L 6.79

67/14
C

Granchek

COPY

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Washington

January 23, 1943

Mr. Charles F. Ernst
Project Director
Central Utah Relocation Center
Topaz, Utah

Dear Mr. Ernst:

This is in reply to your letter of January 8 relative to the growing of vegetable plants at Gila for use at Central Utah.

We have received a letter from Mr. Bennett, Project Director at Gila, stating that they are not now in position to produce these plants for use at Central Utah and feel that it would be impossible to make such arrangements, at least for this year.

We do not know what, if any, other plans you had in mind for the supplying of your needs for planting stock or what contacts you have made relative to this matter. If you have not already done so, I would suggest that you contact the state college of agriculture and the state experiment station and obtain their recommendation relative to the best method of supplying yourself with such planting stock as you will need. It might also be well to get the experience of several of the larger commercial vegetable growers in that section of Utah.

We have given this matter a great deal of consideration and have discussed it with some of the folks in the Bureau of Plant Industry. While we feel that the recommendations of the state college and experiment station will probably be more valuable than any suggestions we might make, we are offering the following for your consideration:

It is our opinion that it would be unwise for WRA to put in green house equipment on the several relocation areas for the production of planting stock. Even though it was possible to obtain priorities and purchase equipment needed the cost would be exorbitant, especially if we would utilize these facilities for only a short period of time. It is suggested that by the use of hot beds and cold frames each project should be able to produce the majority of the planting stock which it will need.

Doubtless you have among the evacuees in your center the number of persons who have had experience in the growing of vegetable plants. They could be of considerable help if they

were put in charge of this work. It is our opinion that it would be desirable to plant a small acreage of some of the vegetables as early in the spring as possible even though we would gamble on their being frosted. For these early plants and probably for some of our main season crops it is our suggestion that it might be well to obtain plants from some of the commercial plant growers. I am sure that the folks at the college of agriculture or some of the commercial growers in the state can give you the names of reliable plant growers who have been supplying planting stock in that section of the state.

If we can assist you further in this regard, please let us know.

Sincerely,

/s/ E.J. Utz, Chief
Agricultural and Engineering
Division

cc: J.H. Smart

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Amache, Colorado

In reply, please refer to:

WW:WRB:mi

February 6, 1943

MEMORANDUM

To: James G. Lindley
Project Director

From: Warren R. Bennison
Chief, Agriculture & Industry

Subject: Conference with E. J. Utz,
Chief of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

On February 2, 3, and 4, Mr. E. J. Uz was on the Project for a full discussion of future agricultural activities. As a basis for the 1943 farm program the following acreage will be utilized:

Commercial vegetables		500 acres
Alfalfa		500 "
Grain and feed		1200 "
	Total	2200 Acres
Pasture		1600 "
	Grand Total	3800 "

With the average production this acreage should furnish substantially enough vegetable and meat products for this Project. The 500 acres of vegetables are broken down in the attached list.

The 500 acres of alfalfa is well established now on the land to be used. The alfalfa and vegetable crops will be grown on the land south of the Santa Fe Railroad on the Koen Ranch which has approximately 1275 acres of crop land and 400 acres of non-crop land. The 1200 acres of grain and feed will be grown on the east end of the X-Y Ranch and on the land south of the Santa Fe Railroad on the Koen Ranch.

Attached is a small-scale tracing of the area to be farmed south of the Santa Fe right of way on the Koen Ranch. These acreages have been determined with the view of raising enough feed to finish enough beef, pork, and poultry to meet the future needs of this Center.

Water rights to irrigation water and necessary construction on the irrigation system was discussed with Mr. Utz, Mr. Horn, and Mr. Wroth,

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Washington

February 13, 1943

Mr. Charles F. Ernst
Project Director
Central Utah Relocation Center
Topaz, Utah

Attention: Mr. Bell

Dear Mr. Ernst:

Mr. Hughes' letter of January 23, relative to the vegetable production program which was submitted with our letter of January 6, arrived at our office today. Evidently it was delayed somewhere enroute.

I note from this letter that you were pointing out that we had suggested a considerably larger acreage of dry beans than you had contemplated. This acerage of beans was based on the assumption that we should have approximately 15 pounds of dry beans per person which, based upon an estimated population of 7,500 people and an estimated production of 1,000 pounds per acre, would require 112 acres. It was not planned that you would produce beans for shipment to other centers. As you know, it is the policy of the War Relocation Authority to produce as large a percentage as possible of the food needs. It may be that 15 pounds of dry beans per person is larger than is required. That, of course, would depend to a considerable extent upon the amount of rice, hominy, corn meal, and such other food commodities as were used in the diet. Nutrition specialists of the Department of Agriculture recommend from 7 to 25 pounds of dry legumes and nuts per person. That was largely the basis for our calculation of 15 pounds per person. Your proposal of 20 acres at an estimated production of 1,000 pounds per acre would provide only about 2½ pounds per person. We prefer to leave the decision relative to the amount planted for subsistence purposes on the area largely to your judgment, but feel that where beans can be grown to advantage we should produce all the beans which we feel we will need for subsistence purposes.

Since you make no comments relative to the acreage of other crops which were submitted in our suggested schedule, I am wondering whether we are to assume that you approve the schedule, other

than the beans, and are working toward the production called for in that schedule.

The schedule which we sent you made no suggestion relative to the acreage of feed crops which should be grown. We recognize that the acreage of feed crops would be dependent upon the amount of livestock which is kept which, in turn, would be affected by our ability to obtain equipment, construct buildings, etc. This, in turn, will depend on whether or not we can obtain approval from the War Production Board for our proposed construction program. We are hopeful, however, that we can obtain approval for such construction. We would, therefore, like for you to inform us of the acreage of feed crops which you are now planning on producing on the area. This is very desirable since it frequently happens that the War Production Board, or others, in trying to evaluate the validity of our requests for farm machinery, ask us for specific acreages of the several crops which are to be produced on the area.

The schedule which we sent you included the proposed in-shipments of vegetables produced at other areas. This, as you will notice, gives total in-shipments for the periods mentioned. These amounts were not broken down by months. In view of your proposed production program for 1943, we would like for you to submit to us, not later than March 1, your estimate by months of the kinds and amounts of vegetables which you would like to receive during the fiscal year 1944. The preparation of such a schedule would require the collaboration of your agricultural staff and your project steward. Such a report is necessary in order that we may arrange for the production of these kinds and amounts of vegetables on other areas. An Administrative Instruction is now in the process of preparation which calls for such a report. You should receive this Administrative Instruction within the next week. We are, however, giving you this in advance so that you can prepare this report in the meantime.

Very truly yours,

E. H. Reed, Acting Chief
Agricultural and Engineering Division

COPY

C
O
P
Y

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY
WASHINGTON

June 21, 1943

AIR MAIL

J. G. Lindley, Project Director
Granada Relocation Center
Amache, Colorado

Dear Mr. Lindley:

We have your teletype of June 18 relative to the purchase of Mexican cattle. We have given considerable thought to the advisability of the purchase of additional cattle at this time. This is based first upon your local conditions and second, upon the price situation. You will recall that some time ago members of your agricultural staff were very strongly of the opinion based upon information obtained from local cattle men that cattle could not be profitably grazed on river-bottom land during the summer time due to flies and mosquitoes. Since that time, you have purchased 217 head of cattle. While we believe that it was probably desirable to purchase these cattle, we believe it might be well to obtain further experience in grazing cattle on this land during the summer months before additional purchases were made.

We are questioning whether now is the desirable time to purchase feeder cattle from the price standpoint. The price of feeder cattle has been exceptionally high during the past few months, due to a large extent to the bullish attitude of the cattle feeders, coupled with the relatively small supply of feeder cattle, resulting from many cattle which would normally be fed going direct to slaughter rather than to feed lots. The roll back of beef prices which is supposed to go into effect today may cause some decrease in prices of finished cattle which would in turn be reflected in the feeder cattle prices. Furthermore, there is a rather serious drouth in some parts of the Southwest and it may be that larger than usual numbers of feeder cattle will be sent to market during the next few months.

Taking all of these things into consideration, we are questioning the advisability of the purchase of additional cattle at this time. We have discussed this with marketing specialists of the Department of Agriculture who concur with us in this regard. Understand, we are not saying that additional cattle should not be purchase at this time, but are suggesting that this be given thorough consideration before such purchases are made.

Now in regard to the purchase of Mexican cattle, the present ruling is that the purchase of cattle originating in Mexico must comply with the "Buy-American Act." The Procurement Section, however, is asking the Comptroller General for a ruling as to whether the "Buy-American Act" applies to live cattle. It will probably be at least two weeks or more before we obtain a ruling on this. The following is a citation to the "Buy-American Act" and the Comptroller General's ruling in this regard: 41 U.S.C., Section 10-A, and 14 Comp. Gen. 381 at 383.

If after further consideration you feel that it is advisable to purchase additional cattle at the present time, you should submit information necessary for the formulation of a justification statement to be signed by the Director justifying the purchase of Mexican cattle.

You will notice from studying the above references the justification must be based on availability, price and public interest.

In your teletype you also raised a question about the purchase of cattle on the Denver market. I assume that you refer to the purchase of native cattle on the Denver market. We can see no particular reason why you should hesitate to buy cattle on this market, providing the supply was fairly liberal and the price which you paid was not out of line with the prices being paid by other purchasers of feeder cattle. We can see where there might be considerable reaction if you purchased a large number of cattle at one time, thereby seriously interferring with supplies available to other feeders.

