



ANNUAL REPORT 2007 FIFTH ANNIVERSARY EDITION

LOOKING BACK OVER FIVE YEARS (AND AHEAD . . .)

ust over fifteen years ago in the fall of 1992, I met Craig Woodson in the local NRCS office in Sheridan. He had just purchased a ranch in our small community. Little did I know that through that chance meeting I would embark on an adventure of renovation, conservation, education



and perspective? Craig and Martha are, to say the least, passionate about their ranch in the Ruby Valley. Over the past years, they have poured their heart and soul and a good deal of their financial assets into the enhancement of what everyone has come to know as the "Woodson Ranch". Those of you who have had the opportunity to visit the ranch know full well the result of their efforts. The property is an incomparable jewel of diversity in uses and habitats. Agricultural, wildlife and recreational opportunities are shared by family, neighbors, friends and community.

Over the years, I became fully aware that the Woodson's had a driving conservation ethic and a love for the Ruby Valley. Yet, in spite of my long term relationship with Craig and Martha, I was unprepared for the level of foresight and generosity they displayed in the fall of 2002 with the creation of the Ruby Habitat Foundation. Five years later I am still amazed.

It is difficult to express in words the extent of my respect and enthusiasm for what has happened and my anticipation for what is yet to come. The creation of the Foundation assures that the Woodson Ranch will remain intact and the family and community will enjoy the benefits of the conservation efforts taken to date. But the contributions of the Foundation are much broader then that. The property is an unparalleled showcase of possibilities for land owners large and small. Educational, recreational, agricultural, wildlife and residential uses coexist on the ranch in sustainable fashion. The ongoing projects detailed in this annual report are a testament to the Woodson's and the Foundation's commitment to demonstrating what time, effort, creativity and an open mind can achieve.

Craig's wisdom in seeking out an alliance with a highly respected conservation organization cannot be undervalued. The Foundation's association with the Montana Land Reliance has proven to be invaluable. Their encouragement and advice have contributed to the Foundation's success in no small measure. I want to extend my deep gratitude to the Directors, the Board and the staff of the Montana Land Reliance for their support and assistance over these past five years.

I hope you will take time to thoroughly review this 5th Anniversary Annual Report. Once again, the talented Dr. Samuel Corl III has created an outstanding summation of our past year. We are off to a good start, but there is much yet to achieve in our effort to preserve and enhance conservation values of this great area. I hope you will choose to partner with RHF, MLR and the Woodsons as we strive to maintain the integrity of our western landscape and heritage.

Les Gilman



Spring at "Woodson Ranch"

A s Martha and I sit here in our Ft. Worth home on a cool January morning over breakfast and the morning papers listening to CNN report about the New Hampshire primaries, our gaze is drawn occasionally to a photograph of the entry to our ranch sitting on the table taken by Colter Kenworthy a student in Sheridian. He captured two pheasants sitting on the crossbar of the entry as well as two in the road and one in the grass. A deer is also feeding.



The beauty and tranquility we enjoy is the reason we called the Montana Land Reliance six years ago with our desire and dream to preserve the ranch to share with others, our children, and grandchildren. Bill Long and Rock Ringling, executive directors of MLR, came to meet with us. At our first meeting, we outlined our desire to create a support foundation, The Ruby Habit Foundation, to MLR. Our desire was for RHF to come into being as soon as possible with the goal of being the recipient of the ranch and endowment at my death. In the interim, I would operate and be responsible for all costs of the ranch. In order to answer questions that MLR might have and those Martha and I, as well as members of our family might also have, we would be experimenting with dual use of the recreational aspects of the ranch and ironing out any wrinkles during this period. All parties have participated with few conflicts. Dual Use works.

While it was not part of our original plan, we have subsequently remolded the Hill House for the use of the foundation and it seems to stay in constant use.

