Bighorn sheep once roamed the Western deserts and mountains in great numbers, but the range needs of livestock, the diseases of domestic sheep, and wanton killing have driven them to the few remaining areas of relative wilderness. The rugged canyon country of southeastern Utah still harbors some of the most prized game animals in North America. Quickened interest of sportsmen and conservationists has resulted in efforts to expand their numbers in the southeastern Utah area (see the June 1968 issue of Utah Science) and reintroduce them to their former habitat in the Wasatch Mountains. The efforts of Utah Fish and Game Personnel to stock the bighorns in the mountains near Brigham City, Utah are briefly described in this issue of Utah Science.
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Bloat on dry alfalfa hay and legume pasture

C. R. ACORD, J. E. BUTCHER, and D. W. THOMAS

Bloat, disorder of sheep, goats, and cattle, is characterized by an abnormal distention of the rumen by gas produced by rumen micro-organisms and impairment of the eructation (belching) mechanism.

Of all diseases effecting these farm animals, bloat is perhaps one of the most perplexing. It is a single manifestation of a condition usually caused by interactions between ruminant physiological peculiarities and certain feed components.

Frothy bloat, caused by feeding alfalfa, creates considerable financial loss to Utah livestockmen each year. It often occurs in the spring and fall on green alfalfa pasture. In certain areas of Utah, however, bloat even occurs when cattle are fed dry alfalfa hay.

WHAT CAUSES BLOAT

Legume plants, high in nitrogen, cause much more bloat than non-legume plants. Bartley & Bassett (1961) from their analyses of alfalfa bloat foams reported that the foaming constituent is primarily proteinaceous. McArthur & Miltimore (1964) have isolated from alfalfa leaves a protein with physical and chemical properties that make it an ideal bloat promoting agent. McClay & Thompson (1955) demonstrated that plants producing bloat have a higher content of saponins than plants with few or no bloat promoting properties. Studies of Bartley & Yadava (1961) found saliva, and more specifically mucin in the saliva, to be an effective antifoaming agent. Van Horn & Bartley (1961) added saliva to incubated frothing rumen contents and found that the additional saliva permitted greater quantities of gas to escape.

The purpose of this study was to determine if: (1) bloat can be controlled in ruminants by feeding poloxalene (an anti-bloat compound) in the block form when cattle are fed alfalfa hay, and (2) bloat can be controlled on pasture by feeding poloxalene in block form or as a top dressing on grain.

ALFALFA HAY STUDY

Four cooperators contributed a total of 346 calves, averaging about 364 pounds each. Each cooperator had experienced bloat problems with their stock. The calves were divided...
The treated calves were offered a salt-molasses block containing 30 grams of poloxalene per 1 pound of block. The control calves received a salt-molasses block without poloxalene. The salt-molasses blocks were placed in the pens at the rate of one block per five head of calves. When the block was approximately 50 percent consumed, another block was added. Weekly consumption records were kept. Cattle were checked daily for severity and incidence of bloat, as well as death. The cattle were adjusted to the respective salt-molasses blocks for a week prior to the test. Severity of bloat was assigned scores according to Johnson et. al. (1958).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Average daily consumption of the respective salt-molasses block by treated and untreated groups is shown on each ranch in table 1. The daily average daily consumption of the untreated groups was .22 pound and .244 pound for the treated group.

The incidence of bloat at each ranch is indicated in table 2. Ten calves in the untreated group bloated (7.2 percent), but only three calves in the treated group bloated (1.9 percent). The difference of bloat between the treated and untreated was 5.4 percent and was significant (P<.05). The test suggests that the poloxalene helped reduce the incidence of bloat in these trials.

### Table 1. Average consumption of salt-molasses block on dry alfalfa hay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rancher</th>
<th>Days on trial</th>
<th>Number cattle</th>
<th>Average daily consumption block/head-lb</th>
<th>Number cattle</th>
<th>Average daily consumption block/head-lb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Untreated group</td>
<td>Treated group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Summary of bloat on dry alfalfa hay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rancher</th>
<th>Number cattle</th>
<th>Bloat incidence</th>
<th>Number cattle</th>
<th>Bloat incidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of calves bloating: 7.2% (Treated group) and 1.9% (Untreated group).

**SUMMER PASTURE STUDY**

During the summer of 1967 a rancher cooperated in a test for bloat control on irrigated pasture. The 6.2 acre pasture was planted with a mixture of 8 pounds orchard grass and 3 pounds Ranger alfalfa.

