

10-19-76

G

October 19, 1976

WHOA! supports the multiple use concept. We prefer that only natural barriers be utilized and urge serious thought to be given to range riders in lieu of fencing.

It is generally conceded that wild horse populations were controlled by harvesting for commercial profit prior to the passage of the Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971. This would lead us to believe that the prime burden of over-grazing would rest with the domestic livestock industry. The hue and cry over horse over-population is not the sole cause for depletion of resource. It is redundant to claim that approximately 4% wild horse grazing pressure seriously threatens the 96% livestock use. It is the density of populations, due to man's encroachment upon the habitat, that is the issue. By other sources of information we understand that cattle in trespass are common throughout Nevada. If this be the case, then accusations of horse over-population, and depleting the resource are mute. It is our position that healthy, viable horse herds remain on public domain. The excess to be removed humanely. This of course predisposes the numbers game, in relationship to population control.

WHOA! does not believe at this time, that alternatives other than adoption would be accepted by the public at large. Until all avenues of adoption are closed, any other alternatives would need research into their feasibility and acceptability. Thought towards future population controls should be seriously considered at this point, i.e. sterilization, etc. For those critical of control and management programs, sterilization or some such means, would be a direct answer to those accusations that the managing agencies have no 'real' controls over the wild horse.

Abuses of all kinds have been evidenced in the past...these should now be recognized within the opposition and dealt with.

continued..Monte Crisco Wild Horse Area

If the resource is to be saved then all considerations should be dealt with fairly and humanely. I do not believe that every solitary animal on the national resource land should be considered for its economic value. It has been evidenced with the 1971 Act and recent court decisions, that aesthetic values of the public in its public domain, must also be considered. Continued opposition from the horses' opponents only supports the antagonism heaped upon the livestock operators by the public. It must be remembered that it is public land and use by the private operator is a privilege, not a right. It is WHOA!'s concensus that varied uses be permitted, and none eliminated entirely. This can only be gained by supporting the managing agencies and recognizing the horses;existence upon federal land. Livestock has shown, with co correct management, to be an intregal tool of land management, and it behooves us all to come to solutions so that not any one use is predominantlly favored.

Without benefit of data, a proposal at this time is premature. Uses should be considered with these factoes in mind:

- \*Number of livestock presently on public land (resource area).
- \*Number of horses (wildlife), on public land (resource area).
- \*Number of claimed animals in trespass, or unclaimed, branded animals.
- \*Previous reductions in AUM allotments.
- \*Base land for permittees (on or off resource area being considered).
- \*In resource area is land rated as, good, bad, or poor.
- \*Will reductions stabilize the land,
- \*Total population for wild horses within district.
- \*Average number of acres required per AUM.
- \*Proposed areas of mineral, oil, and geothermal productions.
- Will any of these further reduce wild horse, wildlife, or cattle.

We greatly appreciate the opportunity of expressing our opinions.

Most sincerely,

Dawn Y. Lappin (Mrs.)  
Adoption Director