Sincerely,

/s/ E. J. Utz

E. J. Utz, Chief
Agricultural and Engineering
Division

C
O
P
Y

MEMORANDUM

June 30, 1943

TO: Mr. James G. Lindley

FROM: John A. Rademaker

RE: Farm Program

Mr. Spencer's suggestion that only those blocks which provided a stated minimum of workers for the project farm shall be furnished with vegetables from the farm has reached my attention. The justice of such an arrangement is obvious, at least if each block has manpower sufficient to meet the required minimum, and if it does not cause some workers to drop out where the block is unable to muster the required number. However, the success of this plan in actually getting workers out on the farm depends largely upon how it is broached to the community. If Mr. Spencer appears before the Community Council, presents the need for workers and asks for suggestions to meet the problem, making it plain that the solution is the responsibility of the community and not of the administration, someone is bound to put forward some such suggestion in the ensuing discussion. If some councilman does not suggest it, Mr. Spencer should ask whether the Council might be able to use this idea to distribute the burden equitably and to see that the work gets done, and invite the Council to take the necessary steps to formulate and carry out such aplan.

Such an appeal, carried to the block managers also, will have much more likelihood of getting people out than will an order from the top directing each block to supply a given amount of enforced labor. If the community governing body initiates and directs such a policy, the community will cooperate, particularly where excellent leadership such as that of Mr. Spencer has already been made evident. I have listened to eloquent and effective appeals by block managers, block leaders, and councilmen, to which they were inspired by the example set by Mr. Spencer: "If Mr. Spencer really thinks the situation is so bad that he will himself jump on a tractor and drag the wheels around, the least we can do is to cooperate and do all we can to get the work done." Several of the persons who had volunteered for farm work cited this example to me as the reasons for their volunteering.

On the other hand, if it appears to the evacuees that they are being shoved around again, they will "fail to cooperate" once

more, not because the program is not sound, but because the method of appraoch is unsound. I take it that our objective is to get workers out on the farm, and respectfully suggest that some such democractic approach be used.

/s/ John A. Rademaker
John A. Rademaker
Community Analyst

MEMORANDUM

(6) Xtra

July 2, 1943

TO: Mr. James G. Lindley
FROM: John A. Rademaker
RE: Farm Program

The suggestion of the evacuee farm leaders that only those blocks which provide a stated minimum of workers for the project farm shall be furnished with produce from the farm has reached my attention. Since evacuee attitudes are critically concerned, I conferred with Mr. Spencer, and with several leading evacuees who hold positions of responsibility and authority. Upon the request of Mr. Spencer and the suggestion of the other persons with whom I conferred, I am submitting my observations and findings, and a few suggestions which I hope will prove helpful.

(1) The success of any plan in actually getting people out on the farm will depend upon (a) its intrinsic qualities, and (b) how it is presented to the community. However good it may be, much will depend upon how it is presented. This is partly due to the fact that anyone who has had an active share in making any plan will be more energetic and enthusiastic in carrying it out, and partly a result of the habitual ways of thinking and acting of the Japanese Americans. After sounding out the ground rather carefully, I must report that an order from the top incorporating the plan mentioned above will not meet with much success. If one the other hand, the community governing body is called into action and given authority as well as responsibility, some plan--possibly this one--which will work has fairly good likelihood of being put into successful operation. If Mr. Spencer and Mr. Inouye appear before the Community Council, present the problem and the facts concerning how many workers are needed, what kind of work must be done, and the lack of available workers to do it, and ask for suggestions to meet the problem, making it plain that the solution is the responsibility of the whole community, and not of the administration alone, someone is bound to come forward with a usable plan. If not, Mr. Inouye should ask whether the Council might be able to use this idea to distribute the burden equitably and invite the Council to take the necessary steps to formulate and carry out some plan. Such an appeal, carried to the block managers also, will have much more likelihood of getting people out than will an order from the top directing

each block to supply a given amount of enforced labor. If the community governing body initiates and directs such a policy, the community will cooperate, particularly where excellent leadership such as that of Mr. Spencer has already been made evident. I have listened to elequent and effective appeals by block managers, block leaders, and councilmen, to which they were inspired by the example set by Mr. Spencer: "If Mr. Spencer really thinks the situation is so bad that he will himself jump on a tractor and drag the wheels around, the least we can do is to cooperate and do all we can to get the work done." Several of the persons who had volunteered for farm work cited this example to me as the reasons for their volunteering.

On the other hand, if it appears to the evacuees that they are being shoved around again, they will "fail to cooperate" once more. It is imperative that facts rather than threats be used. The issei in particular react very strongly to any suggestions that they will be made to work on the farm or not be fed. They may say with pretty forceful determination, "The government has put us in here and it is the responsibility of the government to see that we are fed. The men in prison who are serving sentences for crimes they have committed are always fed. We have not committed any crime. How can the government avoid its responsibility to feed us? That is not justice, but tyranny. We will appeal to the Spanish Consul, and do everything we can if they try to force us." Whether they are justified or not is not the main consideration. The main thing to note is that we can make a lot more progress through the methods of leadership than through coercion. If we try the latter, we'll have the sort of situation on our hands that we, both appointed personnel and the constructive community evacuee leaders, have been working hard to avoid. I take it that our objective is to get workers out on the farm while habituating people to live under a democratic system. If we want to accomplish that objective, our best opportunity will be by means of a democratic approach such as suggested above. I do not say that that approach will succeed, because several previous efforts have failed, and the Council and community may take the point of view that we come to them to solve problems that we find we're licked on, and that in other cases we just tell them, "Well, it's going to be this way, whatever you think about it." I might add that there are several intrinsic difficulties about the plan proposed, which will have to be overcome. (a) Such questions as the number of able-bodied persons who can work at far labor in each block will have to be ascertained; their essentiality in their present jobs will have to be evaluated--a task which Mr. Knodel is now doing; and the number of workers who can be transferred to farm labor determined, not on the basis

of a prior assumptions, but on the basis of the facts relating to each block. (A case in point is the discharge of one stoker from a block to make him available for farm work; this man was 67 years old, retired from active labor for ten years, and unable to stand the physical strain of farm labor. He stayed at home for a week, then heard of an opening as janitor, and secured the position. He has been doing this light but useful work ever since. He suggested that if they had wanted to lay off a stoker to get a farm worker, they should have laid off someone who could do farm work--or if all three could do it, perhaps alternate on the farm work and stoking until fall, when they will all be needed on the stoking job again.) Before the Council or any other intelligent authority decided that a certain number of workers will have to be forthcoming from each block, it will have to be convinced that they are actually existent, or resentment against an impossible program will arise. The basic data must be secured before anyone can be convinced. (b) The right of any authority to punish children and old people and others because those members of the block who could work on the farm will not do so, or the justice of such a procedure, is open to some question. This is another instance where persuasion and reason would seem to be superior to force. (c) There is at least some likelihood that the government of the United States, under the Geneva protocol, is responsible for feeding the evacuees whether they work or not. If the evacuees are held not to be covered by the Geneva protocol, then certain laws against enforced labor might be applicable to them. Again, authority may be present to carry out such a program, but some plan worked out through voluntary cooperation would sidestep this question and avoid confusion, difficulty, and delay.

For these reasons I doubt greatly the advisability of any order from the top putting this plan into operation. If it is to be presented, with some hope of achieving our objective, or if some plan is to be worked out with hope of success, I should like to suggest that some procedure such as that outlined below be followed: It should be noted that if a thorough discussion of this and other plans is held, under the circumstances outlined below, that we will not only secure more enthusiastic and wholehearted cooperation, but we will also be able to discover and straighten out difficulties which seem important to the people, but which may have been overlooked or not sufficiently considered by our administrators, whether evacuee or appointed personnel.

(1) As Project Director, you can perform the indispensable function of going before the Council, and presenting to it the key facts of the situation, many of which are not yet grasped accurately by the members or even the leaders of the community, as unavoidable aspects of a wartime economy, namely:

(a) It will not be possible for WRA to buy on the market all the foods necessary for adequate feeding of the community, because:

(1) WRA has no priority over civilians in buying.

(2) Not enough food is being produced in the U.S. to care for the needs of the armed forces, our allies, and over civilian population, including us.

(3) Public sentiment is such that it will be impossible for us of WRA to get adequate amounts of foods of which inadequate supplies are being produced, because we will be put last on the list, rather than first. So far as public opinion and politics are concerned, if any American civilians go without certain types of food, it will be us. It is true that there will be enough food provided, but it will be almost entirely bulky, starchy, high-calory, low-vitamin types of food, with little variety, and inadequate to meet many needs of our bodies. Therefore

(b) If we want to have enough of the foods we can grow here, such as vegetables, butter, eggs, beef, pork, we will have to grow them ourselves. We cannot get enough of them any other way. We can get bread, rice, and macaroni, on the market in sufficient quantities to fill our stomachs, but they are not enough to keep us healthy, and certainly far from a good diet for our growing children.

(2) Mr. Spencer should introduce Mr. Inouye to the Council with the statement that he is doing a good job in managing the farm; that he has knowledge and skill in supervising the growing of crops, the production of hogs, cattle, and poultry, and that he has a capable staff of assistants who are also skilled in their respective fields; that they have administered the farm well, impartially and for the good of the whole community, without favoring people from any area or in any particular field; that he is doing this voluntarily, as a service to the community because he has plenty of income to live without doing a thing, and a good farm in Iowa to retire to if he doesn't want to work; that about forty men and women are now working day and night on the farm, because they realize that what the people in the center eat next fall, winter and spring, in the way of vegetables, meat , eggs, poultry, and butter will depend upon their efforts right now; that it is not just nor reasonable to expect these forty mennand women to continue their devotion

and sacrifice to the community if the rest of the people will not even come out to work from 8 to 11:45 and from 12:45 to 4:30 six days a week to help harvest and produce the food that we will all depend upon for the rest of the year and next winter and spring.

