

## Handling Questions

18. If you prefer to have questions at the end rather than during your talk, let the audience know about it. They will not interrupt you and can be thinking of questions to ask later. It can be embarrassing to a speaker to ask for questions and not get any. Repeating your invitation only makes you look weaker. Usually, after you say, "Now, who has the first question?" several hands will go up, and with them the interest of the audience. In big gatherings or where time does not permit questions, you may suggest that people come up afterward for discussion of their queries.

19. Never play down a member of the audience; you may do yourself more harm than the one you're trying to hurt. This is especially important to remember when questions are being asked. Try to be courteous when someone asks a question you have just answered; and never show anger or get provoked. 20. In asking the audience a question, ask it first to the whole group. This causes everyone to listen and start thinking about it. If you direct a question to one person, everyone else will be more

interested to see how he gets off the hook than what the question is about.

21. Stop the questions before they run down or get to wandering. You might say, "There is time for just one more question," which allows you to close the discussion in an orderly way.

## Ending Your Talk

22. Be careful with the summary of your talk. Try to hit only the major topics discussed, not a complete review. If you bore the audience with a long detailed summary, taking 7 or 8 minutes to cover what you said in the previous hour, your audience will wonder why you took the hour.

23. Stop on time. Carefully following your notes should keep you on schedule, but if it doesn't it is better to stop while the audience's interest is high, than to keep on until they're restless and bored.

## And Finally

24. Take every opportunity to speak. Practice makes perfect.



## The Dameron Deer Study:

# Do Similar Problems Exist Elsewhere?

Frederick J. Reynolds

The Dameron Canyon drainage, located just south of Kanosh in southwestern Utah, has a history of heavy winter use by mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*). In 1934, to study the impact of deer in this area, the Civilian Conservation Corp, under the direction of the USDA Forest Service, constructed two exclosures. These exclosures of 1/2 acre each are adjacent to one another. One was enclosed by a 10' high log fence restricting livestock and deer. The other, by a 40" high log fence, restricting livestock but allowing use by deer.

One 20' x 20' study plot was later established in each exclosure. There was also a 20' x 20' plot established outside the exclosure to be used as a control. Data from these plots were collected in 1940 and 1950.

By the spring of 1977, the exclosures were very deplapidated, and either needed to be rebuilt, in order to protect the study site, or removed and abandoned. Fishlake National Forest decided to evaluate the worth of the 43-year-old study before making a final decision. Many problems, however, were encountered while analyzing the study. The remainder of this article will deal with these problems and, hopefully, help prevent similar problems in other areas where they may occur.

**First, there was a 5-year period** between when the exclosures were constructed and the study initiated, which created a problem, especially in comparing the control plot to those in the exclosures.

Secondly, and probably the most significant, was sample size.

The author is range conservationist, Fishlake National Forest, U.S. Forest Service, Fillmore, Utah 84631.

One 20' x 20' plot in each area is too small to allow for dependable data. A complete analysis of each plot showing percent litter, bare ground, and rock as well as pounds of herbage/acre would have been helpful for later use.

Aside from a vegetative map made of each plot during the 1940 and 1950 readings, only percent cover had been considered. These vegetative maps proved invaluable in helping to explain why the percent cover of some species had changed. This was especially true for the browse species, since some of the plants had died.

Another major problem encountered was the placement of the study plot in the southwest corner of the deer exclosure. Since it was located near the 10' high log fence, the micro-environment of this plot differed from the other two, particularly in increased soil moisture partly as a result of the shading effect. The fence also served as a wind break, reducing evaporation and evapotranspiration. As a result of the increased moisture, the 1977 reading showed that moss was the dominant ground cover in the deer closure at 14.19%. This compared to 3.19% and .13% ground cover by moss in the cattle exclosure and open site, respectively. It is also interesting to note that moss had not been mentioned or considered during the previous readings.

Despite the problems caused by the fence, it was very fortunate that it remained intact and standing until the 1977 reading. The log fence was then replaced by a net wire field fence, which should help alleviate the problem.

Another problem in analyzing the study was insufficient data. The study was to be read every 10 years; however, after the 1940

and 1950 readings, the study was left unattended until 1977, leaving a 26-year span when no data were collected. Part of the problem came in the confusion of turning over these types of studies by the Intermountain Regional Office of the Forest Service to the individual Forest and Districts beginning in the 1950's. The rangers may have felt that some of the studies were not as important as other projects, or they may have had insufficient funding to make the study.