Sixty calves, both steers and heifers, averaging 475 pounds per animal, were weighed in on the pasture on May 6, 1967. They were divided at random into three lots of 20 each. The three lots were all cartagged and kept separate during the summer. Lot 1 was the control and received a salt-molasses block without poloxalene. Lot 2 received poloxalene in the salt-molasses block. Lot 3 received the poloxalene on .226 pound of rolled barley per animal fed twice daily. The calves receiving the poloxalene top dressing were limited to 1.5 grams of poloxalene premix per 100 pounds body weight per head per day. The calves were weighed every 28 days, for gains, and were checked four or five times daily for bloat.

**RESULTS OF PASTURE TEST**

Average consumption of the salt-molasses block for lots 1 and 2 was .418 pound and .390 pound per head per day, respectively, for the 125 days on pasture.

Bloat incidence on the pasture is shown in tables 3 and 4. All untreated calves (lot 1) bloated once during the 125-day test, two severely. Three calves or 15 percent of those receiving poloxalene in blocks on pasture produced mild bloat (lot 2). There was no bloat of any degree among those fed the top dressing with poloxalene premix (lot 3). Tests were significant (P<.05). When bloat was controlled, alfalfa pasture produced as high an economic return per acre as any other field crop in Utah.

**SUMMARY**

Three hundred forty-six calves, weighing approximately 364 pounds each were fed alfalfa hay, ad libitum, and 1 pound of rolled barley per head per day. Two hundred eight were offered a salt-molasses block containing...
30 grams of poloxalene. Bloat incidence was 1.9 percent. The other 138 calves (controls) were given a salt-molasses block without poloxalene. Bloat incidence was 7.3 percent.

Sixty calves, weighing 475 pounds, were randomly divided into three lots and grazed for 125 days on an alfalfa-orchard grass pasture. Lot 1 received a salt-molasses block without poloxalene; lot 2, a salt-molasses block with 30 grams of poloxalene per 1 pound of block; and lot 3, a poloxalene premix top dressing of 1.5 grams per 100 pounds of body weight with .226 pound of rolled barley twice daily. Lots 1, 2, and 3 had a bloat incidence of 27, 3, and 0, respectively.

Alfalfa forage is of prime importance for livestock, and it often causes bloat in ruminants. If bloat can be controlled, as these tests indicate, then ranchers can realize increased animal units per acre, decreased hazard of livestock losses, increased net return, and can obtain full utilization of alfalfa for pasture.

### Table 3. Results of bloat on irrigated pasture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Untreated group</th>
<th>Treated group (block)</th>
<th>Treated group (top dressing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant (P < .05)

### Table 4. Summary of bloat incidence in 60 beef animals receiving different bloat prevention treatments while on irrigated pastures – 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number calves</th>
<th>Incidence of bloating Number</th>
<th>Incidence of bloating Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untreated*</td>
<td>Treated (medicated block)**</td>
<td>Treated (top dressing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Bloat in two calves was classified as severe. Others experienced moderate to slight cases of bloat.
** Bloat was classified as slight in three calves.

---

**LITERATURE CITED**


Salty popcorn is great. Salty soil is trouble. And Utah has 11 million acres of so-called salt desert land. This amounts to about 21 percent of the state. Most of Utah's salt desert is publicly (government) owned. Which means that all of us have a stake in what happens to it. An element of self-interest thus helped motivate scientists in USU's Ecology Center to try to find out more about the nature of these lands.

One project, led by Dr. Neil West, has centered in Curlew Valley, an area about 20 miles southwest of Snowville, Utah. The saltiness of the soil there is caused primarily by the presence of large quantities (several thousand parts per million) of sodium, potassium and calcium chlorides, sulfates, carbonates, and bicarbonates. The main plants growing in the bot-

Figure 1. Greasewood discourages grazing.
In addition to facing high costs and low profit margins in raising beef calves, farmers and ranchers in some areas of Utah are experiencing increased feed costs and decreased numbers of grazing units on public lands. Others are finding a decreased demand for cash crops, even to the extent of some cash crop factories being discontinued. Confronted with such situations, many are having to look to other alternatives for maintaining a living.

**ALTERNATIVES**

As alternatives they may: (1) sell out and seek other employment; (2) strive to improve their position through greater integration with feeders and retailers; or (3) undertake more efficient use and management of land resources at hand to produce more meat per unit of land and thus offset increased capital and current expenses. The latter alternative focuses attention on the possibility of more efficient use of irrigated pastures as a means of bolstering farm income.