The foundation has been fortunate to have several things fall into place in the past five years. It has been under the very able direction of Les Gilman as executive director. George Swan joined the board and became president for our first five years. Neil Barnosky, another board member has agreed to be our next president. Both Neil and George are ranchers and long time residents of the Ruby Valley. Along with these friends and with the support of Rock Ringling and Roy O'Connor, board members representing the Montana Land Reliance, we feel confident that RHF and the ranch will be able to continue to accomplish our goals.

Les and Neil have combined with the NRCS to have two projects of interest and benefit to all ranchers in the area adding to the store of knowledge and experience. It is open to everyone to see, as well be available at the NRCS office.

My personal experiments with native plants and habitat have been my hobby and yielded results that with time I hope will encourage others, including new residents to help beautify the valley. Martha and I envision every one supporting our rural life style and its heritage and adding their bit of habitat and beauty whether by planting native plants such as Blue Flax, Blanket Flower and Indian Rice Grass or establishing a perennial native sunflower patch.

In short, these years have been rewarding, full of surprises and pleasures. We look forward in the coming years to continuing work toward these goals throughout the Ruby Valley and southwest Montana.



Craíg Woodson

Winter on the Ruby River

his being the 5th anniversary of the Ruby Habitat Foundation, the Board of Directors can look back with pride and a sense of accomplishment that the Foundation is up and running, and moving toward the goals that have been established. Although all members of the Board have provided insight and dedication to the principles and objectives set forth in the mission statement, we would have never advanced to our present condition without the zeal and passion brought to the table by Craig and Martha Woodson.

The Woodsons exemplify and exhibit what it takes in leadership & vision to preserve and protect the valley's wildlife and agriculture while maintaining the integrity of the land.

The Montana Land Reliance has been, and continues to be, instrumental in guiding the Foundation through these formative years offering both assistance with fund raising, as well as expert advice on the use of easements as a tool for the continued preservation of the Ruby Valley.

In closing out my thoughts on these first 5 years, I think it's appropriate to commend Les Gilman of Ranch Resources for his dedicated efforts in keeping the Board on track as well as handling the many essential details & projects we constantly ask him to perform.

I look forward to the ensuing years with great expectation and confidence that RHF will be an important factor in the preservation of our spectacular surroundings in southwest Montana.

You are invited to come and witness the many projects that are underway on the ranch. It's an interesting and exciting experience.

n September 9, 2002 The Board of MLR voted to work with Craig and Martha Woodson on the formation of the Ruby Habitat Foundation. The five years since the formation of the Foundation has been more like the melding of families, than two separate non-profits. MLR has benefited tremendously from the relationship with Ruby Habitat foundation both on a personal level and a professional level. It's hard to quantify the values of sitting in Craig and Martha living room at the ranch and talking about the Ruby Valley, or the experience of driving around Woodson ranch listening to Craig and Les Gilman talk about ranch management and native grass plantings. Easier to quantify is the investment others are making in the foundation from financial gifts, art work or books and fly rods. These individuals are seeing the potential for the Foundation to effect real change in the Ruby Valley, they see the vision so well articulated by the Woodsons and the foundations roll in that vision. The Montana Land Reliance is happy to be a part of all the activities taking place on and off the ranch.





Montana's State Flower The Bitterroot







INTENSIVE GRAZING, FORAGE VARIETIES COMPARISON

A great deal of work has already been done on the benefits and methods of intensive grazing (confining a relative large number of livestock on a small area for a short period of time). Our ongoing project is attempting to determine which plant varieties, suited to our climate, will respond most favorably to this practice. Eight small pastures were seeded in the spring of 2005 and allowed to become established. During the growing seasons of 2006 & 2007, these pastures were grazed with a small herd of cattle on a rotational basis with each pasture being grazed for three days and allowed to rest for twenty-one days before being grazed again. Forage and fecal samples were taken from each pasture and analyzed to determine quantity and quality of the forage and potential rates of gain for the cattle. Results from the first two years have been compiled by the local Natural Resource Conservation Service and shared with area producers.

