

# Erratum

**Sprinkle, J., M. Holder, C. Erickson, A. Medina, D. Robinett, G. Ruyle, J. Maynard, S. Tuttle, J. Hays, Jr., W. Meyer, S. Stratton, A. Rogstad, K. Eldredge, J. Harris, L. Howery, and W. Sprinkle. Dutchwoman Butte Revisited. *Rangelands* 29(6):21–34.**

*To the Editor:*

It has recently been brought to our attention that there were some errors made in Table 2 of our recent December 2007 *Rangelands* article entitled, “Dutchwoman Butte Revisited: examining paradigms for livestock grazing exclusion.” Specifically, errors were made in listing the organic carbon and organic matter percentages for the respective soil horizons. We also need to clarify some of our statements related to soil series classification and soil moisture regime.

We include a revised Table 2(rev) that reflects accurate data for respective horizons. The distribution of organic matter in Table 2(rev) is consistent with horizon depths as would be expected for Aridic Argiustolls. Percentages originally reported for each horizon were actually data from replicate “A” horizon samples referred to in text on page 26 and the values reported in the original text on page 26 were from soil profiles. These data were inadvertently switched. The sentence on page 26 should read “*Average organic carbon was 2.31% (3.92% organic matter) at DWB and 2.15% (3.66% organic matter) at WT.*” Additional clarification is provided in Table 2a, which shows the five values (shown in the original Table 2) plus the original “A” horizon samples from the soil pits. These additional data were collected 1) to obtain more reliable estimates of organic matter of the A horizons of respective sites, 2) to test for statistical differences in organic

matter between sites, and 3) to obtain estimates of sample variability. Given the management implications recited in Ambos et al. (2000), it was important to establish a reasonable basis for validation or rejection of their arguments, especially in light of their limited sample sizes and lack of data validation.

Related to soil moisture and classification, reference to an “aridic” soil moisture regime on page 23 is incorrect. The site has an Ustic moisture regime that is marginal to Aridic. Also the statement on page 25 under the heading *Soils* is incorrect: “In the field, soil pits dug on both sites were within the same soils classification and soils series.” Since there is no established soil series, the soils cannot be placed with the same series.

We regret our failure to insure proper data reporting in Sprinkle et al. (2007). Please accept our revised Table 2 and for clarity, Table 2a as an addendum to *Rangelands*. We apologize for any confusion that may have resulted from this error.

Sincerely,

A. L. Medina  
J. E. Sprinkle  
Other coauthors  
sprinkle@ag.arizona.edu

**Table 2 (rev). Soil characteristics**

Horizon	Depth, inches	% clay	% silt	% sand	Texture	pH	Organic carbon, %	Organic matter, %
Dutchwoman Butte relic area, Lab 1								
A	0–2	18	34	48	Loam	6.0		
AB	2–7	22	34	44	Loam	6.2		
Bt1	7–17	36	32	32	Clay Loam	6.0		
Bt2	17–26	58	26	16	Clay	6.0		
Bt3	26–36	64	18	18	Clay	6.0		
Dutchwoman Butte relic area, Lab 2								
A	0–2	17	39	44	Loam	6.0	2.912	4.95
AB	2–7	21	37.5	41.5	Loam	6.2	1.245	2.12
Bt1	7–17	36	30.5	33.5	Clay Loam	6.0	0.885	1.50
Bt2	17–26	53.5	30.5	16	Clay	6.0	0.866	1.47
Bt3	26–36					6.0	0.654	1.11
Whiskey Tank grazed companion site, Lab 1								
A	0–1	26	34	40	Loam	6.0		
Bt1	1–10	46	34	20	Clay	6.0		
Bt2	10–13	58	26	16	Clay	6.0		
Bt3	13–21	60	26	14	Clay	6.0		
Bt4	21–26	68	22	10	Clay	6.2		
Whiskey Tank grazed companion site, Lab 2								
A	0–1	23.5	58	18.5	Silty Loam	6.0	2.993	5.09
Bt1	1–10	43.75	33.25	23	Clay	6.0	1.413	2.40
Bt2	10–13	48.5	33	18.5	Clay	6.0	1.032	1.75
Bt3	13–21	56	28	16	Clay	6.0	1.123	1.91
Bt4	21–26					6.2	0.936	1.59

**Table 2a. Mean organic carbon (%) and mean organic matter (%) for the A horizon of the Dutchwoman Butte relict (ungrazed) and the Whiskey Tank (grazed) sites. Individual samples were composites of four sub-samples randomly selected over the site and total 24 samples per site**

Dutchwoman Butte, sample ID	Organic carbon, %	Organic matter, %	Whiskey Tank, sample ID	Organic carbon, %	Organic matter, %
DWB-1	1.907	3.24	WT-1	2.355	4.00
DWB-2	2.885	4.90	WT-2	1.897	3.22
DWB-3	1.782	3.03	WT-3	1.787	3.04
DWB-4	2.404	4.09	WT-4	2.396	4.07
DWB-5	1.959	3.33	WT-5	1.499	2.55
DWB-Pit	2.912	4.95	WT-Pit	2.993	5.09
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.92</b>	<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.66</b>
<b>SD</b>		<b>0.855</b>	<b>SD</b>		<b>0.910</b>

# Letter to the Editor

*Editor's note: this letter is in response to the Rangelands June 2008 issue on rangelands and climate change.*

To the Editor:

I seem to remember being chastised last year for my article on sage grouse since I used empirical data. Disgusting for a scientific society. And now, we have an entire issue using politically correct empirical data, based on advocacy science. Your readers may wish to go to <http://www.noaa.gov> for actual global temperatures for the past twenty-some

years. No trend up or down. For 219 million years of record see [www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/image/vostok.t.gif](http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/image/vostok.t.gif).

The articles should have been slanted that while there is only 0.7 degree global warming, it is politically correct to go ape, so ranchers, get your ducks in a row to cash in on carbon credits!

After viewing the Vostok data, one wonders if we should be preparing for a new ice age. Now that will be a challenge! Cheers.

James Brunner  
jimbrunner1@hotmail.com