(3) Mr. Inouye should present to the Council the key facts about the farm situation--the kind of crops being grown, those which need immediate attention, the livestock on hand or coming, the work needed to care for it, and the number and kinds of workers needed to do the work. He should then ask the Council to undertake the task of finding some way to get enough workers out on the farm to plant, cultivate and harvest the crops and care for the livestock, expressing his willingness to cooperate in whatever plan they work out, which is feasible in view of the needs on the farm. If the plan mentioned above is to be presented, he should present it, but it would be preferable to have the Council work out its own plan. Doubtless some member of the Council will ask him for suggestions. In that case, he will have a good opening to submit the plan to them for their consideration, approval, and execution. Doubtless too (in fact, certainly) the Council will want considerable information concerning the number of workers available in each block, their present employment, the essentiality of that employment, and the number unemployed but able to work. On the basis of this information, the Council will do a pretty earnest and conscientious job in trying to solve the whole problem, if it responds as several of the members seem inclined to do at present. To provide this information it would be well to have Mr. Knodel present and supplied with the type of information described.

The fact that competent evacuee leaders have formulated some plan is encouraging, and challenges our support and assistance in seeing that such efforts arrive at a successful conclusion. I submit these suggestions in the belief that they will be most conducive to that success.

John A. Rademaker
Community Analyst

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

WASHINGTON

July 16, 1943

J. G. Lindley, Project Director
Granada Relocation Center
Amache, Colorado

Dear Mr. Lindley:

I had several opportunities to discuss things with you on my recent visit to your center and will try to put down a few of the points covered and a few suggestions for consideration.

I was well pleased with the appearance of the farm. Many crops were planted later than desirable and much of the irrigation system had been repaired too late, but these things are to be expected when we consider the multitude of problems that had to be met in such a short time. I imagine the 1½ inch rain you received the last night I was there has improved crop prospects materially and everyone should be feeling better.

Many crops can still be planted to produce vegetables and feed for winter use and every effort should be put forth to take advantage of the improved soil conditions due to the heavy rain. The agricultural staff seemed very much on their toes and I presume they have taken quick advantage of the situation.

Some time in the early winter I would like to spend several days with your staff and draft a complete program of agricultural production and a calendar of work which should help in getting things done on time in 1944. By the end of this season your agricultural group, both administrative staff and evacuees, will be much better informed on soils, irrigation water supplies, climatic conditions, equipment, etc. One must expect at least a year of experimentation to learn a new farm and all of its conditions.

Successful farming in Amache is tied closely to taking advantage of the early water supply. Potatoes and many other crops should be planted so that their demand for water will come before July 1. Crops that have a lower water demand can follow and produce well with the limited water available during summer.

While I am discussing the water supply I would like to urge the fastest possible consideration of some shallow wells for irrigation. Mr. Wroth of your engineering section said that water was available at shallow depths and that wells that would deliver from 600 to 1,000 gallons per minute should not cost more than $1,800 each, including pump. If two of these wells were available this year to supply supplemental water for the 500 acres of vegetables, they would pay for themselves several times over.

The cool well water is the best guarantee possible for getting stands of late vegetables during the hot summer months. There seems to be some difference of opinion between Mr. Wroth and the agricultural staff about the location of these wells. For my part, I recommend that the land be mapped according to its productive ability and the wells be placed where they will serve the land best suited to the production of vegetables. The wells should be located, if possible, so that they can be sold with a good sized farm whenever the land is offered for sale to individual farmers after WRA is over. I suggest that a survey be made to determine the availability of undergrcund water on this X-Y ranch, and if sufficient water is available, that consideration be given to drilling two or three wells there to supplement the limited amount of water in the X-Y ditch. The agricultural staff stated that they would make such a survey and prepare a map of all farm land according to its productive ability.

Vegetable Crops

The agricultural report for June shows a heavy reduction in anticipated yields from Amache. This emphasized the importance of late plantings that can yet be made. I have discussed these at length with the agricultural group and I urge that every effort be made to carry out the revised plans.

Mr. Spencer indicated that he needed some technical assistance in getting the canning kitchen constructed. I suggest that he go to Ordway or Manzanola and study the commercial canning factories operating there. He could also discuss problems of operation with the commercial canning men and probably save many mistakes.

The storage cellars should be built as soon as possible so that they will be available by fall. About three weeks ago a suggested plan for a cellar to serve as a summer cooler and winter storage cellar was sent to you. Neither Mr. Spencer nor the steward have seen it. I suggest that it be turned over to them as a guide for construction of the cellar already started and the others to be built.

Grain Crops

The corn and other grain crops seemed to be progressing nicely. I suggest the planting of a sizable acreage of fall wheat in September to be used for poultry feed next year.

The additional equipment needed to properly handle the large acreage of land now being summer fallowed should be requisitioned at once. Abandonment of part of the acreage on the X-Y ranch, when it became known that water would not be available, was good judgment, but everything possible should be done to have it in shape to plant next year. Completion of the ditches should be accomplished this year so that everything can start on time next year.

Hogs

The program of alternate feed lots for hogs recommended in April should be carried out immediately to prevent another epidemic of disease such as the one in June that caused the loss of over 100 head of hogs. Such losses are inevitable unless sufficient lots are available so that proper sanitary programs can be carried on.

The number of hogs now on feed should make it possible to start and maintain a continuous supply of pork for the project. The agricultural staff stated that the mess division could not use the hogs as fast as they are ready due to shipments of pork being received from the Quartermaster. I recommend that all orders for outside purchases of pork be cancelled and that the feeding program be operated to supply all center demands. Feeder pigs are now plentiful and are selling at prices $2.00 to $3.00 per cwt., below the fat hog market. WRA can very profitably take advantage of this situation to utilize our cheap feeds. The hog program of supplying alfalfa pasture for small pigs and feeding garbage only to those over 100 lbs. in weight was discussed in detail with the agricultural group. Strict adherence to this program will undoubtedly prevent serious losses in the future. Equipment needed to put this program into operation should be secured as soon as possible.

Cattle

The cattle now on the project are doing very well. It is advisable to wait until fall before heavy purchases of additional cattle be made. However, if exceptionally good bargains are offered they could be picked up as the pasture can carry a large number until crops are harvested and the farm roughage and alfalfa stubble can be utilized.

The future of the cattle program can be more definitely planned after a program involving all of the centers is worked out. This should be ready by fall.

Slaughter House

You are familiar with the discussion regarding the possibilities of leasing the local slaughter house while I was there. A slaughter house equal to the one in Lamar could probably be constructed on the project for around $5,000; less than that if the old dairy barn is used. This would also save the transportation of livestock, meat and workers from the center to Lamar and return which would probably cost around $75.00 per month. The rental asked for the slaughter house in Lamar of $200 per month is unreasonable and I suggest that plans be drawn to construct our own as soon as possible, as you will have a large number of hogs and chickens to slaughter from now on. Later it may be desirable to slaughter cattle there and ship the meat to other centers.

The dairy barn has cement floors, water piped in, and sewage disposal installed. It could be rearranged for a slaughter house quickly and cheaply.

Poultry

The poultry program seems to be progressing very well but some changes would be desirable. First of all, the laying flock should be increased as fast as equipment can be secured. The present flock of pullets will not supply more than 50% of the needs.

I recommend that the meat birds be fed until they reach four pounds. Present plans were to slaughter them at two and one-half pounds. This would increase the cost of chicks and expensive baby chick feed rather than utilizing our own farm produced rough feeds. Only a limited number of meat birds should be planned for your project since beef can be produced at much less expense for feed and equipment. What equipment you have, however, should be kept in continual use by a year-round production program. This will be considered in more detail at a future time.

In conclusion, I wish to compliment your agricultural staff, both appointed and evacuee, for the good job they are doing. They seemed to feel disappointed at the results but when all the problems they confronted are considered, I feel

they have done a good job. I especially liked their enthusiasm regarding future plans. They know what they want to accomplish and are building a sound program for it. Most of the mistakes this year were unavoidable but that experience is being put to good use in planning for the future.

I enjoyed my trip very much and wish to extend thanks to everyone on the project for the fine considerate treatment I received. Much of that is due to your own fine hospitality and I appreciate it very much.

Respectfully,

(signed)

William M. Case, In charge
Agricultural Production

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY
GRANADA PROJECT

August 26, 1943

File copy

B

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. W. B. Wroth
Public Works Division

FROM: D. E. Harbison

I am attaching hereto copy of Mr. Utz's letter of August 19, in which he discusses our farm program as well as some of our construction problems.

The fifth paragraph of page one concerned our proposed three additional wells. Funds in the amount of $2500 for this project have been received.

The sixth paragraph on page one deals with the hen house construction. One such house is now being built by farm section employees. I believe it will be necessary for you to ascertain the value of this building when completed, in order that it may be a matter of record with the Engineering Division.

The third paragraph on page two deals with the slaughter house. I am not certain what Mr. Spencer's final decision is in regard to construction of the slaughter house. However, I am inclined to think that inasmuch as we have not been able to lease a slaughter house, that he is seriously considering recommending that we build a slaughter house. If this is correct I believe that definite plans should be made at an early date in order that we can do our own slaughtering. You will note that Mr. Utz suggests that plans for a slaughter house should provide for means of working up all the edible offals. Our plans and cost estimates should include equipment necessary to do this.