The Goals and Objectives of the project are to:

- Showcase different species for irrigated pasture
- Monitor protein and energy through the growing season for different species by using fecal analysis
- Monitor re-growth potential for different species
- Monitor production for different species
- Showcase intensive grazing on irrigated pastures
- Meet producers cattle production goal of 2.5 lbs/day
- Showcase intensive grazing on irrigated pastures

Cell Number: 9 Cell Number: 8 Cell Number: 7 Cell Number: 6 Cell Number: 5 Cell Number: 3 Cell Number: 2 Cell Number: 1

Woodson Ranch Grazing Trial Map

	Plant Types	Seeding Rate	2007 est. rate of gain	2007 production
Cell 1	Standard pasture mix	18 lbs/acre	3.5 lbs/day	2880 lbs/ acre
Cell 2	Tall Fescue - Fawn	4 lbs/acre	2.9 lbs/day	4080 lbs/ acre
Cell 3	Orchard Grass - Latar	10 lbs/acre	3.6 lbs/day	3000 lbs/ acre
Cell 4	Meadow Brome - Paddock	10 lbs/acre	3.7 lbs/day	2960 lbs/ acre
Cell 5	Russian Wildrye - BoZoisky and Alfalfa - Spreader 3.	Wildrye 3 lbs/ acre, Alfalfa 9 lbs/ acre.	3.8 lbs/day	6200 lbs/ acre
Cell 6	Creeping Foxtail - Garrison and Cicer Milk Vetch - Oxley	Garrison 11 lbs/ acre, Milk Vetch 6 lbs/acre	3.3 lbs/day	3200 lbs/ acre
Cell 7	Beardless Wildrye - Shoshone and White Clover - Alice	Wildrye 14 lbs/ acre, Clover 4 lbs/ acre	failed stand	stand failed
Cell 8	Tall Fescue - Fawn, Orchard Grass - Latar, Meadow Brome - Paddock	Fescue 5 lbs/ acre, Orchard 4 lbs/ acre, Brome 10 lbs/ acre	3.1 lbs/day	2520 lbs/ acre
Cell 9	Control cell with old hay stand that has gone wild	NA	3.2 lbs/day	4480 lbs/ acre

Actual gain for the steers in 2006 = 2.56 lbs/day

- Gained 11,037 lbs on 25.6 acres in 2007
- Actual gain for the steers in 2007 = 2.97 lbs/day
- A difference of .41 lbs/day

• At \$1.00/lb, gross income was \$431/acre

LOW INPUT CATTLE PRODUCTION

The Challenge

R anchers live and work in a production driven sector of the economy. Historically, cattle producers have been motivated to maximize the weaning weights of our calves since our commodity, beef, is sold by the pound. The heavier the weaning weight, the bigger the paycheck. Ever increasing input costs for labor and supplemental feed are driving producers to take a harder look at the cost of production. Sustainability in the business requires that we consider profit as well as production.

The largest single annual input in the cow-calf enterprise is forage. A cow consumes approximately 3% of her body weight each day. A 1200 pound cow, which these days is a small cow, requires about 36 pounds of forage a day regardless of whether she harvests it herself or if it is delivered to her in the form of a hay bale. A cow's nutritional requirements increase incrementally as calving season approaches and it peaks right at calving. The post-partum period requires that the cow be in good condition to produce milk for the calf, recover from calving and prepare to rebreed in three months. To accomplish this with the traditional February/March calvers in Montana, the cows require a large amount of good quality hay before and after calving. A low input herd calves in May and June and can harvest the required nutrients during this critical period directly from green grass, which happens to be in its most productive and nutritious stage of growth. The trade off is younger calves and lighter weaning weights. For a low input program to be successful, these reductions must be offset by more calves weaned for every cow exposed to the bull and less input cost for each cow.

