



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

NATIONAL WILD
HORSE & BURRO
ADVISORY BOARD

June 29-30, 2023

Volume 2

Day 2 Meeting Minutes

U. S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Contents

FRIDAY, JUNE 30, 2023.....	2
WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER.....	2
ADVISORY BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSIONS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS.....	2
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD (3).....	13
ADVISORY BOARD DISCUSSION AND FINALIZE RECOMMENDATIONS (BOARD VOTE).....	22

Friday, June 30, 2023

Welcome and Call to Order

Bryant Kuechle, Facilitator, The Langdon Group

Mr. Kuechle welcomed attendees to the Wild Horse and Burro Advisory Board meeting. He then went over the Rules of the Room concerning providing public comment with those in attendance in-person and online.

Ms. Celeste Carlisle, Wild Horse and Burro Advisory Board Chair

Ms. Carlisle welcomed all attending in person and by live stream. She then began the meeting with Advisory Board Subcommittee Discussions and Draft Recommendations

TABLE 1 NATIONAL WILD HORSE & BURRO ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS	
Board Member	Representing
Dr. Tom Lenz, DVM	Veterinary Medicine
Ms. Celeste Carlisle	Wild Horse & Burro Advocacy
Dr. Barry Perryman, Ph.D.	Public Interest (NRM Special Knowledge)
Mr. James French	Natural Resource Management
Dr. Ursula Bechert, DVM, Ph.D.	Wild Horse & Burro Research
Ms. Tammy Pearson	Public Interest (Equine Behavior)

Advisory Board Subcommittee Discussions and Draft Recommendations

Ms. Carlisle: Welcome back everybody. If you're online, thanks for tuning in. In the room, thanks for being here. We are at the part in our board meeting where we begin to edit and fuzz through the recommendations that we've been putting together as we listened to public comment and as we listened to the information from the agencies and the folks that have been brought in to talk to us. This part of the meeting is generally agonizing especially for those of you watching. So, we're going to try to do, first time ever, sort of hybrid of that process. And what we've done this time is swiftly typed up, at least drafts to get the board started. And instead of projecting on the screen-- it can be projected. It doesn't matter. Instead of going back and forth with a third party, trying to type in our on-the-fly comments, we're going to collect them all up here on an old-fashioned sheet of paper. And we will take a break at some point during the day. And I will need a few minutes to just type it in, and then we'll project that. So, you don't have to go through the agonizing process of watching us strike things through in the back end. So, apologies for our first try through this. But this part of the meeting is not going to be terribly exciting. You may argue that other parts in the meeting were not terribly exciting. So, thank you, and bear with us for the sake of transparency and remaining in the guidelines of the meeting. We have to make our comments on our mics so it can be picked up and transcribed. It's painful for you all in the room. We will not be offended if you get up and leave. So, with that, we have eight recommendations that we're going to try to whittle down. We decided we'd start with too much and too long. And there may be sometimes of silence as we're reading to ourselves and making notations. I'll go ahead and open the floor to anyone who just has a kick us off sort of thoughts or would like to start with the first one to make any comments about that.

Dr. Lenz: I have a couple of comments. I hate to word smith this. But on the third line where it says without implementation, a meaningful, amounts of fertility control, I would strike enough amounts of-- just say meaningful fertility control. But down-- one, two, three, four, five, six, seven-- on the seventh line, we're talking about, this is a meaningful, impactful fertility control of translate to diverse bipartisan support. Need for robust horizontal funding. I would like to insert, improve the health and welfare on the range, as well as the range. Right? Because the bottom line is, we want to make sure the horses and the range are healthier. The health and welfare of horses on the range and the range. Right before will, you have in capitals. That's all I've got so far.

Ms. Carlisle: One more idea we get going. I guess we could project the draft so it leaves people that are here can see that we don't sound like we're hallucinating. Well, I'm not sure. I'm open to shall-- I'm making them here. I want them all in one place so I can change the document. All right. Plan is we will get through the nitty-gritty wordsmithing. But we won't live catch it right here. When we get to the note thought bigger stuff, we'll live catch it.

Dr. Perryman: Madam Chair, I have a couple of suggestions here about the same place. One, two, three, four, five-- begins with reliance, the sentence that begins with reliance. I think we can strike that sentence. It's just information that's already encapsulated in the other language.

And we can take out the capital letters. This is not a text that we're trying to impress our--

Ms. Carlisle: You don't want emoticons in our recommendations? Anybody else? Do we seem-- okay.

Dr. Bechert: I actually had all of those same changes as well. And then on, kind of in the middle of the page, where it says including considerations as to best practice-- it's including consideration regarding best practice with respect to. And then I would start with location and accessibility, animal, product.