The second paragraph on page three deals with our proposed Center irrigation project. Mr. Utz states that he presumes it is our intention to have the evacuees put in the irrigation ditches from the street distribution line at their own expense and their own time, outside of regular working hours. I did not know that this had been a part of our thinking, and I doubt the feasibility of attempting to do it that way. I believe that there would be numerous questions arise as to who would be responsible for the ditch layout and also questions as to the disposal of waste of water. If you believe that that part of the system could be constructed by volunteer labor I would of course have no objection to giving it a try.

The third paragraph of page three deals with our proposed new garage, as well as with the present garage. Mr. Utz calls attention to the fact that he was to be notified of our conclusions regarding a new garage, and the use of the old garage. As soon as plans have been worked out in detail for the proposed new garage, Mr. Utz should be advised. You will note that he at present understands our plan for a new garage to be a building 37' x 168'. Unless you have decided against the plan which you roughly sketched for me, I believe he should be advised of our new thinking in regard to the dimensions of the proposed shop. I am especially anxious that you follow through on the garage deal as rapidly as possible. I say this advisedly because I do not know how far you have gone with your plans.

cc: Mr. Spencer

cc: Mr. Smith

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY
WASHINGTON

August 19, 1943

Mr. J. G. Lindley, Project Director
Granada Relocation Center
Amache, Colorado

Dear Mr. Lindley:

I want to thank you and your staff for the excellent cooperation in reviewing the work on your project and discussing the various problems incident to the center operation, while I was at Granada last week.

Real progress is being made in carrying out both the construction program and the agricultural development and production work. While I recognize that Mr. Spencer and others on your staff were disappointed in not being able to produce all the vegetables that had been tried in the 1943 program, I am sure thatnone of us expected that we would be entirely successful in the growing of such a variety of vegetables, the most of whish had never been grown commercially in this area. Possibly some of them such as carrots, would do reasonably well, if planted relatively early in the spring. The hot weather, together with limited irrigation water, would be a handicap to a number of the different types of crops.

I was agreeably surprised to see the fine progress being made by the Vocational Agricultural boys on the five hundred acre tract which they are farming. The boys deserve a great deal of credit and commendation for the excellent showing they are making, and the contribution of their work toward the subsistence of the center.

Your potato crop, at least from the limited investigations we made, will undoubtedly produce condiderably more than was originally anticipated. Any production of potatoes beyond the needs of your center probably should be shipped to Heart Mountain and possibly other center, for late summer consumption. I doubt very much whether these early potatoes, produced and harvested under the extreme heat condisions, will keep for any length of time in your root cellar.

Sincer my return to Washington, approval has been given for the digging of three additional wells to supply water supplemental to that furnished through the regular canal system. If possible, one or more of these wells should be installed at the earliest possible moment, and the water used in helping out in your irrigation work the balance of this summer, particularly on your late vegetalbe crops. Undoubtedly the experience gained this summer in connection2 with some of the crops which are more difficult to raise should be of value in determining the kinds of crops to be raised next year, and probably also whow improvements in the techniques for the raising of those crops which you decide to attempt next year.

Every effort should be made to complete your laying houses for the poultry flock, so that the pullets may be adequately housed before they get into full production. I noted that you have purchased entirely heavy breeds of poultry. While I recognize that it is possible to purchase high-producing strains in the heavier breeds, your chances of getting them are much less in the heavy breeds than they are in Leghorns. I believe that all of the other centers so far are depending mainly on White Leghorns as layers. It will be worth while to watch your production carefully this following winter, so that we can compare it with the production of the lighter breeds.

The beef cattle which you have purchased to date are showing very good gains. We discussed at length the prospects of additional purchases of feeder cattle to utilize

the pasture which is now available on the K-Y Ranch. While much of this pasture will be less palatable thirty to forty-five days form now than it is at the present time, I doubt that the purchase of relatively expensive feeder cattle at this particular time will be an economy.

Since returning to Washington, we have made some further analysis of the feeder and fat cattle markets, and feel rather strongly that the particular purchase which you proposed to make while I was at the center will prove to be rather expensive meat. Thin cows with claves, it seems to us, should be purchased for approximately theprice asked on the dry cows which were offered to you. Cow with calves at ten cents a pound would appear to be about a fair price. One of the difficulties in buying the heavier weight feeders, which will need a relatively short feeding period, is the high investment that is required as compared to the amount of gain resulting from the feed put into these cattle. Cattle costing ten to eleven cents per pound as heavy feeders will cost us approximately that same amount per pound after they are fed out, if we make any reasonable allowance for the feed consumed.

When we recognize that these cattle will only dress probalbly forty-seven to fifty percent, and when we include the cost of slaughtering, our meat will cost us upward of twenty-four to twenty-five cents per pound. Commercial grades of meat in the markets are nearly five cents below this price at the present time. I am inclined to believe that we may secure a better price on feeder cattle by placing our order with a reliable, established order buying concern that we can by going out through the country and attempting to shop for individual lots of cattle. While funds have been made available for the purchase of feeder cattle, and you have been authorized to purchase additional amounts, I hope that you will analyze any purchases you propose to make very carefully, to determine whether or not you can afford to buy the cattle, and whether the price of the beef when delivered to the mess hall will be in line with the wholesale price of the quality.

In connection with the building of a slaughter house on the center, plans should be developed rather quickly, together with justification, and a priority request for the remodelling of one of your buildings on theKhen Ranch into a slaughter house. This of course, is on the assumption that your present slaughtering arrangements are only temporary in character. This slaughter house should provide for the manufacture of the edible offal from both pork and beef carcasses, and if possible, for the conversion of the inedible offal into tankage or meat scraps to be used in supplementing your farm-grown poultry feeds. You no doubt will also need to expand your Hog feed lots, in order to improve your sanitary conditions. It would seem advisable to have a sufficient number of feed lots to allow rotating of your feeder hogs, to permit an adequate clean-up of them that are vacant.

After looking over the lands which had been turned over to private operators under permit for this crop season, it would seem advisable fore the project to attempt to farm as much as possible of this additional thousand acres that is either not being farmed or poorly farmed this year, rather thatn to issue permits or leases again. I recognize that some additional equipment will be required. This equipment for the most part, however, will not be needed until spring, and I believe that arrangements can be made between now and that time to adequately equip you to handle the additional acreage. While I do not think the issuing of permits on this land to private operators this year was entirely bad, I believe it would be a mistake to issue permits or leases to most of them for another year.

With regard to construction on the center, I was pleased to see the root cellar

p

practically completed. My major criticism of the root is the extreme height of the bins from the ground. This not only is waste space as far as the root cellar is concerned but will, I am afriad, make it impossible to secure sufficient humidity to properly perserve the crops stored in the cellar. I believe the earth over the roof of the building should be levelled, and probably treated with oil, in order to prevent blowing during the windy periods.

I was rather amazed at the size of the department store which was being built on the center. While I realize that the War Production Board gave approval for the construction of four buildings for community stores, I did not realize that three buildings would be connected up to make one building of 12,000 square feet floor space. To the best of my knowledge, this is the only store of its kind in any of the ten centers, and is much larger than we have even on the largest center. Since the building is so far along toward completion, there is, of course, no change to be made. It might be advisable, however, to consider utilizing a part of the building for some other purposes. I hope that this store will not become as famous as your high school building.

With regard to the center irrigation, it is my understanding that the pipe is on order, and that you are expecting to complete the system as soon as the pipe is received. I presume it is your intention to have the evacuees put in the irrigation ditches from your street distribution line at their own expense and with their own time outside of regular working hours. This is in line with the policy that has been established for this type of work. I noticed in one of the other centers recently, where the system has been installed, that the evacuees have failed to take advantage of the ditches along the streets and are still using domestic water to sprinkle their lawns and gardens. If your irrigation system is installed, I would recommend that all garden hose be removed from the blocks, and that pipe also be removed, so that domestic water is not available for center irrigation purposes.

When I left the center, and as a result of our discussion concerning the construction of a garage building, you indicated that you would study the problem further, and notify us as to whether you proposed to build an entirely new garage building, or and addition to the present structure. If no other space should be found which would adequately house silk screen poster shop, I believe you proposed to use the present garage as a poster shop, and build a new one approximately 37 feet by 168 feet. If other space could be found for the poster shop, you would consider going ahead with the plans as they have been approved by the War Pseduction Board. I understand that Colonel Fiero has visited your project since I left, and probably you have worked out with him your definite plans. If you propose to build the new garage at the other location, it will be necessary for you to cancel your present approved garage project, and submit a new application which we can transmit to WPB, requesting approval for construction of a larger building. Adequate justification andreasons for the cancellation of the approved project should be submitted with your proposal. We are not in a position here in Washington to write up your new proposal andjjustification.

Since my return to Washington, we have approved the promotion of Mr. William Wroth to the Chief Engineer position at P-5. We have also approved the appointment of a candidate for the position of construction superintendent. I hope it will be possible for you to find a competent Irrigation and Roads engineer in the very near future, so that progress can continue to be made on the cleaing of the X-Y canal, and on the repair and maintenance of the balance of your canal and road systems. Adequate staffing in your Engineering Division should make it unnecessary to require the agricultral staff to construct livestodk buildings or Community Enterprises to take responsibility for construction of stores.

Sincerely,
/s/ E.J.Utz
E.J.Utz, Chief
Operations Division

GR:FS:JS

AIRMAIL-SPECIAL DELIVERY

GRANADA PROJECT
AMACHE, COLORADO

January 13, 1944

Mr. D. S. Myer
Director
War Relocation Authority
Barr Building
Washington (25), D. C.

Dear Mr. Myer:

We have received your letter of December 31 pertaining to the leasing of land on the Koen Ranch. In this it is suggested that all lands on the Koen be farmed by the center, that if land is available in excess of center requirements it be leased from the XY acreage, and that leased lands not be sub-leased to relocated evacuees.

