Range Management

Range Management

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

1. Name of the Planned Program

Range Management

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
121	Management of Range Resources	40%		25%	
133	Pollution Prevention and Mitigation	0%		5%	
213	Weeds Affecting Plants	20%		25%	
216	Integrated Pest Management Systems	0%		5%	
302	Nutrient Utilization in Animals	0%		5%	
307	Animal Management Systems	25%		25%	
605	Natural Resource and Environmental Economics	10%		5%	
610	Domestic Policy Analysis	5%		0%	
901	Program and Project Design, and Statistics	0%		5%	
	Total	100%		100%	

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	2.6	0.0	0.6	0.0
Actual	4.0	0.0	1.1	0.0

2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c	1890 Extension	Hatch	Evans-Allen
86309	0	82270	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
86309	0	82270	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
124035	0	980919	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

A winter forage trial was conducted in Birch Creek near Lone Pine, Idaho. Four range grass cultivars were planted in November 2005 and four forage kochia cultivars were planted in December 2005. During 2006, 2007 and subsequent years, data was collected and information disseminated to stakeholders.

The winter forage trial demonstrated forages that can be grazed in late fall and winter, allowing for extended grazing periods and reduced hay feeding costs. Utah State University economists say that feeding cattle hay cost about $1.00 /head/day. This is the largest single expense for cattle producers. Economists also report that grazing cost about $.24 to $. 50/head/day.

In 2007 two plot tours were conducted. A total of 41 people attended the tours. These included ranchers, educators, college students, and NRCS personnel.

In cooperation with USDA-ARS Forage and Range Research Laboratory, a Range and Pasture Management Workshop was held in Pocatello, Idaho on January 25th. Speakers were from USDA-ARS, Utah State University Extension, and U of I Extension. Subjects included grass, legume, and forbs selection and management, pasture and range renovation and establishment, weed management, animal nutrition and grazing management. 110 people attended.

The Natural Resource 4-H Day Camp was organized in cooperation with Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District and U of I Jefferson County Extension 4-H. 14 youth attended. Subjects included plants, animals, ecosystems, soils and water conservation. Each child planted a tree seedling in a pot to take home.

Several research projects were funded to address key issues related to rangeland ecology, especially issues associated with invasive species and noxious weeds.

2. Brief description of the target audience

Ranchers, land managers, youth, policy makers, environmental restoration advocacy groups, and other research scientists.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

Target for the number of persons (contacts) reached through direct and indirect contact methods

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	**Target**	**Target**	**Target**	**Target**
Plan	2500	500	90	175
2007	5657	0	573	0

2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)

Patent Applications Submitted

Year	Target
Plan:	0
2007:	0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

	Extension	Research	Total
Plan			
2007	5	5	10

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

Range and weed tours.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	4	4

Output #2

Output Measure

Range monitoring and grazing workshops.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	4	5

Output #3

Output Measure

Weed workshops and presentations.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	2	38

Output #4

Output Measure

7th grade science school.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	1	2

Output #5

Output Measure

BEHAVE training.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	8	1

Output #6

Output Measure

Extension publications.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	1	5

Output #7

Output Measure

Refereed scientific journal articles.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	5

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

O No.	Outcome Name
1	O: Awareness of new, accepted or recommended grazing and weed management practices.I: Number attending educational events.
2	O: Youth learning about rangeland ecology and management.I: Number of youth participating in school programs on range.
3	O: Extension Educators & NRCS personnel understanding and teaching BEHAVE principles.I: Number of Extension Educators & NRCS trainers trained.
4	An increase in the number of trained graduate students prepared to enter the workforce.

Range Management
Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Not reporting on this Outcome for this Annual Report

2. Associated Institution Types

3a. Outcome Type:

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

What has been done

Results

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

Economy
Public Policy changes
Competing Programmatic Challenges
Other (personnel retirement)

Brief Explanation

Because of a mid-year retirement, the Behavior workshop was delivered to a single group of professionals, rather than to several groups of end users.

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

After Only (post program)

Evaluation Results

Participants in the 7th grade science day demonstrated information that they had learned.Participants in the Behavior workshop indicated new knowledge gained about how the life experiences of the grazing animal affect grazing behavior. Participants in dozens of weed programs and workshops indicate new knowledge and motivation to cooperate in weed control efforts.

Key Items of Evaluation