The idea of grazing beef cattle on irrigated pastures is not new. In an Experiment Station Field Day Report given at Pleasant Grove, Utah, in August 1959, Lorin E. Harris *et al.* indicated that from 1,249 to 1,705 pounds of beef gain per acre could be obtained on such pastures in a growing season. They had found that the amount of production depended largely on the treatment of the pasture and management of the cattle.

To produce large gains required pastures with a high legume content, however, which also presented serious bloat problems. For example, in 1966 eight head of cattle were lost in 2 days on a 6.2-acre test pasture in the Palmyra area of Utah County. The pasture had been seeded at 8 pounds orchard grass and 3 pounds alfalfa per acre. In 1967 a study was begun on this pasture to investigate the bloat problem and pasture production. How the bloat problem was corrected by treating with poloxalene is discussed in another circle, “Bloat on Dry Alfalfa Hays and Legume Pasture”, in this issue of *Utah Science*. The present article aims to show the kinds of gains and returns one might expect from beef cattle grazing properly managed irrigated pastures.

**GAIN STUDY**

The 6.2-acre Palmyra pasture was designated as pasture A. It was treated with 66 pounds of available nitrogen in 1967 and irrigations were scheduled every 14 to 21 days depending on when water was available. On May 6, 60 steers and heifers, weighing an average of 475 pounds, were put on the pasture. It was divided into three sections with 20 head of cattle per section. Each section was then subdivided to provide intensive grazing. The cattle stayed on a subsection no longer than 5 or 6 days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grazing period</th>
<th>5/6-6/17</th>
<th>6/18-7/14</th>
<th>7/15-8/14</th>
<th>8/15-9/9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days in period</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg wt/animal (lbs)</td>
<td>555.2</td>
<td>587.8</td>
<td>612.8</td>
<td>640.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg gain/animal (lbs)</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Daily gain/animals (lbs)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Avg initial weight — 475 pounds)

CLAIR R. ACORD is Extension Livestock Specialist.
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Each subsection was allowed to rest for 25 to 30 days before regrazing.

Gains were checked every month until the study was concluded on September 8. The results are shown in table 1. During the 123 days that the 60 steers and heifers were on the 6.2-acre pasture, they gained a total of 9,915 pounds or 1,599 pounds of beef per acre. If we estimate the value of beef produced at $25 cwt, each acre of pasture grossed a return of $399.75. Significantly, the 9.8 steers per acre were grazed for the 123-day period with no loss from bloat. The cattle treated with poloxalene did not bloat.

**IMPLANTATION GAINS**

In 1968 the pasture study, employing similar rotation and irrigation practices, was expanded to test the added advantage of diethylstilbestrol implants. The steers and heifers were also pastured separately. Thirty-four steers, averaging 380 pounds, grazed a 7-acre pasture in Heber Valley, Wasatch County. This 7-acre piece was designated pasture B. It contained a mixture of grasses seeded at 10 to 11 pounds per acre and alfalfa at 3 pounds. Sixty-nine heifers, averaging 520 pounds, grazed pasture A which had been expanded to 8.7 acres.

One third each of the steers and heifers on these improved pastures received different treatments: control, 15 mg, and 30 mg. The steers received the implants June 27 at the beginning of the study and the effects were checked at intervals during the 123-day grazing period. The heifers were implanted on July 17 and had the benefits of the implants for a 76-day period.

The over-all gains obtained may be seen in tables 2 and 3. The steers gained an average of 287.5 pounds or a total of 9,775 pounds in 123 days. That amounts to a production of 1,369 pounds of beef or $342.25 gross per acre (at $25 cwt). The heifers gained an average of 219 pounds of 15,111 pounds total in 151 days of grazing, making 1,736 pounds of beef or a gross return of $434 per acre for the season. It should be noted, however, that during the test period these heifers also were fed daily 2 pounds of rolled barley with poloxalene at 1.5 grams per 100 pounds of body weight to control bloat.