We believe that we have failed to give you a clear picture of the situation in regard to these lands, their relation to our 1944 cropping program, our irrigation water supply problem, and the public relations angles involved. We shall attempt to outline the situation as we see it, and we request you reconsider in light of the following amplification of our conditions:

(1) It is unnecessary to farm all of the project lands in order to meet the center's requirements for vegetables and meats as set forth in the 1944 farm program. Our plan calls for an increase in area of land farmed by us amounting to 1,124 acres. 624 acres of this land are north of the Santa Fe railroad tracks on the Koen; the balance is XY lands which were prepared for planting last summer and fall. Alfalfa hay is essential to successful livestock operations. Practically all of the alfalfa acreage on the project is included in the lands to be farmed by the center.

(2) The center has experienced one year of farming operations. Because of this fact we can more accurately judge the limitations of such operations than would have been possible a year ago. Limitations caused by shortages of labor, machinery and transportation will prohibit expansion of farming operations to include all of the farm land on the project. The number of well qualified farm workers is bound to be greatly reduced next spring. A high percentage of farm workers have indicated their intention to leave the center on either seasonal or indefinite leave. Continuation of present seasonal leave policies conceivably could prevent the harvest of a crop as large as that grown in 1943. Restrictions on number of hours of work per day create a machine shortage in spite of the fact that the project

possesses a large inventory of farm machinery. Training of machine operators is another problem which must be considered. For three weeks last spring, during the busy planting season, it was impossible to train tractor operators as rapidly as they left the center.

(3) Leasing of XY ranch lands would be undesirable and perhaps impossible. Most of the good farm land on this place has been prepared for spring planting. To lease such land would result in considerable loss to the project. The canal and laterals have been cleaned, making more probable an early supply of irrigation water. None of the uninhabited dwellings on the XY is suitable for tenant houses. The headquarters buildings are needed by the farm as a location for cattle feeding and pasturage operations. All pastures on this ranch will be utilized by the project herds. Few prospective tenants would want land--sorghum and corn land, the type available on the XY--unless they could be assured of some pasturage.

(4) Apprehension lest the releasing of land to relocating evacuees might create an unfavorable public reaction would seem far less likely than the unfavorable local reaction which has existed, and might continue to exist, due to improper utilization of Koen farm lands. Public opinion will undoubtedly be severely adverse to poor farming of Koen crop land or the utilization of these lands north of the railroad exclusively for the production of feed and pasture crops. Koen ranch land is considered to be the most productive land in this section of the Arkansas Valley. This land has been used for many years to produce sugar beets and other intensively farmed crops in proper rotation with small grain, hay and corn. Farmers living on these lands always produced large vegetable gardens, poultry, pork and milk, which production was utilized in Granada and Holly. Loss of this source of farm products has been keenly felt. So critical were the local people of the situation on the leased lands this year that they had pictures taken of the weedy fields. From the local standpoint we can be assured of favorable public reaction to the leasing of Koen land to tenants--regardless of race--who will produce good crops of vegetables, hay, and grain.

(5) Proper consideration will be given to cropping plans and water requirements on all leased tracts prior to execution of a lease. The amount of each crop to be grown will be dictated to the end that the acreage of high water requirement crops (beets, onions, etc.) will balance with crops requiring less water such as sorghum, broom corn, corn, and wheat. When this is done there should be little difficulty as regards the allo-

cation of water; in other words, a cropping plan will be made a part of each lease.

(6) Apparently some misunderstanding exists regarding the distribution of irrigation water. All of the lands proposed for lease on the Koen ranch are located at the lower extremity of the farm's water distribution system. Crops grown by the center have first access to all flows coming from the main canals. It would, therefore, be very difficult for anyone living on leased lands to steal water. Perhaps the situation on the Koen has been confused with the XY where outside water users all live at the head of the ditch. In a number of instances private land owners have been caught taking XY ditch water which belonged to the Government.

(7) How critical is the irrigation water supply situation at the present time? Recent heavy snowfall has greatly improved the prospect of summer irrigation water. It is believed that the water supply situation is as favorable as it was at this time last year. Residual soil moisture content is much less than a year ago; however, the project in anticipation of a drought has winter irrigated most of the hay land.

(8) Other than the Government, the largest water right on the Lamar ditch belongs to the American Crystal Sugar Company whose properties are all located above the Government lands on the Lamar canal. Leasing of land to the American Crystal Sugar Company might have exactly the opposite effect of that mentioned in your letter; in other words, if the company is interested in a crop growing on the Koen ranch, they will be anxious to see that the Government receives the necessary water needed for the development of such crop.

The time for making leases, advantageous to the Government, is growing short. Good tenant farmers in this vicinity make their arrangements for leasing land prior to February 1. Delay of approval from Washington for leasing these lands last year resulted in our being forced to lease to draft evaders and poor farmers, since the better type of tenants had already located places elsewhere. Therefore, an early favorable reconsideration of our proposal will be much appreciated.

Very truly yours,

James G. Lindley
Project Director

cc Malcolm Pitts
John Spencer
Donald Horn

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY
Granada Project

C O P Y

January 28, 1944

MEMORANDUM

To: H. F. Halliday

From: D. E. Harbison

Subject: Pork Production Program

This is in reference to Mr. Powers's comments in his letter of January 11 regarding the proposed Cropping Program for the crop year 1944 and to your memorandum of January 17 which you directed to Mr. Spencer when you were Acting Chief of Operations in which you requested that Mr. Spencer and Mr. Wells submit any proposed changes as suggested by Mr. Powers's letter. I believe the only point raised concerns the matter of pork production and is found in the last paragraph of the first page of his letter.

Mr. Powers suggests that we keep sufficient pigs on hand to consume all garbage for the entire period covered. I wish to refer this question back to your division because of the fact that, at the time the program was prepared, we had quite lengthy discussions on the matter of the amount of pork to be produced. At that time it was brought up that, if we did not consume the garbage in the production of pork, we would be confronted with a garbage disposal expense which the Agricultural Section felt was unwarranted inasmuch as the garbage should be producing pork which is the cheapest meat possible of production. As I recall, the argument raised by the Mess Section against our proposal to maintain a swine herd sufficient to consume all the garbage was that they proposed to purchase hams and bacon and that they would have no way of disposing of the rest of a pig carcass.

Inasmuch as our program was prepared on the basis of center requirements as stated by the Mess Section, the pork production program conformed to that section's estimate of prok and beef as well as their estimate of vegetables needed. I believe that it is proper that the Farm Section should ask the Mess Section to justify the pork production program.

In order that we may make a prompt reply to Mr. Powers's letter, I should appreciate your early reply to this memorandum.

C O P Y

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY
Granada Project

MEMORANDUM

February 3, 1944

To: D. E. Harbison

From: H. F. Halliday

Subject: Pork Production Program

With reference to your memorandum of January 28 in which you suggest that the Mess Section justify the pork program, the following comments are offered:

1. The file copy of the program submitted shows that it is anticipated that 261,660 lbs. of pork will be consumed during the calendar year 1944. Comparing this to the total of all meats reported consumed, you will find that it equals 39½% of the total. Thus, if that consumption figure is to be used, it appears that it is close enough.

2. However, it is noted that the consumption is divided into two periods--197,600 lbs. to be used from January 1 to July 1, and 64,060 lbs. for the remainder of the year. I checked with Mr. Wells who advises that his figures were not so divided as the total estimates he made were based on weekly consumption figures of 3,806 lbs.

3. In this connection, it is noted that the beef production figure used in the production plan coincides exactly with the figure used by the Mess Section for the 1945 fiscal year. The pork production figures vary considerably. The Mess Section used a figure of 197,940 lbs. for the budget for the fiscal year 1945. The Farm Section used a total of 261,660 lbs. for the calendar year with 197,600 lbs. or almost the total annual quantity that Mess estimated shown as consumption for the first six months of the calendar year. Also, on an attachment of notes the production program estimates that 295,860 lbs. of pork will be used. All of these figures are at wide degrees of variance from any estimate made by the Mess Section.

4. The proposal that ham and bacon be purchased is governed above all by limitations of facilities for curing and storing on the project. Limited production experiments conducted during the past few months show that such items can be produced but not with facilities or labor now available or in sight. The volume of curing would have to be stepped up considerably to make such operation worthwhile. If the slaughterhouse can and will produce such items of acceptable quality, I can see no reason why the Mess Section would refuse to accept them.

5. The mess estimates of pork to be consumed were based on 35% pork and 65% beef. The Washington office merely suggested that 40% should be pork. If the present figures stand, we meet this suggestion within about 1%. If the Mess Section figures are used, it makes a difference of approximately 2 more hogs per week, and I won't object to such revision but I can't see that such change will utilize all our garbage. I think it is recognized that the pork production is limited only by our ability to consume it; and if we use garbage utilization rather than pork consumption as the basis for pork production, we will find that neither our proposed program nor that of Washington will utilize all our garbage. If under either program there is a surplus of garbage, I would recommend that the surplus be sold to outside hog raisers.

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

GRANADA PROJECT

B

In reply, please refer to:
WW:JNS

AIRMAIL

February 7, 1944

Granada Proj File.

Hold for Mr Utz.

Mr. Dillon S. Myer
Director
War Relocation Authority
Barr Building
Washington (25), D. C.

