

April 25, 1985

4-25-85

EXPERIMENTAL STEWARDSHIP-MODOC/WASHOE

Good Morning ladies and gentlemen. I welcome you, the National Association of Counties to Nevada, and to my home county, Washoe. My name is Dawn Lappin, Director for Wild Horse Organized Assistance. Curtis Spaulding who is the environmental representative on the ESP, could not be here today. He has asked me to give you my perception of ESP.

I served in 1978 as a representative for wild horses to resolve conflicts in the grazing regulations in Salt Lake City and Albuquerque. In 1980, I served as a member of the District Advisory Council for the Susanville District. In 1984, I served as a member of two Technical Review Teams for the Modoc/Washoe Stewardship Program; one on grazing and the other on wilderness. This year I was appointed to serve on the Steering Committee for the Modoc/Washoe ESP. During this time I have become intimately aware of the livestock producers, wildlife advocates, conservation advocates and developers. I have eaten, toured and yes, even camped out with most of the user groups.

From that relationship one might believe that concensus by be successful because participants are well known to one-another. I don't believe this is the case and I'll explain why shortly. Certainly ESP is a monumental success for social resolution. It is a giving process, you must learn, grow and commit yourself. The concensus only works when integrity remains intact. Self rule, power plays, can't work when concensus is the end product. People often ask how it is possible to reconcile aesthetic values with economic values. We dont always! There are lapses of emotionalism and sometimes people will attempt to circumvent the process. The question of how I can protect wild horses over production of livestock to feed people is simple; to me it's not a question of not feeding peoples' stomachs, but feeding their spirit and souls. I believd there is room for both, if sound management practices are implemented,

Ealier, I said, I'd explain why I believe ESP works over other processes. I serve in CRMP in seven areas of Nevada and in five counties. The CRMP process was supposed to work like ESP, a concensus, but there are major flaws:

- 1) no real agency committment
- 2) members join to solve individual problems, not mutual probems.
- 3) no concensus, a majority rule process
- 4) haphazard attendance.

In Nevada 85% of the land is in federal hands, either BLM, FS, or Military. That makes them our landlord! You don't get cheaper rent by intimidating your landlord. The situation was like a time bomb waiting to go off. People really didn't have a choice but to try and resolve the conflicts before World War III broke out on the range. Most conflict resolution efforts I've

worked on have had only moderate success; but none has had the sustainability of the ESP process. Why? I'd speculate the root of the problem is structure. The non-chartered individual stewardships are nothing better than AMP's or CMA's with another name. In each the plans are produced by the livestock producers, with other users attempting to amend the plan around those needs. It is not successful in Nevada, for in southern Nevada, I am considered "not local enough" to participate. A conservationist I know was also summarily dismissed for the same reason. There is much intimidation and abuse of those wishing to speak in behalf of other resources. So therefore, the individual stewardship plans will not receive an endorsement from WHOA until those practices are discontinued.

What does ESP do for WHOA so that we would commit our resources, time and energy? It allows me to work directly with state and county governments to resolve misunderstandings; it gives me the opportunity to directly influence the management of wild horses within the District, and it also gives me the opportunity to correct past errors made on the management of wild horses. It also gives me the opportunity to educate others on our philosophies.

When I served on the TRT, especially the grazing TRT, I expected it would be a fist fight or free-for-all livestock producers; it was neither. It was hard and complex and you knew that every decision made would affect the cowboy sitting next to you. If I wanted more for horses, it may affect the wildlife manager, and so on down the line. It does broaden your knowledge of how and why vested interests tend to think as they do. I was totally unprepared because of the success of the grazing TRT for the openly hostile, frustrating TRT on Wilderness. The site was complex, full of potential for livestock, wildlife, wild horses, and scenic benefits. My perception of wilderness didn't follow with the livestock interests or the mining interests. After the screaming was over the TRT did come up with resolutions for a large area, but it left many potential areas undecided and that was left for a BLM decision.

The jury is still out on whether the ESP objectives will EVER achieve the goals to resolve environmental conflicts, while sustaining and stabilizing the livestock industry, manage wildlife at reasonable numbers, manage wild horse populations; while preserving the soil and vegetative resource. It will take some time to see the monitoring data that shows whether this process will be as successful on the ground as it is with people conflicts. In my mind the structure, chartered ESP should be given enough time to determine its' future for the long term.