

July 9, 1980

Mr. Neil McKleery, District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
P.O. Box 831
Ely, Nevada 89801

Dear Mr. McKleery:

So that there can be no misunderstanding between us and best clarify WHOA's position and our distress with the Ely District it is best that we clear the air and hopefully allow some type of working relationship to resume.

- 1) You district advised us that removal of approximately 400-500 horses was necessary to protect the resource and make the horses 'more manageable.'

Response: we agreed that capture of 'trespass' horses was necessary and inquired as to why it had taken so long to take the action.

- 2) Although we asked why if claiming period had ended in 1975, why the District was unable to bring charges against persons whose brand or horses remained after 1975, we received no answer.

Your district further declined to address trespass impact within the existing conditions, only admitting that it did occur. To what extent?

Although you addressed our comments on the alternative numbers to be gathered, we are curious as to why our other questions were not addressed.

- a. guarantee that livestock AUMs will not be activated before the EIS
- b. how the excess were determined? Through observation, utilization, trespass, active use?
- c. none of our questions regarding the capture were addressed, such as distance for colts, ground to air control, aged, and studies to gather what information?

Upon attending the public meeting, of where I arrived late; a conversation with livestock operators clearly was one of panification; whereas it was stated the wild horse problems would be eliminated within a couple of years. It was decided at that time that some field observation was in order. I cannot possibly describe to you our amazement, udder devastation and livestock still grazing! This in addition to the fact that PUBLIC WATERS had barriers around them.

We have designed a surveillance program for the State of Nevada in all Districts. We are weary of arguing points that are clearly spelled out in PL 92-195, NEPA, FLMPA. This surveillance is designed to warrant out proposals that make the wild horse the scapegoat for all public land ills. I believe our history is such in that it substantiates our support of legitimate proposals within the wild horse program.

As we see it the steps necessary to correct abuses of public ranges in the Ely District fall naturally in order:

- 1) the complete removal of trespass horses (Cook's and Hoopers)
- 2) administrative action for over use or illegal use of public ranges
- 3) the repair of drift fence in Newark Valley to prevent drift
- 4) complete removal of all barriers on public land waters
- 5) that all horses (branded or claimed) under the age of the claim be used as evidence for violation