

4-14-97

draft

April 14, 1997

Mr. Steve Ellis, Acting NPO
Bureau of Land Management
Department of the Interior
18th & C Streets, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Mr. Ellis:

I appreciated your call this a.m., assuring that WHOA or I had personally had not suffered injury to reputation by the report that Ms. Barcomb and I submitted to BLM jointly. I have worked hard for many years, not only for wild horses, but also to strengthen the reputation of the Bureau's management of the same. It is only human nature to carefully guard reputation; recognition for one's life works; and covet admiration for good deeds. It would be less than honest of me to state that I am any different and do not suffer those weaknesses. However, I am discomforted by the subject matter.

Yes, Ms Barcomb and myself have very different methods of working. I am a product of my time and training, training provided by-in-large by BLM over a period of many years and over great periods of controversy. I had advantages that no other national organization had, the learning of a new program beside the very managers of the wild horses. Because I was alone, the same programs developed to train BLM personnel, were open to me as well. I learned very early through the CRMP process, where one wild horse advocate fought amongst cattlemen and wildlife interests to compromise because we were consistently told by BLM that those issues that couldn't or shouldn't be addressed in the EIS stages would be addressed in the herd area management plans where

Page two

the AML would be addressed. I can't even say now how many more stages we have gone through and led us to believe the allotment evaluation process would protect the wild horses that were not overgrazing. Then IBLA ruled the the HMAP's needn't be used to address AML's, that we could question the AML's in the activity plan. This week I received, in the mail from Washington, D.C. a letter denying my protest on the calculations on stocking levels, stating that I should have addressed them in the RMP!

There is always some excuse why this question cannot be addressed and I suspect that BLM knew all along that sufficient funds were never going to be available to monitor in the manner that would determine legitimate numbers. Well, you know that old adage about "fooling some of the people....." I thought seriously about our conversation today and it occurs to me that despite a deep and on-going depression regarding the BLM, I am unwilling to retrieve, if I every had it to begin with, a reputation at anothers expense. *Retrieve*

If I know nothing else, despite our differences in style, Ms. Barcomb cares deeply about the wild horses and burros. Where I have viewed the BLM within the realms of black and white, with shades of gray; Ms. Barcomb sees black and white..who knows, perhaps had I seen the BLM in those terms, we would not be where we are today. I can say with certainty that if BLM values my work over the past twenty five years over a report that is true, then they have a funny way of showing it. I, and I alone chose, by my support of the BLM, to isolate myself from most of the wild horse advocates. That pragmatism that you and I spoke of perhaps is not so admirable after all. I watched three video tapes today of budget hearings in Carson City, where the confidents of BLM employees (persons who obtained the 28 page report from BLM personnel), easily spoke in libelous terms, misinformation they could only have gotten from BLM.

To be perfectly blunt; I am aware of one recent visitor to the D.C. area, one that is well aware of Cathy's and my own differences of opinions. I do not want there to be any misunderstanding on this issue. It will not serve BLM well to attempt a breach between us. It is also

Page three

not advisable to assume that simply because I disagree with other advocates opinions or methods that I won't assist them in their pursuits, particularly if BLM continues its' assault on the horses. I do not know what my limits are, and I am weighing options. I apologize if I led you to believe anything different. I do intend on setting up a meeting with the Associate Director to determine what changes in the program, if any, the State Office intends, as a result of the Task Force Reports.

In conclusion, the cattleman that called this week seeking the information on Del Rio, also stated that representatives of the cattlemen were told in Washington D.C., by BLM employees, that half of our joint report was lies. Considering the magnitude of the Report, we are curious as to which portion of the report BLM admitted. I watched the mentioned videos of the Eureka representatives, and again, they stated that " the Bureau reported that half the report was lies." So while your words were temporarily soothing some facts remain undisputable; 1) the Commission is making a difference, 2) nearly all communication between Commission, WHOA and BLM ceased upon release of the report, and 3) virtually all written communication is being expeditiously funneled to organizations seeking drastic changes in the Commission or its' demise. It would not be prudent for Washington, D.C. BLM to believe anyones' opinion about what WHOA or myself may, or may not do regarding the wild horse and burro program.

Most sincerely,

Dawn Y. Lappin (Mrs.)
Director