Has the long-time trend of livestock reductions on range-
lands been due to range deterioration or beef cattle improve-
ment? This trend is apparent in Figure 1. The data for this
chart came from the U.S. Forest Service and are a total of
cattle plus sheep (5:1) on a cattle equivalent basis grazing in
New Mexico. Whenever cow size is increased substantially,
the amount of feed necessary for maintaining weight will
also go up. Feed requirements will also increase as the per-
cent calf crop and calf weights increase. When this is all
added up, has the total amount of feed required increased
efficient to affect carrying capacity?
In order to calculate this, definite statistical information is
needed on what actually existed 50 years ago. This informa-
tion exists in the bulletin published by Walker and Lantow in
1927. Using their basic data as a baseline, we compared it to
present data from the New Mexico State University experi-
mental herd located near Las Cruces, New Mexico. For the
comparison, two basic assumptions were made: range con-
tion has not changed (during the past 50 years) and the
relative dry matter intake of cattle has not changed.
Walker and Lantow (1927) based their bulletin on a
detailed survey of 127 ranches in southern and eastern New
Mexico in 1925. The average size of those ranches surveyed
was 61 sections per ranch. There were 754 cows, 34 bulls,
433 calves born (57%), and 361 calves branded (48%). A 12%
death loss was incurred with 78% of the deaths attributed to
starvation. The average cow weight was 777 lb and calf
weaning weight was 323 lb. An average of 155 lb of calf was
weaned per cow.
The Walker and Lantow data were used to compare to
cows from the NMSU College Range breeding project (Rank-
kin et al. 1978). The two sets of NMSU cows were Herefords
(1,000-lb cow, 63.4% calf crop 411 lb weaning weight) and
Brangus-Hereford crossbred cows (1,100-lb cow, 85% CC,
495 lb WW).
Dry matter intake calculations were based on metabolic
weight (WT\(^{17}\)) basis using the same constants for each stage
of production. The stage of production, calf crop percentage
and weaning weight of the calf were all included in the
calculations. The calculated intakes were compared to
actual values as published by Cordova et al. 1978. These
were also compared to National Research Council recom-
endations. No allowance was made for difference in diges-
tibility of forage by season as trends were assumed to be
the same in 1925 as in the present.
Size of the cow definitely affects the daily intake. Average
yearlong daily intake calculates to be about 17.5 lb per day
for the 777 pound cow and 26.6 lb per day for a 1,100-lb cow if
each raised a calf. Calf crop percentage plays an important
role in calculating total herd forage intake. Cows without a
calf are considered to be maintaining their weight, which
results in a lower intake. For example, a dry, 1,100-lb cow will
eat about 18 lb as compared to 26 lb per day during early
lactation. When the weighted averages of stage production,
size of calf, and percent calf crop are calculated, the 777-lb
cow consumed 15.2 lb of forage per day yearlong as com-
pared to 19.6 lb for the 1,000-lb cow and 22.6 lb for the
1,100-lb crossbred cow.
Assuming a base herd of 800 cows with an average weight
of 777 lb in 1925, they would eat 12,160 lb of dry matter per
day. Now, with a herd of 1,100-lb crossbred cows eating 22.6
lb/day, only 538 cows would consume the same amount of
forage and it would take only 620 cows weighing 1,000
pounds.
Let's look at this another way. Cows of 50 years ago pro-
duced 124,000 lb of beef where the crossbreds produced
226,363 lb of beef. This is done with only 67% as many cattle
or a 33% herd reduction.
If we turned the screw one more turn and implanted the
calves (not done on the NMSU cattle), we can expect a faster
growth rate to achieve about 25 lb added per calf. This would
give an additional 11,875 lb without affecting numbers. We
would then have 238,238 lb of beef produced from 538

Fig. 1. Cattle equivalent grazing on New Mexico's forests.
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crossbred cows, or about twice as much beef from 67% as many cows.

The decreasing number of livestock on the ranges is at least partially explained by the improvement of the livestock. Ranchers and land managers were realizing that in order to maintain range quality they had to continue to trim numbers. Undoubtedly this process was slow as the improvement in cattle is slow. If one could plot the annual forage yield removed from the range over time, there would still be a decline but not nearly as steep as the one shown in Figure 1. Also, a certain amount of improvement in the cattle came from changes in the range management area. The improved efficiency such as calf crop percentage and weaning weights would be directly affected by range condition up to a point after which increases are mainly genetic rather than environmental.

Thus, any change in cow size and production efficiency as great as the changes discussed in the article would have a pronounced effect on carrying capacity. Any rancher wanting to run the same number of cows as in 1925 should have a forage base of about 50% greater than the original. This could have been done by expanding the number of acres, or improving livestock distribution and range improvement practices.
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**Editor's Note:** The author didn't really intend to answer the question, "has range management kept up?" That would take a much longer and more complicated article. His intentions were to stimulate some thinking in this area as well as make a point that size and productivity of the animals in a herd do affect carrying capacity. We haven't paid much attention to this fact in the past in range management. We generally just consider a cow is a cow is a cow.
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**Reubens**

returns raw soil to grassy beauty.

Grows even where there are extreme nutrient deficiencies.

Ideal for planting on roadsides, landfills, mine tailings, right-of-ways, pipelines, earthen dams, dikes and backfilled quarries. Reubens Canada bluegrass' rhizome and root system develops a tough, long-lasting sod which helps prevent soil erosion. Reubens germinates much faster, is lower growing. Adapted to a wider range of pH conditions, it survives well on slightly acid or alkaline soils.

It's the answer for revegetating most barren areas. Attractive dark green in spring, Reubens progresses to blue green, to light saffron color with cinnamon seed heads.

Specify the first and only U.S. certified Canada bluegrass, REUBENS.

Want wild flower seeds included in your mix?