Attention: Mr. E. J. Utz
Chief, Operations Division

Dear Mr. Myer:

During our recent telephone conversation with Mr. Utz, he asked that we supply your office with a map, indicating the project owned lands, which we proposed to lease this year. The map is attached hereto. Names appearing on the map are those of tenants with whom the government had cropping permits last year. With the exception of Earl Laird, Adam Behm and M. Madrid, we propose that the tenants would be the same this year.

The lands farmed by Lee Diller, Jeffers Brothers and G. L. Young would be taken over by the Center and used to produce the quota of crops set forth in the 1944 agricultural program submitted to your office December 15, 1943.

Yours very truly,

James G. Lindley
Project Director

168.5
241.
155.
175.
190.
36.
145
130
57
1294.5

FEB 10 1944

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

WASHINGTON

March 15, 1944

Copy given Mr Halliday
HEH

Mr. J. G. Lindley
Project Director
Granada Relocation Center
Amache, Colorado

Dear Mr. Lindley:

I am giving below a report of my visit to your center February 29 to March 2, inclusive. All of the points covered in this report were, I believe, discussed in considerable detail with Mr. Harbison and Mr. Spencer, but since it was necessary that you leave for the Directors' conference at Washington previous to the end of my visit, I did not have the opportunity to discuss these things with you.

Mr. Horn, Mr. Harbison, Mr. Spencer and I reviewed the recommendations made by the Washington Office for changes in your proposed farm lease form. It was agreed that most of the suggested changes were desirable. However, your staff members thought it desirable to put back into the lease the paragraph excluding all grazing until a specified time in the fall, and also the provision that the tenant shall peaceably quit the land upon the expiration of the lease. I agreed that these provisions should be put back in the lease. Since returning to Washington I have checked this with the Solicitor's office and found that this is agreeable with them.

Mr. Harbison, Mr. Spencer and I discussed at some length the use of this additional land on the Koen Ranch which you are operating this year for the first time. It was my recommendation that this land be utilized as fully as possible even though this meant that some of the land which was originally planned for use this year on the XY Ranch could not be utilized.

It is recognized that much of the land on the XY Ranch is already plowed and will require but little additional work to put this in shape for feed crops. The work of preparing additional land, I recommended, should be shifted from the XY Ranch to the Koen Ranch. I also recommended that any crop land on the XY Ranch which was surplus to needs be rented out, but was informed that no one would care to rent this land.

It is our opinion that this entire matter of the amount of land needed for agricultural use at the center and the disposition which should be made of the additional land not needed for your use should be given further attention and that sometime this summer, probably not later than July or August, a definite decision should be made as to the land which should be used by the WRA during the crop year 1945, and the disposition which should be made of the remainder of the land.

Your hogs were looking very good. This was gratifying since your losses during the past four months have been excessively large, amounting to 169 head. It is to be regretted that at the present time you do not have sufficient fat hogs for your own use. On the other hand, present indications are that if the hogs that are now on hand were fed to normal weights you would have, within a few weeks, hogs far in excess of your needs. This points out the need for giving close attention to the hog purchase program in order that a more constant supply of pork may be provided to mess halls.

I was very much pleased to see your slaughter house. The old dairy barn was remodeled at very slight expense. While the slaughter house is not all that could be desired in some respects, it seems to me that on the whole it is very satisfactory and that very good judgment was used in the remodeling of this building for slaughter house purposes. I understand that it will be necessary in the near future to make additional provisions for the disposal of sewage from your slaughter house.

I was interested in seeing your beef cattle lay-out, since you had no feed lots for your beef cattle when I visited your center in November. It is, of course, unfortunate that such a large percentage of the cows which you purchased were bred, thereby seriously interferring with your plans for providing beef for your center and also for Heart Mountain.

This raises the question as to the type of beef cattle which should be purchased in the future. I was very much interested in seeing the steers which you had on pasture in the center field on the XY Ranch. These were medium quality steers which I understand were purchased at around 650 to 700 pounds in weight. It is recognized that one can not always buy just the kind of cattle they desire, but it would seem that steers of this weight and quality are admirably fitted to our needs.

Mr. Tigges raised the question as to the advisability of chopping alfalfa hay for beef feeding and we promised to obtain additional information regarding this. We have reviewed literature

which we have available and have also discussed this matter at considerable length with Mr. Ellis of the Bureau of Animal Industry. Mr. Ellis states that as a rule the chopping of alfalfa for beef cattle is not profitable. It is true that the Oregon and Idaho stations have recorded some increase in gains through the feeding of chopped hay, but most stations have not obtained such results. It seems that unless there is considerable wastage of uncut hay, the additional gains obtained from chopping are insufficient to pay for the cost of chopping. Based on the literature which we have reviewed and the recommendations of Mr. Ellis, we therefore do not believe that it would be advisable to chop alfalfa hay for your beef herd.

Loader or spreader

I was also informed by Mr. Tigges that requests have been transmitted to Washington asking approval for the purchase of a manure loader. Upon my return to Washington I found that this request had been disapproved. It was thought that the manure hauling could be done at a time which would not seriously interfere with other farm work and thus would be the means of profitably employing farm workers when they were not otherwise engaged. Also, since manure loaders are not used on the average farm, it was felt that we were not justified in making this expenditure.

In the discussion of the new policy for the pricing of agricultural products, you will recall that the statement was made that if this new pricing policy went into effect it would require some revision of your agricultural program. As you know, the Administrative Notice putting this new policy into effect has been issued. If a revision of your proposed agricultural program is desirable it should be submitted at once in order that your agricultural program for 1944 may be approved by the Director, as provided by the Manual, thus authorizing the expenditure of agricultural funds. In revising your proposed program it should be kept in mind that it is the policy of the Authority, as stated in the Manual, to produce as large a proportion as possible of the foods needed in feeding the evacuees. On the other hand, we want, in so far as possible, to avoid surplus production.

With your proposed vegetable production program submitted on December 17, 1943, you also submitted a list of the vegetables which you would need in addition to those which you will produce on the center. It will be impossible for other centers to produce all of these vegetables for you. The attached sheet shows the kinds and amounts of vegetables which we have asked the Gila River center to produce for you. These amounts, together with the amounts which you had originally planned as set forth in your program submitted December 17, 1943, would, according to our calculations and assuming a population of 6,800 on your center, give you .8 of a pound of vegetables per person per day during the month of June; 1.6 pound in July; 2.2 pound in August; 3.1 pound in September; 2.3 pound in October;

2 pounds in November; 1.7 pound in December; 1.6 pound in January; 1.4 pound in February; 1.2 pound in March; 1 pound in April and 1 pound in May. Mr. Wells is in much better position than anyone else to determine the quantity of vegetables which will be needed per person per day. It is our opinion that the amounts planned for the months of July to November were slightly in excess of needs. However, we recognized that some of these are watermelons, squash, cantaloupes, etc., which partake of the nature of dessert rather than staple table vegetables. We would, however, suggest that Agriculture and Mess Operations again review your proposed program to determine whether any changes are desired before I give your program to the Director for his approval.

You will recall that in our letter of January 11, 1944, in regard to your proposed agricultural program we raised the question about your proposed pork production, since you had indicated that you planned on producing 197,600 pounds of pork during the first half of the calendar year 1944 and only one-half that much during the second half of the year. We understand from Mr. Spencer that present plans are that the production during the second half of the calendar year will also be 197,600 pounds.

We shall therefore appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience as to the changes, if any, which you desire to make in your proposed program in order that we may su mit your program to the Director for his approval.

I appreciated the opportunity of working with you and the members of your staff and want to assure you that we shall be glad to be of assistance to you in any way possible.

Sincerely,

E. H. Reed

E. H. Reed
Agricultural Section

Enclosure

GRANADA PROJECT

WW:JNS

April 10, 1944

Mr. E. H. Reed
Chief, Agricultural Section
War Relocation Authority
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Reed:

The Mess Section and the Farm Section have made a careful recheck of the vegetable production program submitted to you December 17, 1943. We believe that our estimates of that date are accurate and that we should proceed according to plan. We recognize that the per capita pounds of vegetables is high for the periods August, September and October. As you know, this is our peak vegetable production season and many of the items produced at this time cannot be listed as staple vegetables. They are, however, food crops highly desired by our population and we feel that they meet a definite need. It is recognized that a subsistence program must be somewhat flexible in order to adequately care for uncontrollable conditions such as weather fluctuations in population, insect problems, etc. We would much prefer having slight surpluses than to be confronted with shortages at a time when the entire national food problem is as critically important as it is now. After all, there are numerous ways of disposing of surpluses.

We believe that we failed to make ourselves clear as regards the proposed program for utilization of alfalfa. We did not propose to chop or grind the alfalfa, but rather to put it into pit silos using the methods commonly employed in the dairy sections of Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Vermont, and New York. It was our plan to employ a field alfalfa harvester, conveying the chopped feed from the cutter to dump trucks and placing in the silo in a manner similar to the methods used in storing our corn crop last fall. We planned to us 25 to 35 pounds of phosphoric acid per ton of alfalfa. This chemical would have the double value of preserving the silage and later being used as fertilizer on vegetable lands deficient in phosphorus.

The canning bulletin has been received and is being reviewed by the Engineering Section preparatory to completion of our canning facilities.

We appreciate the assistance which you gave us at the time of your visit and we hope that you will be able to return to the project soon.