When considering the viability of becoming a low input producer, a variety of factors weigh into the decision an individual producer must make regarding calving dates and resulting inputs. The large amount of forage available in the higher country of Montana is only available as summer forage. In order to make use of this forage while accomplishing herd management objectives, operators have been motivated to have the cows "calved out" and "bred up" prior to moving to the mountains. A breeding season in April, May and June means a calving season in January, February and March. Another significant challenge comes in providing adequate amounts of nutritious "standing" forage for the winter months. The allocation of available labor and the wise use of ranch assets and infrastructure must also be considered.

The Project

F or the past three years, we have run a small herd of cattle on the Woodson Ranch. They have been grazed year round and received no harvested forage (hay). The cattle calve on-their-own beginning May 15th. In the fall of the year the herd receives the recommended vaccinations, the cows are pregnancy checked and the calves are separated from the cows (weaned). The labor, equipment, infrastructure and supplemental feed inputs are kept to a minimum.

The 15 mature cows, which were late calving cows from two separate "traditional" herds, came to the ranch in the early spring of 2005. These cows were exposed to bulls for late spring calving in 2006. When the cows were pregnancy checked in the fall of 2005, 5 of the 15 cows (33%) were not pregnant. It was believed that the exceptionally poor conception rate could be attributed to the age of the cows (older), and an inability for some of the cows to adapt to the new situation. Additional late calving cows from the control herds replaced these open cows. The cows did not receive any harvested hay or other supplements in the winter of 2005/06.

Every cow delivered and raised a live calf in the spring and summer of 2006. However, when the cows were pregnancy checked in the fall of 2006, 5 of the 15 were once again found to be open. Inherent fertility problems in the late calving cows from the control herds and in the bulls used, were considered as potential contributing factors, as was the lack of supplemental mineral in the diet. Cows from the control herds once again replaced the open cows. The calves were weaned on Dec. 12th and the steer and heifer calves combined averaged 567 pounds. The calves were retained with the steers destined for an intensive grazing program on the Woodson Ranch and eventual slaughter and the heifers for herd replacements.

The herd was wintered on the Woodson ranch over the 2006/07 winter and did not receive any harvested hay but did have the benefit of a mineral supplement. All of the cows once again delivered a live calf. One cow/ calf pair was removed from the program due to a case of mastitis but they were replaced with another pair. Two bulls were fertility tested and found fertile prior to introducing them to the herd in late August. When the cows were pregnancy checked in December of 2007, all of the mature cows and all of the replacement heifers were confirmed pregnant. The calves were weaned and weighed on December 31st and the steer and heifer calves combined averaged 512 pounds. One poor doing steer calf significantly affected the weaning weight average.

The Results

A generally accepted standard of performance in the beef industry is "pounds of calf weaned per cow exposed to the bull," and profitability is a measure of success in any business. In the tables below, these standards are compared. If projections are correct, we could see a five fold increase in net income per cow compared to traditional high input cattle production."

Table 1	Та	bl	e	1
---------	----	----	---	---

	Low Input Herd 2006	Low Input Herd 2007	
% calves weaned/cow exposed	66% (5 of 15 open)	60% (5 open & 1 mastitis)	
Pounds of average calf weaned/cow exposed	567#x66%=374.22	512#x60%=307.2	
Average steer/heifer calf price *	\$1.2165/lb for 567 lb calf	\$1.244/lb for 512 lb calf	
Income/cow exposed	\$455.24	\$382.16	
Value of grazing inputs/cow	12mo.x\$20/mo.= \$240	12mo.x\$20/mo.= \$240	
Value of hay inputs/cow	outs/cow none none		
Value of annual labor inputs/cow (1 full time employee with associated costs)**			
Value of breeding inputs/cow	\$25	\$25	
Vet expense/cow	\$15	\$15	
Mineral expense/cow	none	.05/dayx365= \$18.25	
Annualized investment in cow (depre- ciation & interest)	\$120	\$120	
Expenses/cow exposed	\$440	\$458.25	
Net Income/cow exposed	\$15.24	-\$76.09	

The Control herds are operating under more traditional late winter/early spring calving scenarios beginning February 20th. The Projected herd is what we hope for and anticipate now that the cows are adapted to the program.