Data indicating advantages of the implants are shown in tables 4 and 5. Note that the 15 mg and 30 mg implants increased the daily gains of the steers over the controls by 10.6 and 21.8 percent respectively. This treat-

| Table 2. Average gains of 24 beef steers on 7-acre irrigated pasture at Palmyra, Utah County, during summer 1968*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Grazing period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/27-7/12</td>
<td>7/13-8/25</td>
<td>8/26-9/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days in period</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg wt/steer (lbs)</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>575.9</td>
<td>667.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg wt gain/steer (lbs)</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg daily gain/steer (lbs)</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Avg initial weight — 480 pounds)

| Table 3. Average gains of 69 heifers on 8.7-acre irrigated pasture at Palmyra, Utah County, during summer 1968*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Grazing period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/3-7/17</td>
<td>7/18-10/2</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days in period</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg weight/heifer (lbs)</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg gain/heifer (lbs)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg daily gain/heifer (lbs)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Avg initial weight — 530 pounds)

| Table 4. Average increases in gains and dollar value for 123-day period from use of Stilbesterol implants on 34 steers grazing 7-acre irrigated pasture at Heber Valley, Wasatch County, Utah during summer 1968
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15mg</td>
<td>30mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg lbs gained/steer</td>
<td>253.2</td>
<td>290.5</td>
<td>315.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg daily gain</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent daily gain increase over control</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg gain over control/steer (lbs)</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar value over control (425¢/lb/steer)</td>
<td>$9.33</td>
<td>$15.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of stilbesterol on avg daily gain (lbs)</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The author acknowledges and expresses thanks to Paul Daniels, County Agent; Marion Sorenson and Lloyd Lawton for their help in furnishing cattle, pastures and weighing of cattle; to Dr. D. W. Thomas for arranging for stilbesterol implants; and Hess & Clark, Ashland, Ohio, for furnishing the stilbesterol implants.
ment produced 37.3 and 63.3 more pounds of beef per animal respectively, or cash returns above the control group of $9.33 and $15.33 per animal (at 25 cents a pound), respectively.

Because of the shorter implant period, the treated heifers did not increase so much in dollar value as the steers. However, they did show a notable increase in gains and dollar value resulting from the implants.

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Table 6 summarizes the beef production obtained during 1967 and 1968 on two different improved irrigated pastures under intensive rotation grazing. The emphasis was on the total pounds of beef produced per acre and the gross return per acre from the pastures. Although differences in areas, years, grazing periods and grazing intensities preclude meaningful comparisons between the pastures, we concluded that properly managed improved irrigated pastures can bring a gross return of $350 to $400 per acre in beef production. To obtain such returns, the pastures should be: (1) grazed in rotation; (2) grazed intensely for 4 or 5 days; (3) allowed to grow for 25 to 30 days before grazing again; and (4) irrigated according to plant needs—usually every 14 to 21 days.

To obtain high beef production from irrigated pastures containing high levels of alfalfa, stilbesterol implants are economically feasible and bloat prevention treatment is essential. In addition, we recommend: (1) winter the cattle to hold gains at not more than 1 pound per day before going on the pasture; (2) have them weigh approximately 450 to 550 pounds when they are turned onto the pasture in the spring; and (3) treat them for flies periodically during the grazing season. The increased efficiency gained from the recommended practices makes beef production on irrigated pastures a profitable, income-enhancing alternative for farmers and ranchers.

---

**Table 5. Average increase in gains and dollar value for 76-day period from use of Stilbesterol implants on 69 heifers grazing on 8.7-acre irrigated pasture at Palmyra, Utah County, during summer 1968.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>15 mg</th>
<th>30 mg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg initial weight (lbs)</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg gain/heifer (lbs)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg daily gain/heifer (lbs)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent daily gain increase over control</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg gain over control/heifer (lbs)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar value over control @ 25¢/lb/heifer</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of stilbesterol on avg daily gain (lbs)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6. Summary of pasture production study.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pasture</th>
<th>1967</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number cattle</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total acreage</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grazing days</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg initial wt</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg final wt</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>667.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg total gain/animal</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>287.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg daily gain/animal</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lbs beef</td>
<td>9,915</td>
<td>15,111</td>
<td>9,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lbs beef/acre</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>1,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross return/acre @ 25¢ lb</td>
<td>$399.75</td>
<td>$434.00</td>
<td>$342.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOIL CEMENT LININGS FOR CANALS

C. W. LAURITZEN

Soil-cement has possibilities in some sandy-soil areas for lining canals and reservoirs. To determine the adaptability of soil-cement for canal lining, a series of laboratory and field tests were undertaken.¹ The Eden Project in the vicinity of Farson, Wyoming was selected for the field tests, because the soils in that area are generally sandy and canals there have heavy seepage losses. This seepage has contributed to high groundwater tables and salinity conditions. Furthermore, the absence of good concrete aggregate and the marginal character of the agriculture in the area limited the expenditure justified to control seepage. The lack of suitable aggregate also influenced the type of lining economically feasible.