Ms. Carlisle: What did you say after--

Dr. Bechert: Product. And then delivery method and treatment frequency. And then cross off all the other stuff. And then as well as expected annual-- the rest.

Ms. Carlisle: Okay.

Dr. Bechert: And then the next pair gaffe, this effort should include-- I don't know what is meant by where additional horses are gathered. So that's as many mares as possible, blah, blah. What does that mean?

Ms. Carlisle: It means if you're a thousand horses and your AML's 800, you'll gather 200 or 300 so you can apply mares that will be returned to the range. More mares that can be returned to the range.

Dr. Bechert: I'm going to think about how. We should communicate it better. I agree.

Mr. French: Madam Chair, if I could.

Ms. Carlisle: Yes.

Mr. French: I'm going to be the outlier here. I think there's too much in this, too much language in this recommendation on, I assume, as far as the bureau as far as this logical type of this thing. What I did is I went down to, I think it's 7 where removal means, plus meaningful and impactful fertility control. I went-- I started right there, and I ended with the HMA territory management plans. And then I skipped down to the board recognizes that specific HMA that piece that ends with different approach. And then I took-- I added the, or I held onto the following paragraph at the end. And I only did that because I just thought it meant the same thing to me when I read through it several times. It meant the same thing. That's just me.

Ms. Carlisle: What do people think about it? We want to shorten it and add political umph. Okay. Has everybody gone to number two? Has anybody read through and said, for, let's strike this whole thing? Because that would also be awesome.

Dr. Bechert: I thought about it second paragraph under the first thing. I was thinking it could be, um, something like these efforts can service demonstration sites which can also serve as opportunities to validate and adjust PopEquis.

Dr. Lenz: Where is that? On 2-- in the first sentence, rather than say, begin determining the process of analysis, I would say, develop a process of analysis. I would strike beginning, determining-- I would strike that and replace it with develop a process of analysis.

Ms. Carlisle: Perfect.

Mr. St George: Celeste, a little point of clarification. On number 1, second paragraph in reference to Pop Equus I want to reaffirm from the agency's plural, agency's position, Pop Equus does not inform management decision. It is a tool that helps us understand conditions on the range. I want to reiterate; we don't use Pop Equus to make management decisions.

Mr. French: Could I ask a follow-up question? Brian, I'm assuming though that somewhere either now or somewhere in the near future that Pop Equus would be part of the day that you'll be considering two issues. It wouldn't be a mandatory, some sort of mandatory trigger that you would follow but it will be part of a dataset you would consider.

Mr. St George: That's great, Jim. Good clarification. Maybe we'll go further. I think Pop Equus is a useful tool to help the agencies understand a range of potential actions where I want to be specific is we do not put input data to Pop Equus to get out a resulting management decision. Right?

Ms. Carlisle: We're ready for 2? who's having fun out there?

Dr. Perryman: I have some opening volleys, I guess, for number 2 for ready for it. Due to protracted drought and other climate-related issues in the west, so we'll strike and changing conditions. So due to protracted drought and other climate related issues in the west, the board recommends-- that the BLM and Forest Service develop a process to try to begin determining the-- and we move on down, long-term range health considerations to guide decisions toward AML. So strike a range, dependent as oppose to numbers on. And I would strike, the board recognizes the future of upward and downward, I would strike that last sentence because it's encapsulated in development of a plan.

Ms. Carlisle: Others about two?

Dr. Perryman: So it would read, then due to protracted drought and other climate-related issues in the west, the board recommends that the BLM and Forest Service develop a process of and analysis that enable relevant short and long-term range help considerations to guide towards decisions AML. Period.

Ms. Carlisle: Okay. It's interesting we're making the same changes. It's a good sign. Number 4?

Dr. Perryman: Number 4 is actually number 3.

Ms. Carlisle: Right. That's-- yes. Number, labeled 4, actually number 3. Just changed it. Okay. So, we got rid of one. There you go.

Dr. Perryman: I do what I can.

Ms. Carlisle: That how you do it? You just miss number? thank you.

Dr. Lenz: On number 3, the second sentence I would delete ability. So, it would say program's effectiveness-- well-- oh, it should be and their ability. Yeah, insert there. And then right there.

Ms. Carlisle: Got it.

Dr. Lenz: Their ability to. And then in the last, C, I would start that with utilize budgets. And then that parenthesis, you have doesn't end. So, I ended it. I hate parenthesis in the middle of the sentence. Just a eastern problem. Following years funding, period. You can say et cetera if you want to. Period. And then start a new sentence in this manner, BLM will know how much they will be getting from year to year.

Ms. Carlisle: Got it.

Dr. Lenz: Got it?

Ms. Carlisle: Uh-huh.