	Low Input Herd 2008 Projected	Control Herd Ave.		
% calves weaned/cow exposed	90%	86%		
Pounds of average calf weaned/cow exposed	540#x90%=486	610#x86%=524.6		
Average steer/heifer calf price *	\$1.23/lb for 540 lb calf	\$1.195/lb for 610 lb calf		
Income/cow exposed	\$597.78	\$626.90		
Value of grazing inputs/cow	12mo.x\$20/mo.= \$240	7.5mo.x\$20/mo.= \$150		
Value of hay inputs/cow @35#/day	none	4.5mo.=2.3625tonx\$85= \$201		
Value of annual labor inputs/cow (1 full time employee with associated costs)**	\$40,000/1000 cows = \$40	\$40,000/500 cows= \$80		
Value of breeding inputs/cow	\$25	\$25		
Vet expense/cow	\$15	\$15		
Mineral expense/cow	.05/dayx365= \$18.25	.05/dayx180days= \$9.00		
Annualized investment in cow (depre- ciation & interest)	\$120	\$120		
Expenses/cow exposed	\$458.25	\$600		
Net Income/cow exposed	\$139.53	\$26.90		

Table 2

*The price is based on the average value of a steer and a heifer weighing 500# for fall delivery at \$1.25 per pound. To adjust this price for heavier calves, a "slide" of .05 cents per pound for every pound over 500 has been imposed.

**The value of the labor inputs is difficult to calculate, but the basic assumption here is that the summer calving cows will require about one half of the labor per cow as the control herd.

MANAGED WINTER GRAZING

The goal of this project is to determine if the production of standing or stockpiled forage of high quality and sufficient quantity to meet winter carry over needs is possible, practical and sustainable for the Ruby Valley and Southwest Montana. (Stockpiling is the practice of allowing a hay field or pasture to regrow during mid-summer or early fall so forage is available for grazing later in the season. The practice is also known as deferred grazing and aftermath grazing.) We would like to determine if managed grazing of stockpiled forage can save on feed costs while providing high quality and quantity of feed for animals during the winter. In this project we will analyze the quality and quantity of stockpiled winter forage typically available to livestock. Fecal samples will be collected to determine nutrient levels provided by the different forage varieties. Data will also be collected to analyze the subject forages for suitability as hay and summer forages and as wildlife habitat along the field borders and ungrazed areas.

To initiate this project, samples of a variety of forages which we are considering for this project were sampled in late January and sent to SDK Laboratories in Kansas for analysis. The results are as follows:

Forage	Good Quality Grass Hay	Tall Wheatgrass	Great Basin Wildrye	Smooth Brome	Cicer Milkvetch
% Crude Protein	10.8	2.35	4.89	3.28	12.92
% ADF (Acid Deter- gent Fiber)	29.4	45.91	46.62	46.76	29.83
% TDN (Total Di- gestable Nutrients)	56.9	40.57	39.61	39.42	62.28

We have been wintering the low input cow herd on standing winter forage the past two winters and this year we are wintering the yearling steers as well. Late fall weights and early spring weights on the yearlings will be used to determine rates of gain resulting from wintering on standing forage.



Great Basin Wildrye being stockpiled for winter use as standing forage (Gin a body meet a body Coming thro' the rye . . .)

VEGETATION PROJECTS

e continue to experiment with various vegetation practices on the Woodson Ranch, in an attempt to perfect sustainable methods of meeting our management goals. We are practicing no-till farming when possible. We are working on establishing perennial wildlife food and cover plots on field borders and corners. We continue to work on reestablishing native plant communities. We share our findings with the community and engage them for their ideas and support.

