

Berkeley
June 7, 1973

Dear Burt:

The postscript in your May 25
1972 note to me says - Gus:

Won't give up on me. I am not
and that is one of the reasons
I'll be in Washington on June
14 next.

I would like to see this
meeting limited to —

Directorate Silcock, Turcott
Administration In charge?

Legislation & plans Senzel

Resources

Heil and Whypely?

See you

Gus

June 11/73
Hormay

Washington DC. RR Meeting
June 14, 1973

Personnel in attendance

1. Directorate Director Silcock
 Asso. Dir. Turcott
2. Resources Asst. Dir Keil, Deputy?
3. Administration Asst Dir ?
 Div. Chief Hasty Budget
4. Legislation, plans Asst Dir Senzel

(1)

1. May be short meeting
Only one question to ask.

2. Before asking
Current Bureau problems, issues?
My comments related.
→ Hear very little in Bark. ALH a BLM'er?
NEPA 1969 Impact statements
User groups - public
Reorganization Cost? Efficiency? Fed. BLM

3. The question
Is Bureau interested in learning
about RR land management?

HORMAY RECEIVES SOCIETY
OF RANGE MANAGEMENT AWARD

The Society for Range Management's
annual Frederic G. Renner Award has
been presented to August L. Hormay,

a U.S. Forest Service employee whose
work with "rest-rotation" grazing has
greatly aided the Bureau's range
management program.

4. May not take kindly to questions
and remarks Who does Hormay think he
is.
Inclined punch nose

Hope - Fore stall

Remind

- a) Oldest man in room
- would not strike a man your
senior
- b) Talk from experience.
43 yrs gov. service, ^{in field} wildland
management
- c) More research experience
- d) More plan wise management experience
- e) Watched (F.S 47 yrs BLM 39 yrs) grow
from infancy
know most of the principal people
in these organization including
Pinchot and Perry Carpenter

From the sidelines I believe I
have obtained a better insight into
the problems besetting these bureaus
than the people directly involved
with the work of the Bureau
Believe better position to see solutions

5. I ask question whether or not Bureau interested in RR because has not shown serious interest to date.

Joined Bureau in 1966 enthusiastic about having opportunity

1. explain and demonstrate RR ^{manag.}
2. help Bureau achieve goals

Wanted first to explain RR to people in Bureau determining direction and policy of Bureau - for approval trial or rejection

Have not been given opportunity to date.

Proceeded training field going ~~perennial~~ personal - effort largely wasted because of lack of understanding and support by top administrative heads - this group and state directors

Very discouraged last 4 years

(4)

6. Bureau has very little understanding of RR planning and management present

RR
Multiple-use
plan.

Does not have a single RR land
management plan

Has a single area under RR management

7. 1971 RR Questionnaire

Knowledge of RR management ^{principles}
in Bureau

Renewable resources

13 questions framed as
examination questions

Bureau score 58 peer

Participation (see page 5a)
Offices and scores

No response from Wash on
report.

June 11/73
Hornay

7 cont'd 1971 RR Questionnaire.

Returns and results by principal offices

Office	Number of returns				Score rating
	Potential	Actual	%	Percent signed	
Wash. D.C.	113	26	23	88	55
State	175	41	23	70	53
District	1413	517	37	69	60
Service Centers	<u>69</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>38</u>
Bureau Total	1770	627	35	71	58


Score rating	Scores		All Respond Bureau
Excellent	100		1 %
Very good	80-95		15
Fair-good	60-75		42
Poor	0-55		42

√ excluding engineers and realty specialists

PR Questionnaire

Scores on questions 15-27 in relation to period of training (training courses)

Score ratings	Number of training sessions			
	0	1	2	3
	% of respondents scoring			
100 Excellent	0	7	0	6
80-95 Very good	4	14	15	35 29
60-75 Fair-good	16	45	53	47
0-55 Poor	80	41	32	18
No of respondents in above	133	230	176	123



 Ave score 58 = Poor-fair

8 Knowledge of RR management
answer to practically all land
management, people and money problems

Problems

Environment (NEPA 1969)

User groups

Public - Congress

All problems yield to management
know-how

6

9. If Bureau is to realize goals

a) Should become fully informed on RR management principles.

b). State goals simply and clearly citing legislative authorization and stating policy.

c). Change organizational setup to maximize management, ^{results} output
Function of office

" & responsibilities personnel
Allocation and control of funds

Now organized on a political-economic basis as big business

Big change to shed old methods & ways
Calf Path, Fresh Air

d) Promote multiple-use land management training - all personnel

School (Colleges, universities)

On-the-job (In-Service)

e) Modify promotion procedure (ties to e above)

f) Modify planning and evaluation procedures.



United States Department of the Interior

IN REPLY REFER TO:

C-930.1
4413

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
STATE OFFICE
2800 Cottage Way - Room E-2841
Sacramento, California 95825

JUN 25 1973

Memorandum

To: A. L. Hormay
From: Chief, Division of Resources
Subject: Wells Meadow 1973 Report

Attached is a copy of the report on our field review this Spring. We thought you might be interested.