Yours very truly,

J. G. Lindley
Project Director

JGL:ln

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

WASHINGTON

April 11, 1944

Mr. J. G. Lindley
Project Director
Granada Relocation Center
Amache, Colorado

Dear Mr. Lindley:

A study of agricultural reports indicates that crop acreage abandonment and livestock and poultry losses were excessively large in many centers last year. The data for your center, together with the average of nine centers, is given below:

	Granada	Av. Nine Centers
Vegetable acreage abandoned--percent of planted acreage	26	20
Feed crop acreage abandoned--percent of planted acreage	11	9
Hog losses--percent of pigs obtained by purchase and farrowing	28	19
Poultry losses--percent of chicks purchased	40	29

It is obvious that the average vegetable acreage abandonment for the nine centers is entirely too large. Abandonment on your center, however, was slightly larger than the average for the nine centers. We believe that all centers are justified in "stretching" the season as much as possible through both early and late plantings of small acreages of certain vegetables. Since we may expect rather frequent losses from these "out-of-season" plantings, it is important that the acreages of such plantings be held to a reasonable amount. Losses on most centers last year, however, were due to factors other than small out- of-season plantings. Your feed crop acreage abandonment is also larger than average abandonment on nine centers. Of course, this was due primarily to lack of irrigation facilities.

Average hog losses also were excessive. Garbage feeding authorities state that a ten percent loss is normal. The average loss on the nine centers was almost twice that figure, while your loss exceeded this average. It is obvious that this is a matter of particular concern, since it is difficult to justify the loss

of twenty-eight per cent of the pigs purchased. We would recommend that you give consideration to the method of purchasing hogs. It is our opinion that one can normally expect higher losses from hogs bought on auction markets than from hogs bought directly from farmers. We would, therefore, suggest that you give this further consideration in order to determine whether the ease of purchasing through local or nearby auction markets is enough to compensate for any additional death losses which might be incurred through the purchase of sick or unthrifty feeders.

Average poultry losses for the nine centers were also high, while losses on your center were considerably higher than the average. This, of course, was largely the result of your lack of adequate facilities, and it is anticipated that you will be able to reduce these losses materially this year.

We are very much concerned about these losses which occurred last year and know that you are likewise concerned about the losses on your center. We are confident that you have made plans to keep these losses to a minimum this year. We shall appreciate knowing of your plans in this regard.

Sincerely,

E. J. Utz

E. J. Utz, Chief
Operations Division

C O P Y

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

WASHINGTON

B

April 24, 1944

Mr. J. G. Lindley
Project Director
Granada Relocation Center
Amache, Colorado

Dear Mr. Lindley:

We have considered your proposed agricultural production program for the calendar year 1944 which was submitted under date of December 17, together with the supplemental information submitted in subsequent correspondence including that in your letter of April 10. We approve your vegetable production program calling for the production of 590 acres of vegetables, as set forth on the enclosed copy of Form WRA-301.

At the time you submitted your proposed agricultural program last December, you also submitted a list showing the kinds and amounts of vegetables which you would need in addition to those produced on the center. It was impossible for other centers to produce all of the vegetables which you would need in addition to your local production, We have, however, requested Gila to produce a large proportion of these vegetables. A list showing the kinds and amounts of vegetables which Gila has been asked to produce for shipment to your center was enclosed with Mr. Reed's report of March 15.

We approve your proposed feed crop production program, as set forth on the enclosed copy of Form WRA-301, calling for the production of 2,225 acres of feed crops in addition to your pasture acreage.

Your proposed pork production program calling for the production of 295,200 pounds of dressed pork for consumption on the center is approved. With hogs dressing 200 pounds each, this would require the slaughter of approximately 1,975 hogs per year. It is understood that most of the feeder hogs will be purchased. However, a few will be raised by highschool students as a vocational agricultural project. It is expected that you will plan your feeder hog purchase program in such a manner as to provide a constant supply of pork for your mess halls. As stated in the Agriculture Handbook, we feel that as a rule it is desireable to purchase feeder hogs at from 60 to 85 pounds in weight. We do not object to the purchase of smaller hogs provided it

is considered more economical to do so. Due to the quantity of garbage which we have on hand at all centers, we do not feel that we can readily justify the pruchase of hogs much above 100 pounds in weight, since it seems that we should be able to obtain gains from garbage cheaper thatn the additional weight can be purchased on the market. We therefore trust that you will watch your purchasing operations very closely in the future in order that you may provide yourself with a constant supply of pork. We are greatly concerned about the losses of hogs which you have experienced during the past year and recommend that every effort be made to reduce these in the future.

We approve your proposed beef cattle program calling for the production of 367,600 pounds of dressed beef for your own center and 36,000 pounds per month for shipment to Heart Mountain. The shipments to Heart Mountain should begin as soon as you are in a position to furnish them with a constant supply of beef. Careful consideration should be given to your feeder cattle purchasing program. As has been previously stated by persons from this office, it is our opinion that as a rule common-to-medium quality light steers are probably most suitable. We recognize that this may not be the case at all times and that attimes purchase of heifers or cows may be desirable. Under present conditions, however, we do not feel that the purchase of slaughter cattle can be justified. We hope that in the future you will manage your beef cattle enterprise in such a manner that you can provide the full requirements of beef for yourself as well as another center.

We approve your proposed egg production program calling for the purchase of approximately 8,000 chicks of laying breed and the maintaining of a flock of about 6,000 laying hens. We also approve your proposed poultry meat production program providing for the purchase of 10,000 baby chicks of meat breed estimated to produce 35,000 pounds of poultry meat.

We realize that it may be desireable to make changes in this program from time to time. However, any significant changes should be approved in advance by this office.

Sincerely,

(signed D. S. Myer)

Director

Enclosures

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY
Granada Project

MEMORANDUM

June 26, 1944

To: James G. Lindley, Project Director

From: Duwain L. Delp
H. F. Halliday

Subject: Analysis of Cattle Transactions to May 1, 1944

According to the analysis furnished us by Mr. Utz, the following summarizes transactions in beef cattle by this project from inception to April 30, 1944: (This excludes transactions involving dairy cattle on which there was no point of difference).

Total Purchases	1089	
Calves Dropped	275	
TOTAL to account for		1364
Slaughtered and delivered to Mess	517	
Surveyed	16	
Deaths (not surveyed)	13	
Shipped to Heart Mountain	30	
Inventoried	759	
TOTAL		1335
NET SHORTAGE		29

In the analysis the following is also reported:

Hides sold	544	
Carcasses delivered to Mess	517	
Excess Hides		27
Hides sold from 2 cattle which died of natural causes		2
NET EXCESS of Hides		25

From these figures it appeared that the project was short some 25 to 29 head of cattle depending on whether the hide analysis or the cattle analysis is used as a basis.

On June 22 and 23 we verified the summary tabulation prepared by Mr. Rose with records on the project. In order to make this reconciliation the following reports were obtained:

(1) A report from the Farm Section prepared by Mr. Spencer showing his record of number of cattle slaughtered since the inception of the project. To the best of my knowledge this record was prepared from summary sheets of beef accepted by the mess. This summary in gross indicated that there were 572 head of cattle slaughtered, but it was found that 12 claimed on November 29, 1943, could not be verified. Therefore, they were disallowed and a net figure of 560 was used for verification purposes from this record.

(2) There was secured from the Cost Section a complete analysis by document number showing the number of head slaughtered and also from separate basic records the number of head delivered to the Mess. After reviewing the records of deliveries to Mess and adjusting for errors, this record indicates that there were 560 slaughtered and was reconciled with the Mess report.

(3) From the Mess Section there was secured an independent analysis of deliveries from the ~~Mess~~ Farm. Some of these were expressed in lbs. and it was necessary to convert to number of head on basis of documents available either in the Farm Section or the Cost Section. This record was reconciled both with the report from the Farm and with the record of the Cost Section which was prepared from Farm reports.

Assuming that reports of purchases, death losses, surveys, shipments, and inventory are correct, the accounting can be expressed as follows:

Slaughtered and delivered to Mess	560
Surveyed	16
Deaths not surveyed	13
Shipments to Heart Mountain	30
Inventory	759
TOTAL	1378
NET OVERAGE	14 head

The difference between the 517 originally reported as slaughtered and the 560 shown as slaughtered are as follows:

Basic report of slaughter	517
Slaughtered during period April 24 thru April 27 verified by Mess Section as received May 1st *	29
Cattle delivered to Mess July 21, 1943, originally shown in lbs. but number of head not credited	3
Difference in deliveries during December. Original audit report shows total of 69 but, since it did not reconcile with custom slaughter and Farm slaughter records which showed 59, difference disallowed in basic report	10
Difference in total records thru Dec. 31st which could not be reconciled because of difference in method of accumulating basic records and absence of auditors' work sheet	1
TOTAL	560

It will be noted that, if these figures are accepted as conclusive, there is a total overage of project cattle of 14 head. Because of the long period covered by this analysis, it is impossible to make a definite statement as to the reason for this overage. However, it might have occurred because of any one or any combination of the following:

(1) It is possible that calves born last year and which were not reported as births might have been included in the inventory as steers or cows.

(2) It is possible that calves which were born and died prior to the inventory were reported as surveyed losses but not reported as births.

(3) It is possible that an occasional stray might have been included in the inventory.

(4) It is possible that an occasional stray might have been included in the slaughter during the year.

(5) It is possible that some deaths might have been reported in the monthly reports more than once.