In the fall of 2006 we seeded a couple of small plots of the Medicine Creek cultivar of a perennial sunflower known as Maximillian along with another variety known as Stiff. We had previously attempted to use the Aztec and Prairie Gold cultivars of the Maximillian and had met with little success. Craig's persistence was rewarded in the spring and summer of 2007 with a strong early germination and a dazzling display of color when they began to bloom in mid August. Planted in a community with the early maturing Indian Rice Grass, this combination promises



Maximillian Sunflower

to be aesthetically pleasing and extremely functional as wildlife food and cover. The plots were frequented by pheasants, honey bees, finches and rabbits. Due to the high protein content and palatability of the leaves, buds, blossoms and seeds, we found it necessary to fence the plots to prevent excessive deer impacts. In the fall of 2007 we planted several additional plots and look forward to the contributions they will make to the overall quality habitat that visitors and wildlife enjoy on the ranch.

Two new native plant reestablishment plots were planted in the fall of 2006 and we are pleased with their promise. Native plant communities are slow to establish and are subject to competition from invasive weeds and introduced grasses. We have opted to practice mechanical rather than chemical weed control on these plots and are looking forward to the results in the 2008 season. We are planting native communities to provide some diversity in wildlife habitat and showcase alternatives to traditional introduced plant communities.



Birds do it, bees do it, even mooses on the ranch do it . . .

RHF SUPPORTERS

Sarah Barton Gale & Charles R. Beamon M.D. Diana & Richard Beattie Laura & Gerald A. Bellotti M.D. Jane & Oliver Birckhead Allen Bjergo Douglas M. Booth Linda Hale Bucklin Luana & Gregor Campbell Eric Carson Molly & Jason Carrico Nancy & Michael L. Cherwek M.D. Samuel Corl III R. Reynolds Cowles Jr. D.V.M. Mina & Millard Cox Cherly & John Dale Frederick Danziger Daniel Davis M.D. Rutledge H. Deas Jr. Dr. Dickson Despommier A. Newton Dilley Elise R. Donohue Barbi & Thomas E. Donnelley J. Michael Edwards Mark & Carol Engebretson **Richard & Sherrie Fast** Chad & Paige Foster William R. Fraser Mike Fray Ph.D. Kenneth & Cherrie Garrett Mike & Barbara Gettelman Duke Gilman Joseph & Barbara Gillispie Bruce Gottwald Fredrick Goldberg Bruce Gottwald Dennis J. Grundman John R. Green Leslie & Nick Hanauer Jan & Frank Higgins Carl M. Hillendahl Susan & Duane Jacklin Linda & C. Todd Jessell Joan Kanouse Katherine & Robert Kaufman Thomas Keifer

Stephanie & Curtis Kruer Ron T. Kunkel Diane & John Leicham John Leonard Steve Liebmann Anne & Richard Lower Jennifer & Patrick K. McClellan Elizabeth Ann & Phillip McCrury Robin & David Mitts Lisa & Russell Mitts Barrett M. & Louise Morris James Mossop Ben Nardi & Ashley **Richard Norton** Roy O'Connor Tommy O'Connor J. R. Oosting D.D.S. Harry A. Parks Judy & Steve Parks Steve E. Parks Jr. Janis & Terry Phillips Cynthia & Henry Poett III John Pohl Krista & John Sampson Phillip Sasser Robert Schermer Barbara & Robert Schoenfeld Gary P. Skinner Judith & Peter R. Smith M.D. Peter Solomon **Dale Spartas** Marolyn Stanley Susan & William W. Taylor III Kent Vana Leslie & Steven Vanderpool Marica & James Vogt Jane Waldie Jan & James Wallace John M. Warren Jeremy G. Wilson Mary & Charles Wintzer Nancy & Doug Wolcott Frances & James Wood Jeni & Steve Wood Craig Woodson Martha Woodson