FIELD STUDIES

The ditch selected for the field installations paralleled the west side lateral and served as the supply ditch on one of the development farms. The field tests were designed primarily for the evaluation of standard soil-cement linings, but plans included some plastic soil-cement; and, as the work progressed, some sand concrete linings were placed.

The standard tests required for the design of soil-cement were not made, but the short-cut method² indicated that satisfactory soil-cement could be obtained by using 7 percent cement

¹ These tests were conducted in cooperation with the Portland Cement Association and Region 4 of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. Mr. M. L. Burgener and Mr. L. Norling were present and assisted with the field installations.


C. W. LAURITZEN is a soil scientist for the Southwest Branch, Soil and Water Conservation Research Division, Agricultural Research Service, stationed in Logan.

Figure 1. Windrow proportioner which formed windrow prior to lining ditch.

Figure 2. Cement bags spotted on windrow at proper spacing before being spread.
by volume. Exposed installations generally require additional cement; so the minimum figure was arbitrarily increased to 9 percent. Because of the high sulphate content of the Eden soils, Type 5 cement was used.

The soil was bladed into a windrow on the berm of the ditch with a grader patrol. The size of the windrow was properly adjusted with a windrow proportioner (figure 1) which provided the quantity of soil required per foot of ditch lining. Then bags of cement were spotted at the calculated spacing on the windrow to provide the amount of cement specified in the mix design (figure 2). The bags were then opened, and the cement was spread uniformly on the windrow. The soil and cement were mixed with a modified Wood Roadmixer (figure 3).

Just before the lining was placed, the ditch subgrade was dampened by sprinkling with water. The soil and cement were picked up from the windrow by the mixer as it moved forward. Water was added as a spray to the mix in the pugmill to raise the moisture content of the mix to that required for optimum compaction as determined by the Proctor Method, and the mix was placed as a lining in the ditch in one continuous operation (figures 4 and 5). Shortly after the mix was in place, it was compacted with a Jackson plate vibrator, (figure

---

Figure 3. Wood Roadmixer assembly and spreader box mixing and placing soil-cement.

Figure 4. Perspective view of mixing equipment used in soil-cement ditch lining tests.

---

1 Water tanks
2 Main power unit
3 Hand winch for positioning conveyor belt
4 Pugmill mixer
5 Generator supplying power to motor operating conveyor belt
6 Windrowed lining material
7 Conveyor belt
8 Spreader box

---

ASTM D558
Three passes with this vibrator were made on each section of ditch. After compaction, the soil-cement lining was sprayed with a white pigmented concrete curing compound.

Cores were taken after the lining had cured to determine the quality of the lining structure. These cores were 2 inches in diameter and taken with a core bit powered with an electric drill. One core was taken in the bottom and one on each side in the middle of the slope of each ponded ditch reach. Sampling was limited to reaches that appeared to represent the best quality soil-cement for each given treatment. In addition to bulk density measurement, the cores were analyzed for the actual cement percentage according to ASTM method D806.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Difficulty was experienced in coordinating the multiple operation of mixing, placing, and compacting the soil-cement linings. In most cases, the percentage of cement was less than the plan design. This is especially true of 9 and 12-percent cement mixes where the actual cement content for the two 9-percent sections was 5.3 and 5.8 and the 12-percent was 6.5 percent.

The actual cement content as determined from the analyses of core samples and the bulk density are given in table 1. Although the number of samples taken were not sufficient to fully determine the average compaction, the results indicate that the field density approached the laboratory density of 125 pounds per cubic foot.

It was intended to investigate plastic soil-cement. This differs from the standard soil-cement in that the mix has a higher moisture content giving it the consistency of mortar. This plan was abandoned because of the difficulty encountered with the mix sticking to the conveyor belt. To determine if aggregate with a lower percentage of fines would present less of a problem, three concrete mixes using a sandy aggregate with 4.5, 5.5, and 7.0 bags of portland cement per cubic yard respectively were substituted. It was intended to place the mixture at about a 2-inch slump, but the nozzle capacities in the pugmill were not regulated to supply enough water, and the resulting mix had a slump of about 1 inch. DAREX, an air-entraining agent, was added to the mixing water to increase the workability of the concrete and its resistance to frost action. After the mix was placed, the reach was sprayed with asphalt emulsion as a curing compound.

