

4/9/85
m

W H O A !

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
DAVID R. BELDING
JACK C. McELWEE
GORDON W. HARRIS
BELTON P. MOURAS
GERTRUDE BRONN, Honorary

WILD HORSE ORGANIZED ASSISTANCE
INC.
A Foundation for the Welfare of
Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros

P. O. Box 555
Reno, Nevada 89504
Telephone
Area Code 702

April 9, 1985

COPY

In Memoriam

LOUISE C. HARRISON
VELMA B. JOHNSTON, "Wild Horse Annie"

Mr. Frank Shields, District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
Winnemucca District Office
705 East Fourth Street
Winnemucca, Nevada 89445

Dear Mr. Shields:

On March 21, 1985, I wrote a letter to the District requesting specific information pertaining to the Winnemucca Districts' estimated rates of increases of 11% and 14% on the Sonoa- Gerlach and Paradise-Denio. On March 26, 1985, I received a telephone call from District personnel attempting a verbal explanation; and on April 3, 1985, a letter of follow-up. Neither the telephone call or the letter elicited the information requested. It is truly distasteful to write again requesting the information requested in my original letter, the inventories, data and calculations used to arrive at the 11% and 14% rates of increases.

The fact that you used a figure from an inventory (August, 1983) in Calico and a 11% rate of increase to achieve the 718 figure, does not satisfy my question on how you calculated the 11% rate of increase to begin with; it only explains how you came up with a higher figure for the 1985 estimate. There are many areas, in fact most of Nevada, where no comparable inventories exist, yet they have not deviated from the BLM's Manual instructions on how those estimates are to be calculated. Why Winnemucca feels they can deviate from manuals is beyond me. I do know that I am not satisfied with the explanation and desire to see those calculations. Nowhere in Nevada have the Districts matched your high rates of increases, therefore I must assume that conditions in the Winnemucca District are not as poor as represented.

W H O A has tried repeatedly to assist the BLM in its' management responsibilities, in turn I remind you that we represent wild horses and the information we request, besides being public information, allows us to better represent the wild horses.



Page two

Secondly, I wish to address the Buffalo Hills CRMP. The information sent to me originally was quite clear, it stated, that Buffalo Hills CRMP was in agreement to the 542 level of wild horses. Nowhere did the letter clarify it by stating that consensus has been reached through silence. In parties I have spoken to, the numbers of wild horses never arose. I resent the District attempting to cover misinformation to the public by calling it a "misunderstanding." I don't want a letter to ar"clarify" the misunderstanding to me, I want a correction of the misinformation sent to all people who received the original information.

As far as WHOA is concerned, the MFP III decision was arbitrary in setting a level with no data, but further reduction takes the cake. We will not agree to levels below the MFP III, and if there is an attempt by the CRMP to modify the MFP III levels, we will use that opportunity to challenge the livestock numbers and the BLM's data.

I don't like misunderstandings any more than the BLM; I wished I believed it was a misunderstanding at this point. BLM manuals have been designed to put good horse management in line; but they are disregarded. We've had 14 years of "hodge-podge" management of wild horses because every District did "their own thing." You cannot build sound wild horse management programs if everyone uses a different set of criteria and disregards the manuals that are designed to address long-term management. I supported the changes brought by Mr. Spang's leadership and hopefully with some luck those management objectives will lessen the confrontation between wild horse groups and BLM; but not if the hodge-podge continues. Unless, or until the data base is sound the management decisions will continue to be based on politics, which is the basis for the confrontations today.

CRMP was not designed to reduce wild horse numbers, despite the fact that not much else has been achieved with this process thus far. CRMP in its' truest sense was to resolve resource conflicts through mutual agreement. Experience has taught me how to recognize when CRMP was being used to reduce wild horse numbers and little else; the permittees in Buffalo Hills are not interested in anything but how to get someone else's AUMs and best augment their own.

WHOA would greatly appreciate a written response to our request at the earliest date possible.

Most sincerely,

Dawn Y. Lappin (Mrs.)
Director

Mr. Frank Shields, District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
705 East 4th Street
Winnemucca, Nevada 89445

Dear Mr. Shields:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the tentative schedule for implementation of the multiple resource management decisions. (4700/1791-NV-027.8)

Please send WHOA the data and the calculations upon which the estimated rates of increases were based; Paradise/Denio-14%, and Sonoma/Gerlach-11%. The projections, using BLM's percentages are flawed. An example is the Calico Mountains (Soldier Meadows/Leadville) portions.

1982- 365 + 11% = 40
1983- 405 + 11% = 45
1984- 450 + 11% = 50
1985- 500; yet your estimate is 718.

Using a 14% rate of increase;

1982- 365 + 14% = 51
1983- 416 + 14% = 58
1984- 474 + 14% = 66
1985- 540; yet your estimate is 718.

Since WHOA still cannot match your projection, we used a higher rate of increase, which we feel is unbelievable; we still came out lower than your projections:

1982- 365 + 22% = 80
1983- 445 + 22% = 98
1984- 543 + 22% = 119
1985- 662

Is BLM trying to tell WHOA that forage conditions are so perfect in the Calico's as to promote an increase above 22%? Therefore WHOA needs to understand how the BLM calculated these estimates and what they were based on.

page two

In addition to the above problem, the asterik at the bottom of page one of the letter 4700/1791 (NV-027.8) implies that there is a consensus of the Buffalo Hills CRMP on the AML. In personal communication with Dick Wheeler, he informs me that myself and Helen Reilly are the horse representatives on that CRMP. I attended only one meeting, wherein the permittees argued over who was going to get Casey's AUMs. I spoke with Helen Reilly on March 20th and she informs me that she was not a signatory to any such agreement either. So I contacted Rose Strickland, who is a member of that CRMP and attended many meetings. She informs me that no such consensus was reached or even came up. Therefore, we would like to have minutes of the meeting and the attendants where that consensus was reached.

This letter is to inform BLM that WHOA does not and will not support any such levels as referred to in 4700/1791 (NV-027.8). WHOA would greatly appreciate a timely response to these questions.

Most sincerely,

Dawn Y. Lappin (Mrs.)
Director

cc: Board of Trustees
David A. Hornbeck
Helen Reilly
Rose Strickland
E. F. Spang

4730
BLACK Rock Range East

Est. 89 (14%) AML 59 Remove 28

1982 - 59 + 9 = 68 (1983) + 10 = 78 (1984) + 11 = 89 (1985)

BLACK Rock Range West

Est 581 (11%) AML 424 Remove 157

(1982) - 424 + 46 = 470 (1983) + 51 = 521 (1984) + 57 = 578 (1985)

* Calico Mtns (Calico Allotment)

Est. 718 (11%) AML 365 Remove 353

(1982) 365 + 40 = 405 (1983) + 45 = 450 (1984) + 50 = 500 (1985)

Boy + Lake Range

Est 593 AML 434 Remove 159

(1982) 434 + 48 = 482 (1983) + 53 = 535 (1984) + 59 = 594 (1985)

Jackson Mtns

Est. 319 AML 215 Remove 104

(1982) 215 + 30 = 245 (1983) + 34 = 279 (1984) + 39 = 318 (1985)

Wayn Springs Canyon

Est 402 AML 294 Remove 108

(1982) 294 + 32 = 326 (1983) + 36 = 362 (1984) + 40 = 402 (1985)

Buffalo Hills (CRMP) ??!!

Est. 882 AML 272 Remove 108