Another indicator that the slaughter during the period covered approximated the revised figures shown above is as follows:

In the basic report it was reported that there were 544 head slaughtered during the period. However, there was no inventory of hides shown as of May 1, and we find that on May 6 there were sold 15 hides which very evidently resulted from slaughter which occurred prior to May 1. These, therefore, should be added in order to arrive at the slaughter which occurred prior to May 1. An independent check made from Project Cost Section's records including the 15 hides mentioned shows a total of 558 hides sold. The auditors' basic report showed 544 hides sold. Adding the 15 in question, the auditors' report would show 559, or within one (1) of reconciling with the report referred to above. According to information reported concerning hides, the following indicates the status of hide records:

Hides secured from 2 cattle which died of natural causes	2	
Hides secured from cattle slaughtered and delivered to Mess	560	
TOTAL Hides to be accounted for		562
Hides shown as sold		558
DIFFERENCE		4

At this writing there has been no effort made to determine the disposition of these 4 hides.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion it is believed that a careful review should be made of reported death losses in order to remove any possible duplications and to assure that actual death losses are surveyed as promptly as possible. Furthermore, as a basis for future record subject to adjustments as might occur by review of surveys, the project should officially be considered as being 14 head of cattle long on May 1. This figure should be adjusted downward by any duplications found in the survey, and the net overage when determined by the above analysis should be picked up on the project records by a Receiving Report.

- - - -

* The difference in the project records and the auditors' report appears to have resulted from the question of the status of 29 head of cattle slaughtered on the 24th, 25th, 26th, and 27th of April. In reconciling the

records there was found an entry carried both by the Mess Section and the Cost Section for the receipt of 29 head of beef in the Mess on May 1. The Receiving Report in question was verified by us and at the same time in a summary sheet prepared by the Farm Section there was claimed a slaughter of 29 head of cattle as of the week ending April 29. In order to reconcile this, the slaughter tickets for the period in question were examined, and there were found 4 tickets which evidently had not been included in the Agriculture Section report from which the auditors had prepared their April slaughter record. The tickets in question were separate and apart from other April tickets, and until it was determined that the Mess Section had actually received the beef, no credit had been allowed.

The Receiving Report on which the 29 cattle in question were recorded in the Mess was originally identified as No. M-4550. On examination of the report showing this number it was found that it had been issued for a receipt of eggs from the Lamar Produce Company. Upon inquiry of the Property Officer of the Mess Section, it was found that the ticket had originally been numbered as 4550, but because of a change in numbering systems whereby Tally Ins for Farm produced goods would be registered in a separate series, it had been registered in a new register book as PP 1. In order to assure the existence and the consistency of this type of transaction, we examined both the register and the perpetual inventory card for beef to assure that receipts of beef on and after May 1 had actually been handled in a separate Tally In series as stated. All indications are that the 4 slaughter tickets in question had either not been turned in by the slaughter section or had not been picked up on the records of the Agriculture Section up to the date of the inventory in question.

COPY

B

July 26, 1944

Mr. James G. Lindley
Project Director
Granada Relocation Center
Amache, Colorado

Dear Mr. Lindley:

In my letter of July 8, I commented on several items in connection with my visit to your center, particularly labor and livestock records.

On July 17 you wrote me taking exception to my comments with reference to possibilities of shifts from certain activities into agriculture and public works. My original comments were purely in the form of a suggestion. If the suggestions are unworkable and you are satisfied that the people who are working in mess or in the offices are incapable of doing any work on the outside, then I have no further comments to make. It so happens, of course, that on a number of centers more than half of the workers on the farm are woman.

I know of at least three centers at present who have attempted a plan similar to what was discussed with you and your staff during my visit and was later covered in a memorandum from the Director and results have been exceedingly worthwhile on these other centers. However, they may not be successful on your center. I agree with you entirely that solution does not lie in setting up priority and transferring personnel from work which they are willing to do to work that they do not care to do, if the proposal is made on an arbitrary basis. It will only work if representatives of the evacuees are convinced that there are needed adjustments in labor and that there is a job either in the construction program or in your agricultural program that is a definite responsibility of the people on the center.

There is, I think, a big difference betwe n appealing to your block managers for additional labor to help out on some particular critical work as compared to sitting down with them and attempting to analyze the problems and the responsibilities which they have on the center and getting their suggestions on how improvements in labordistribution can be made in an effort to carry out all the necessary work.

I agree entirely with your handling of the work in the carpenter shop where appointed personnel were building crates in which to ship out evacuee property. This again, I think, points to the need for a definite understanding and consultation with the evacuee representatives in outlining the jobs which are their responsibility or the joint responsibility of the evacuees and the staff.

On July 20 we received a report on the work which has been done in reconciling the hog and poultry inventories. I believe that you have clarified many of the points in connection with the previously noted discrepancies. These reports again point out the importance of keeping our records current and of setting up our survey procedure in such a way that it can operate currently. In both poultry and hogs, you have a very substantial number of animals or birds for which post surveys were executed. By that, I mean that the surveys ere compiled long after the actual losses were sustained. It is this particular point that I am sure will be corrected in the future so that our records at the end of each month will show the actual numbers of liestock on hand the disposition of the livestock for the previous month, whether through slaughter, survey or otherwise.

In summarizing the conclusions which we reached in your office with Messrs. Halliday and Spencer, it is understood that no beef cattle will be produced and shipped to Heart Mountain for their use. It was also understood that $12,000 was to be made available to you for the first quarter instead of the $25,000 originally requested for the purchase of cattle to meet the needs of your center. It was also recommended that you buy cattle weighing from 550 to 650 pounds on which substantial gains could be made with the feed available on the center, rather than to buy 900 to 1100 pound cattle as has been the practice in quite a number of cases.

Plans should be developed on the basis of a stable slaughtering program rather than on the basis of stable buying program. These lighter weight cattle will be fattened and read to slaughter during the period after your present heavy cattle are slaughtered and before the time the calves which were dropped last winter and this spring will be ready for use. I would suggest also that your reduce or eliminate the comparatively heavy fattening program which has been carried on in the past with regard to beef cattle. The type of grass which was on your bottom pastures did not give you a very good finish on your beef animals. Since the labor situation on your center does not permit you to harvest the alfalfa hay in the customary manner, I would like to recommend that you put more of your livestock on the alfalfa pastures. They will make satisfactory gains and reduce the amount of dry lot feeding of your cattle. To date I have had no reports on the success of your original venture in alfalfa pasturing. I hope that it has not been unsuccessful.

With regard to the purchase of hogs, I would again like to recommend that you do not buy any hogs lighter than 60 pounds and preferably around 80 to 90 pounds. Buying hogs of this weight will permit you to use a comparatively short period for breaking in to garbage feeding. Beyond that time, it should not be necessary, except in unusual cases, to feed grain during the balance of the feeding period. I believe that many of the so-called cheap hogs which have been bought at the local auctions have been the most expensive hogs which you have purchased when your losses and DISEASE INFEstation are considered. I would like to suggest that you buy your hogs either directly off the farms in the general vicinity of the center or that you purchase from a reputable order buyer rather than to continue to visit and purchase from the auctions. I discussed this with Messrs. Spencer and Halliday in considerable detail.

Referring to poultry, I believe we were in substantial agreement that no additional poultry facilities would be constructed at this time and that the four houses which are now available would be used to capacity for this fall and winter. While 3,200 laying hens would only supply approximately one-fourth or one-third of your egg requirements, I doubt that we are justified in attempting to go beyond this number. As soon as your meat birds are ready for slaughter, I would like to suggest that you continue slaughtering until everything is cleaned up except the 3,200 laying hens, and that you carry these through until February or March and then begin to cull your layers until you have slaughtered the entire flock. Considering the very heavy losses in poultry during the past year, your problems of management, and your labor situation, I would like to recommend that no poultry be produced on the center next year.

Mr. Spencer indicated that you might have available on your farm some surplus vegetables, particularly potatoes. As soon as you have reasonably definite indications as to the extent of your surplus, I will appreciate it very much if you will notify us so that we can make arrangements for shipment to other centers, or if none of the other centers are in need of potatoes at that time, we will authorize you to sell the surplus. No surplus should be allowed to go to waste. Whatever amounts can be pickled or canned should be disposed of in that manner and the balance sold, in the event you have less than car load lots which might be shipped to other relocation centers.

All centers, I believe, are producing sufficient daikon for their own use and it is the policy of the Authority not to ship melons to other centers. Care should be taken in the sale of produce that a fair price is received, considering quality, so that we will not be subject to the just criticism of undersélling other local producers, to say nothing of the economic disadvantages to the government.

We received this morning a copy of the agreement between a local man and your office contracting the sale of mixed wheat and rye, and of barley. While we have no indication of the quality or yield anticipated on these fields, the price quoted of $.60 per bushel would appear to be highly advantageous to the purchaser rather than to the Government. I understand that you have been ~~xxxx~~ having a considerable amount of rain which has interfered with the harvesting of the alfalfa crop. I hope that on the second cutting you will be much more successful both as to timing and as to weather conditions.

We also discussed the question of agricultural plans for the crop year, 1945, and it was agreed that you would make a careful survey of your needs for a year from this summer and fall, taking into consideration your vegetable program, beef cattle and hogs, and determine as nearly as possible what your actual needs will be for agricultural land for next year. Your feed crop acreage can be reduced very substantially, since you will have no poultry to feed and will be using the minumum amount of grain for both your hogs and beef cattle. Careful study should be made of the center lands and determine how many acres will be required to carry out your agricultural production program. A selection of these lands should be as close to the center as possible. The balance of the land should be reported to the Director as surplus to your needs so that we may take the necessary steps to dispose of the excess agricultural land.

It is our plan as soon as you can provide this information, which we hope will be during September or early October, to take steps to relieve the center of the responsibilities for the balance of this land. This action should relieve you of a great deal of responsibility and should make the securing of the necessary labor for operating the balance of the land much easier. I hope that it will be possible to confine our farming operations to approximately the souty half of the Koen ranch. I believe, if it is possible to carry ~~xx~~ out the above recommendations, much will have been accomplished for a more satisfactory farm program at Granada. I recognize the very real difficulties which Mr. Spencer and your staff have faced last year and to a much greater extent this year.