Like plastic soil-cement, concrete did not lend itself to placement with the equipment assembled. The concrete mixes were too dry, and the resulting lining had an open porous structure with a bulk density of about 125 pounds per cubic foot, compared to 150 pounds per cubic foot for good concrete. Seepage through the concrete-lined reaches, table 2, was about as much as from the unlined reaches. The porous nature of the linings could have been corrected if some method of compaction had been used following placement. Although too dry for slipformed concrete, the mixes were too wet for compaction with the vibrator used on the standard soil-cement linings.

The condition of the standard soil-cement linings on September 24, 1967—11 years after installation—is indicated in figure 7 and figure 8.
Table 1. Cement content and bulk density of concrete and soil-cement linings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station sampled</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Designed cement %</th>
<th>Actual cement by wt %</th>
<th>Cement by vol %</th>
<th>Bulk density lbs/cu ft 1958</th>
<th>Notes at time lining sampled for bulk density measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 + 85</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Good, hard, no crumbling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 + 50</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Good, not too hard, no crumbling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + 00</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Good, hard, no crumbling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + 50</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>s/c plastic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Very hard, dense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + 85</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>s/c</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Good, hard, no crumbling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 + 40</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>s/c</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Good, fairly hard, crumbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 + 50</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>s/c</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Good, hard, no crumbling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 + 50</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>s/c</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Fair, not too hard, very easily crumbled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 + 50</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>s/c</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Good, hard, no crumbling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 + 50</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>s/c</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Good, very hard, no crumbling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 + 50</td>
<td>bottom side</td>
<td>s/c</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Good, hard, does not crumble</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| previously noted, the cement content determined by analysis deviated widely in some instances from the designed quantity. Also, in many instances, construction difficulties involving control and compaction were encountered. Where the actual cement content equaled or bettered the designed value, and satisfactory compaction and curing were achieved, the resultant lining remained in reasonably good condition after 11 years of service. An example is one section in which one-half had a cement content of 9 percent and the other half about 14 percent. Notes at the time the lining was constructed indicate that the operation was well controlled and that good quality soil-cement should result.

It would appear, therefore, that construction of quality standard soil-cement linings with the equipment used is possible. It is doubtful, however, that the method is practical, in view of the control required and the

Table 2. Seepage rates for soil-cement and concrete linings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pond no.</th>
<th>Lining type</th>
<th>Ponded reach</th>
<th>Seepage ft³/ft²/24 hr</th>
<th>Cement content by wt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>l/c</td>
<td>0 + 69 - 1 + 09</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>l/c</td>
<td>1 + 09 - 1 + 61</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>l/c</td>
<td>1 + 61 - 2 + 23</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>s/c†</td>
<td>2 + 68 - 3 + 13</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>s/c</td>
<td>3 + 30 - 4 + 10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>s/c</td>
<td>4 + 30 - 4 + 98</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>s/c</td>
<td>5 + 53 - 6 + 22</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>s/c†</td>
<td>7 + 05 - 7 + 64</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† s/c Standard soil cement
† l/c Low slump concrete
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number of operations that must be coordinated, unless long reaches of canal are to be lined.

The condition of the sand-concrete linings is shown in figures 8 to 10. These, it will be noted, show less sign of degradation and are in better condition than the standard soil-cement linings.

Only a very short reach of the canal, as mentioned, was lined with plastic soil-cement, and it was finished in part by hand troweling. In appearance it was similar to slipformed concrete. The structure was hard and showed little degradation due to weathering, indicating that plastic soil-cement, batched and mixed similar to concrete and placed with the conventional concrete slipform, should be considered in sites such as the Eden area. The shortness of lined section did not permit a seepage-loss measurement, however.

Seepage measurement of the soil-cement linings were taken in 1957 and again in 1958. Ponds were constructed by installing plastic dams at the ends of each reach in which seepage was to be measured; then, the ditch between the dams was filled with water pumped from the canal. The seepage rate was calculated by the drop in the water-surface. The seepage rate of the linings is given in table 2.

It will be noted in table 2 that the seepage was greater in 1958 than in 1957 in all but two reaches. In this interval, transverse cracks had developed on 4- to 5-foot centers in the linings which probably accounts—in part at least—for the larger seepage rate in 1958.

The rate of seepage through the standard soil-cement was less than through the low-slump concrete linings but higher than considered allowable for lined ditches—1 to 1/4 cubic feet per day per square foot. The losses from reaches in which the soil-cement was rated better were not always lower than for reaches that were in a more advanced state of deterioration when inspected in 1967.