**There are many problems like these** associated with many of the studies conducted by the different State and Federal agencies, one of which may be a lack of interest or change in priorities by the person or persons involved. This can happen especially in agencies where there is a constant shift in personnel due to transfers, etc. However, even though an agency may deem a study no longer useful, other agencies or institutions, particularly universities, may find it valuable.

Therefore, I would like to advocate that each State, perhaps through the land grant college or by a special committee appointed by the various Sections of SRM, coordinate such

studies. The college or Section could maintain a special library of the various ecological studies, including a file of when these studies need to be updated. This group could also help evaluate the worth of established studies and help point out a need or even give technical assistance in the establishment of the new ones. This system would also be a means to assure that the future of such studies would not totally depend on one man or one agency. It could also be a means of notifying those who are interested in a particular study, before it is abandoned or neglected, and give them the opportunity to maintain it to obtain further information. Just as with this study, there are many others which have had a lot of time, effort and money invested in them. They may contain years of valuable information which may be lost if some action is not taken, and taken soon.

Fortunately, the Dameron deer and livestock enclosure study was protected in time. Despite the difficulties with the data, much valuable information concerning the effect of mule deer in that area was obtained.

## Montana Grass Registered

Goshen prairie sandreed became the third grass developed by the Soil Conservation Service for use in Montana and Wyoming to be registered by the Crop Science Society of America.

Goshen—a native, warm-season grass developed to stabilize and reduce erosion on sandy areas in the two states—has been available commercially in Montana and Wyoming since 1976. It was jointly released then by the experiment stations of Montana State University and the University of Wyoming, and the Soil Conservation Service.

The registration by the Crop Science Society of America gives the plant national recognition as having been thoroughly tested and reviewed for commercial use.

The rhizomatous grass was developed at the Plant Materials Center, Bridger, Mont. The Center is owned by the conservation districts of Montana and Wyoming and operated by the Soil Conservation Service.

The two other plants developed by the Plant Materials Center receiving recognition are Lutana cicer milkvetch and Critana thickspike wheatgrass. They were registered in 1971 and 1972, respectively.—USDA/SCS, Bozeman, Mont.

## Nutritional Muscular Dystrophy Plagues Sheep Producers

Scattered cases of nutritional muscular dystrophy are being reported from across New Mexico, said Jim Sachse, Extension sheep specialist at New Mexico State University. Farm sheep producers are especially plagued every spring with lamb losses caused from the disease, also known as white muscle disease.

This disease is caused by either an interference with the selenium metabolism or an actual deficiency of selenium or vitamin E. Ordinarily, affected sheep have been grazing on irrigated pastures, Sachse said.

The incidence of the disease is much higher with sheep grazing legume pasture or fed alfalfa hay. Lambs being creep fed or on other high quality diets are also more susceptible.

Lambs with the disease have arched backs and are unable to move properly because they usually can't control their quarters. The disease is most common in lambs three to eight weeks of age.

Nutritional muscular dystrophy causes a progressive paralysis of the skeletal muscles. The muscles of the heart, diaphragm, tongue, and esophagus are also commonly affected. Some lambs die suddenly from heart involvement without prior clinical symptoms.

Affected lambs may be treated with a high degree of success, if treated at the first clinical sign. The common treatment is an injection of selenium and vitamin E which is available only from a veterinarian. In flocks experiencing an annual problem with white muscle disease, it's best to inject the ewes with selenium tocophoral one to four weeks prior to lambing.

A new and perhaps easier method was recently granted approval by the Food and Drug Administration, the Extension specialist said. It is now legal to feed supplemental selenium to ewes and lambs on a limited basis. However, the manufacturers and FDA guidelines must be followed closely, as selenium toxicity is just as detrimental as selenium deficiency.—*New Mexico State University Current Events*

## Grassland Grazing Fees Set

The U.S. Forest Service announced the new grazing fees for National Grasslands. These became effective March 1, 1979.

The formula for calculating grazing fees is similar to the procedure in the Public Rangelands Improvement Act. The system uses annual adjustment indices which include the Forage Value Index, Beef Cattle Price Index, and Price Paid Index.

National Grassland	1979 Grazing fee
Black Kettle	2.85
Buffalo Gap	2.85
Caddo	2.85
Cedar River	2.85
Cimarron	2.85
Comanche	2.85
Crooked River	1.96
Curlew	1.98-2.03
Fort Pierre	2.85
Grand River	2.85
Kiowa	2.85
Little Missouri	2.42
Lyndon B. Johnson	2.85
McClellan Creek	2.85
Oglala	2.85
Pawnee	2.85
Rita Blanca	2.85
Shenandoah	2.64
Thunder Basin	2.81