We believe you would find it worthwhile to make an inspection of your own to see what has taken place.

The Area Manager has requested that we mention the matter of the special evaluation studies you have set up in the allotment. Our budget is going to be even tighter next year than the current one; anything you do to reduce the time element involved and retain integrity in the program will be appreciated.

Enclosure

STATE OFFICE
2800 Cottage Way - Room E-2841
Sacramento, California 95825

Memorandum

June 14, 1973

To: Chief, Division of Resources
From: Range Management Specialist, State Office
Subject: Inspection Wells Meadow Allotment March 1973

On March 27, 1973 the Range Management Specialist, State Office; Ken Boyer, Area Manager; Dave Eabb, Wildlife Biologist; and Virgil Henke, Range Specialist, field inspected the Wells Meadow Allotment.

This allotment comprises approximately 2,030 acres and is rated at 199 AUMs. It is divided into 4 pastures and under a rest rotation grazing system within an approved AMP. The allotment is in a key winter deer range that supports large numbers of deer during some years. Objectives of the plan are to improve both Bitterbrush and Desert Needle grass cover. Improvement in Bitterbrush is contemplated through manipulating cattle so as to obtain relative heavy cattle grazing for plant hedging then provide adequate rest for vigor, seed production and production of new plants. Cattle grazing is largely by calves of mixed breeds (mostly dairy) licensed use is for 50 head 4/15 - 8/14 (4 months) or 200 AUMs.

The grazing system was effective in 1967 but not fully implemented until 1968. Some difficulty has been experienced in obtaining the close cattle use desired on bitterbrush. The calves become sore footed from the somewhat rocky terrain and have to be supplemented from time to time at the ranch and do not tend to break down the brush as well as larger animals.

For the 1972 season grazing use was increased. Numbers were increased to 100 AUs with some mature animals being turned out and the season extended to October. Total actual use amounted to 411 AUMs which probably will include a small amount of supplemental feeding. This report is pretty much a followup of our June 1972 report but is more complete in that we were able to observe the full seasons grazing use by cattle plus 1972-1973 winter deer use.

Grazing by pasture during 1972 was as follows:

- #1. Rest all season.
- #2. Graze after bitterbrush seedrip 6/1.
- #3. Graze season long 4/1-10/15.
- #4. Graze after needlegrass seedrop 5/20.

The 1972 spring was an exceptionally dry one. This, along with a late frost, resulted in poor growth and very little seed production. Deer use during the late winter and early spring of 1973 was exceptionally heavy. During this field inspection at least 60 deer were counted in pasture #1.

The field inspection was made primarily in pastures #1 and #3, pasture #1 because it was rested the past season and we were interested in observing vigor and reproduction of key plants (Bitterbrush and Desert Needle grass). Pasture #3 was grazed season long in 1972 and we were interested in the effects of the increased stocking rate.

Pasture #1. This was not the best season to observe plant vigor. Bitterbrush had made very little leader growth (due to 1972 drought). Close deer use was evident throughout on both Bitterbrush and to some extent on *Ceanothus*. There were practically no new plants of Bitterbrush. Desert Needle grass as expected was lightly utilized, appeared reasonably vigorous and had a reasonably good distribution of different age classes. We are slowly getting the hedging effect on Bitterbrush. Large plants are being broken down and taking on the more compact form we are looking for. (See photos 12 through 17). The hedging shape is more obvious in the special range study photos taken by area personnel. Pasture #3. This pasture took heavy use during the past year which included double the usual stocking by cattle during the summer (1972) and an estimated 2 or 3 times normal use by deer during early 1973. This use has been both good and bad. The heavy cattle grazing has very markedly broken down the Bitterbrush. Large stems up to $\frac{1}{2}$ inch in diameter have been broken down and the hedged affect considerably accelerated. However, the heavy deer use which followed has reduced the plant leaf surfaces considerably and plant vigor has been adversely affected. Perennial grasses were grazed closely by cattle last summer but have received very little deer use. They appear in pretty good condition and gaining in density. This pasture will be rested from cattle use in 1973. It should be watched rather closely to see if bitterbrush regains vigor. Sagebrush reproduction is heavy in this pasture. Very few young bitterbrush plants were noted. Photo #18 is a good indicator of heavy deer use, #19 is rather typical of bitterbrush being well broken down by cattle but followed by deer stripping. #20 shows typical grass utilization.

Observed Mar 27
before twig growth
completed.

Summary of Observations

1. We are slowly acquiring the hedging effect by cattle on bitterbrush.
2. Increased cattle stocking has increased considerably the rate of hedging.
3. Needle grass and Indian Rice grass appear to be increasing.
4. Bitterbrush does not appear to be increasing, little reproduction has been observed.
5. Sagebrush is definitely increasing in pastures 3 and 4.
6. Bitterbrush vigor in the unused pasture for 1973 (No. 1) is good but does not appear to be increasing.

There should be a thorough evaluation made of this allotment and the AMP after the increased stocking rate has been given 1 or 2 more seasons.

Attachments

Photos #12 thru 20

D. E. Dimock

Copy to: Gus Hornay
DM, 0401

DEDimock:cw