In field ditches in this area, ditch stability is the chief function and justification for a lining. Seepage losses, associated with intermittent use, seldom justify lining field ditches on the basis of the value of the water saved in this or other areas. Ditch stability may be all that should be sought. If this is assumed, soil-cement—even that of poor quality—has been reasonably effective for a period of over 10 years.

PROTECT your WATER, SOIL, and AIR—our basic natural resources—from accidental contamination by pesticides or other chemicals on the farm, in the forest, or in the city.

Figure 7. Condition of standard soil-cement lining with cement content of 5.2 percent on September 24, 1967—11 years after installation.

Figure 8. Condition of standard soil-cement lining with cement content of 14 percent on September 24, 1967—11 years after installation.
BIGHORNS ALONG THE WASATCH

LOIS M. COX

About 130 years ago, mountain sheep were abundant all along the Wasatch. In his "Journal of a Trapper", Osbourne Russell often refers to seeing "thousands of mountain sheep". On one occasion, while hunting south of the Salt Lake, he killed 4 of a band of 100 rams. Another time he describes "sheep rock" (Soda Point, Idaho) as being frequented by mountain sheep all year.

The situation changed quickly, however, as white settlers followed the trail-blazing trappers such as Russell. The mountain sheep, along with much of the other wildlife, were killed or they moved to less accessible areas. Some of the sheep persisted in Utah in the Uinta Mountains, but they disappeared along the Wasatch.

The "never-satisfied" nature of man, though, made it inevitable that someday, someone would want to reintroduce mountain sheep to their former home grounds. Wildlife managers and researchers, whether on a university campus or with state or federal agencies, are especially susceptible to that kind of day dreaming.

In 1960, with personnel of the Utah Division of Fish and Game taking the lead, the hope finally began to move toward reality. Letters were written and contacts made with likely sources of bighorn sheep. By 1965, possible areas around Wellsville and Brigham City were being evaluated for paddock construction in anticipation of taking delivery on bighorns from Wyoming and Canada.

The first 80-acre holding pen was built on Wasatch Mountain just above the Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City. This was one of the locations where Osborne had seen numerous sheep between 1834 and 1843. The Wyoming bighorns (5 rams, 9 ewes) were being shipped to Utah from around Dubois, Wyoming and arrived on March 8, 1966. The Canadian shipment (6 rams, 14 ewes) from Waterton Lakes National Park was delivered during April. The first bighorn lamb known to be born along the Wasatch since pioneer days, arrived in May 1966.

Before the end of 1968, the mountain sheep had provided Utah's Fish and Game personnel with several interesting (and frustrating) adventures. Winter weather had taken annual tolls of fences — and rebuilding fence in mid-winter is quite a chore. Many of the bighorns that escaped the paddocks were never captured. Several lambs had been born to ewes remaining inside the fences, and a few had been glimpsed outside the fenced areas.

Overall, it looks as if the Wasatch Mountains are "home" once again for the Rocky Mountain Bighorn.

Figure 1. The bighorns arrived in Utah via truck, and were eager to get back to self-locomotion. They quickly adjusted to their new location. In their first year in Utah, the ewes produced nine lambs. The total population, in the paddock above the Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City and roaming free, is estimated to be about 44-50 despite several deaths among the original Wyoming and Canadian groups.

Figure 2. During their first winter in Utah some of the bighorns left the paddock when winds and drifting snow breached the fence. Two of them provided considerable excitement around Perry when they were chased across the highway by dogs, finally finding refuge on a barn roof. When the dogs were controlled, the sheep had to be literally hauled from the roof. They then promptly took off again and are presumed among those still running free in the mountains.
Louse-like keds cause sheepskin defects

The wingless parasitic fly known as the sheep tick, or ked, is a more costly pest than has been realized.

Sheep raisers have known that the louse-like fly (Melophagus ovinus) irritates animals and causes biting and scratching that damages fleeces. Recently, two Agricultural Research Service scientists found that ked bites also make the raised, pimple-like blemishes in sheepskin called cockle.

Cockle costs the leather and allied industries millions of dollars a year. The defects are of varying size and elevation and impair both the grain and flesh sides of the skin. They cannot be completely flattened out or covered with dyes and stains.

Now that the cause-effect relationship of keds and cockle is known, treating sheep to eradicate the flies becomes even more important.

Dipping in vats containing toxaphene, lindane, or rotenone, or dusting with dieldrin are among the most satisfactory of the many approved treatments for ked control. One treatment a year usually provides good control and is most effectively and economically administered shortly after shearing the ewes. If the ewes are shorn after lambing in the spring, special attention should be given to treating the lambs as well as the ewes. In preparing and using insecticides for this purpose, the directions furnished by the manufacturer should be closely followed.

