

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 _____ (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. Hornay
Employee's Signature

E. Dunford
Supervisor's Signature