

Comments by Everett R. Doman

1. The comparison of range condition and trend in Harvey Valley and adjacent allotments is shaky. We would be on thin ice making such a comparison if the only difference between Harvey Valley and the adjacent allotments was the management system. However, there are also other considerations. Artificial seeding, sagebrush control, grasshopper control, and drainage improvement was applied to 4552 acres in Harvey Valley. No adjacent allotment received this intensity of cultural work. This treatment should have, and presumably did, greatly improved the condition and grazing capacity of the treated area. This would also be reflected in lighter use of the untreated areas in the allotment.

We realize that the rest-rotation system allowed the forest to proceed with the revegetation programs without taking nonuse. This could not have been done under season long grazing. However, it needs to be recognized that both the improvement program and the rest-rotation system were factors in the better conditions that exist in Harvey Valley as compared to adjacent allotments.

2. Part of the costs attributed to the rest-rotation system (i.e. extra riding) were due to the fact that adequate range fences were not in place at the beginning of the demonstration. Had they been in place less riding would have been needed and therefore less cost to both FS and permittee. This could have made the operation more economical and practical from the permittee's standpoint.

It does appear logical that less rather than more riding would be necessary when the livestock are concentrated at any one time on only a portion of the allotment as in rest-rotation grazing.

3. I do not believe that we can say that the rest-rotation system became fully operational in 1954. Actually, as late as 1961 it was found that there were so many variations that pastures had not received the complete rest required under the rest-rotation system. It was only from 1962 on that we had the fences and control to truly put the system into use and stick fairly close to the rest-rotation plan.

Comments by Don BolanderHighlights

It would be most helpful if they would include a paragraph in the Highlights that would briefly spell out what is being compared, i.e., a five-pasture rest-rotation system on an allotment with a given level of cultural improvements as compared to the same area, with a given level of improvements, grazed season-long.

Text

Page 3. It looks like much of the cost for the expensive corral should be a research cost and not an improvement cost. (See page 11a)

Page 4. Does "Standard Forest Service grazing management practice" mean grazing season-long on an allotment that has been fully developed or standard management on an allotment with little or no non-structural and structural development?

Comments by Wayne West

Page 1. The initial statement in the Highlights describes goals for the Harvey Valley study. As written it refers to all National Forests and should be changed.

Page 12. Is the weight gain data obtained from the Gray's Valley exchange in 1967 significant to this discussion? The weight differences may not be as extreme as the Permittee estimated.