The relationship between keds and cockle was established by two cooperating Agricultural Research Service scientists working nearly 2,000 miles apart: Microscopist A. L. Everett of the Eastern Utilization Research Laboratory in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and I. H. Roberts, veterinarian in charge of the Agricultural Research Service Animal Parasite Station in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Everett, who observed keds in many of the woolskins he examined for cockle, and Roberts, who was thoroughly familiar with this sheep parasite, inferred that the insect might be causing the skin blemishes.

The two men planned an experiment to test their theory, employing Roberts’ facilities for work with live sheep. Roberts worked with a flock of about 150 sheep that had been protected since birth from external parasites. He deliberately infested half of them with keds, keeping the rest in isolation. At regular intervals he selected animals for slaughter and shipped the skins to Everett for analysis.

Extensive cockle in all skins of the infested sheep and virtual absence of the defect in the skins of the animals protected from keds proved conclusively that the insect is responsible.

In later phases of the test, Roberts showed that sheep can spontaneously recover from ked bites. When animals were protected from further bites, either by shedding or by immersing in an insecticide bath, the lesions receded. (Reprinted from Agricultural Research, USDA, February 1969)

WILDLIFE NOTES

Trumpeter swans are the largest American birds in terms of weight, males sometimes reaching 30 pounds.

A single egg mass from a female Gypsy moth contains from 100 to 1,000 eggs.

Like eagles, ospreys use the same nests year after year, rebuilding them to the extent that some weigh up to 1,000 pounds.

The flight musculature of the tiny hummingbird is the strongest of any bird—one-third its weight.

When the jack rabbit shifts into high gear, it can travel at speeds up to 45 mph, and make 20-foot jumps.

The only hoofed animal having its origin in North America is the pronghorn antelope.

A worker bee can lift 24 times its weight, a horse only half its weight.

A ground mole will die in approximately 1 day if deprived of its food.

Antelope fawns are capable of running up to 25 miles an hour for short distances when only 1 or 2 days old.
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UTAH SCIENCE
**NEW PUBLICATIONS**

**Bulletin 475** — Effect of Supplementation on intake and digestibility of range forage, by C. Wayne Cook and Lorin E. Harris

**Bulletin 476** — Rising water values that result from increased mobility, by B. Delworth Gardner and Herbert H. Fullerton.

**Bulletin 477** — Predicting use of recreation sites, by A. Allen Dyer and R. S. Whaley

**Bulletin 478** — Probabilistic approach to estimating demand for outdoor recreation, by E. Boyd Wennergren and Darwin B. Nielsen

**Bulletin 480** — Regional research in nematode parasites of ruminants in the Western United States — a 10-year study, by Datus M. Hammond and David E. Worley

**Circular 150** — Symptomatic treatment of brisket disease, by Joseph T. Blake

**Circular 151** — Occurrence and distribution of brisket disease in Utah, by Joseph T. Blake

**Utah Resources Series 45** — An inventory of hydrologic information on the Sevier River Basin, by Ben L. Grover

**Utah Resources Series 46** — Utah: a potential pulp producer, by Thomas Meyer and R. S. Whaley

**Utah Resources Series 47** — A statistical view of Utah's agriculture, by Rondo A. Christensen and Stuart H. Richards

**Monograph Series 505** — Ecology and management of salt desert shrub ranges: a bibliography, by Neil E. West

**Monograph Series 506** — Farmington, Utah, potato varietal trials 1966-1967, by Golden L. Stoker

**Regional Bulletins** — These are published by other Experiment Stations. Copies may be obtained from the publishing stations or from the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station, Logan, Utah 84321

**Bulletin 769** — Nutritional status U.S.A. published by California Agricultural Experiment Station

**Bulletin 836** — Economic structure of cattle slaughtering in the Western United States published by the California Agricultural Experiment Station

**Bulletin 607** — Pattern of plant development in the Western United States published by the Montana Agricultural Experiment Station

**Technical Bulletin 73** — Beef cattle breeding research in the western region published by Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station

**Technical Bulletin 100** — Environmental and other factors in the response of plants to herbicides published by the Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station


**Yearbook, agricultural 27:137**

---

**PROTECT your HOME and GARDEN where 15 percent of all pesticides purchased are used to help preserve a healthy, attractive, productive environment for work and play.**