Campbell-Logan Bindery, Inc. Elise R. Donohue Charitable Trust Fidelity Charitable Gift Fund Frontier Anglers Gettelman Philanthropic Fund **HAP** Foundation Headwaters Realty Jewish Community Endowment Fund John M. Warren, Inc. Montana Land Reliance P & J Ranches Ramsey Rod Ruby Springs Lodge Sweetgrass Rods LLC SaltChuck Resources Shaun Jeszenka Outfitting Sonoran Institute Taylor Family Fund The Braewold Foundation The Community Foundation for the National Capital Region The Donnelley Foundation The Kenneth & Cherrie Garrett Foundation

In Memoriam

Mike Allen J.C. Chapmas Dr. Emory Davenport David D. Hunting Jack Hutchinson Bud Kanouse David Rossiter William "Dan" Simpson, M.D. John Subak Scott Waldie



Co-inspirators, Craig and Martha Woodson

Ruby Habitat Foundation 2006 Financials

2006 General Fund

Income: \$ 139,503

Expense: <u>\$ 40,1</u>35

Net Income:

General Fund Cash on Hand:

Pays the day-to-day expenses that finance the operation of the foundation.

Rural Heritage & Open Lands Fund: \$ 84,302

Designed to provide funding for outreach and land conservation efforts. General fund surpluses and designated gifts create the balance of this account.

Hill Education & Outreach Endowment: 13,198 \$

Income finances conservation education and outreach to landowners and the general public. These funds come from specifically designated gifts.

Woodson Ranch Endowment:

The income from the corpus will be used for operation and maintenance of the Woodson Ranch, to ensure its protection and continued viability. The ranch is home to the foundation and its research efforts. The principal for this endowment, as well as current ranch operating capital, is being provided by Craig Woodson.

Other Assets (Equipment, Art and Books) \$ 29,016

Total Assets as of 12-31-06:

RHF is a 509(a)(3) tax-exempt support organization to the Montana Land Reliance, a 501(c)(3) corporation. Our Tax identification number is 45-0487621. Each entity is audited annually and independently by Junkermier, Clark, Campanella, Stevens, P.C. Audit copies are available upon request.

"The foundation is doing an immense service for all of us who take delight in Montana and its natural beauty." J. Michael Edwards, Columbia, South Carolina

"It is rewarding in these days when so much focus in on disruptive and alarming events to be reminded that there are many people who in quiet ways continue to put hopes for the future above their current desires. It seems to me that the Foundation - sparked by the altruism of the Woodsons- is doing just that," Rosemary Bowler, Boca Grande, Florida

Photo Credits - Ben Nardi: Front Cover, Craig Woodson, p. 3; Winter on the Ruby River, p. 3 and Moose and Twins, p. 9; Les Gilman: Spring at Woodson Ranch, p. 2; Bitterroot, p. 4; Grazing cows, pages 6-7; Maximillian Sunflower, p. 9; Dale Spartas: Craig and Martha Woodson, p.10; Sam Corl: Les Gilman coming thro' the rye, p.8, Moonrise Over the Ruby Valley, Rear Cover. **Betty Swan**: George Swan, p. 4. Picture of Rock Ringling on p. 4 courtesy of MLR.

\$ 66,501

\$ 220,641

\$ 413,658

\$ 99,368

RUBY HABITAT

Land owners and resource managers are inherently bound to a high level of resource accountability. We are bound by law to protect the environment and prevent resource degradation, but we have a higher obligation to be good stewards of our natural resources, sharing them today and preserving them for future generations. The decisions we make and the actions we take affect our own environment as well as that of the wildlife, our neighbors and future generations. (Craig Woodson, founder RHF)

> 2597 Hwy 287 • P.O. Box 638 Sheridan, MT 59749 P: 406-842-5010 F: 406-842-5910 www.rubyhabitat.org