Dr. Lenz: Sure?

Ms. Carlisle: I am.

Dr. Bechert: I thought that was a good change. I would also put the figure of the end of this instead of the beginning.

Ms. Carlisle: I agree.

Dr. Bechert: And then under A, I would change that to continuing to manage long-term holdings nationally. Continuing to manage.

Ms. Carlisle: Anything else?

Ms. Waddell: Hey, Celeste. In looking at-- I guess I'm wondering what is the recommendation if it's a continue, obviously Dr. Bechert is right. We do-- that's how we manage the long-term holding or offering to pastures, public offering to pastures. In addition to offering corrals. We have a national headquarters coordination regarding corral space availability on determining removals and also when we're talking about cost savings and moving animals from corrals to pasture. That's a coordinated problematic effort.

Dr. Bechert: Yeah, I can say something about that. It was, um, designed to demonstrate and the if I go what's done nationally versus what's done locally. And even within what's done nationally there might be tweaks to facilitate coordination. I don't know the details of that. But just leaving that open. So, we just said continuing.

Mr. St George: Can I add one more point of clarification on B and C. Um, I just want to make sure the board as the expectation that in all likelihood the agency's response is something to the effect of great idea. And we commit to carrying that forward to appropriators. Just to be clear, the agency does not have discretion and authority to make these budgetary changes. And our response would likely be the agency commits to advancing that discussion with appropriators.

Ms. Carlisle: I think that's what we're recognizing in this had, if that's helpful we want that to remain, if you're saying it's not going to matter. Then that might change.

Mr. St George: No, I'm certainly not saying it won't matter. I was subtly trying to suggest a wording change because I don't think this is at all my place to change wording of recommendation. If it I was a hypothetical board writing hypothetical recommendations, requesting budgetary change, I would say to the agency, take this to the appropriations staff. Take it to committee. Take it to the Hill. This is what you ought to be advocating for rather than leaving this open-ended as though the agency has the discretion and misleading, the BLM failed to deliver.

Ms. Carlisle: I say, instead of I shall-- I'm going to say communicate to administration and congressional--

Dr. Bechert: Or maybe advocating for the establishment the of.

Ms. Carlisle: Okay. Establishment. Okay, got it. Appreciate it.

Mr. Oliver: Celeste, I have a question going back up to the top on the BLM and Forest Service further centralize. Could get a little clarification on the centralized. When I read it like this, it sounds like you want the BLM and the Forest Service to be centralized.

Mr. St Geroge: Chuck, the Forest Service doesn't want to be a director in the BLM.

Ms. Carlisle: I'm going to say, further centralize their respective Wild Horse & Burro programs.

Mr. Oliver: I'm afraid it will take all your money. [Laughter].

Ms. Carlisle: That's a recommendation further down the list. You'll see it. All right. Let's go to hopefully it is labeled 5 but it is 4 which I'm changing.

Dr. Perryman: I have a couple of suggestions on this one. Some of this is related to Brian's comments on the previous one. The BLM and Forest Service should explore creative ways to garner additional funding sources. We don't need additional resources. They've got all they can handle now, right? Right on the ground. Additional funding sources parenthesis as allowed by law or statute, closed parenthesis. Outside the process that will enable-- that will enable, strike them two-- enable effective, strike LY, management horse and burros. Let's not forget the burro populations, period.

Ms. Carlisle: Yep.

Dr. Perryman: Um, a parenthesis, E period, G period, comma, Colorado Senate Bill 23-275. Close parenthesis, period. That's the end of it. Strike all the rest of that.

Ms. Carlisle: Strike all the arrest of that. Shortens it up and says the same thing. So--

Mr. French: Madam Chair, I had something similar to that. Go back to the first sentence. I want to bring this up, Barry. When I read the funding and resources portion of that sentence, I immediately thought about the fact that the bureau has run into a brick wall with regard to gather resources. There's only a certain number of contractors that have the qualifications to do that kind of work. I immediately thought about expanding that group of contractors or attempting to expand the group of contractors for gather purposes down the road. Maybe it won't be necessary. That's what my thought was.

Dr. Perryman: Your point is taken, commissioner. The reason I-- that's what happened. I tripped over it. To me it initially popped in my head and something else might pop in someone else's head. Resources are, you know, land attributes of one kind or another. Is there a way we can get that sentiment in here so that, so that it's understood by all immediately that we're talking about capacity issues?

Mr. French: That's what I was thinking.

Dr. Perryman: Maybe that's a better term, the way to put it is capacity issue.

Dr. Bechert: There's a way to weave that into there.

Mr. St George: I'm sorry, Dr. Bechert. I spoke over you. I was suggesting that for clarification, capacity is the agency jargon that we would use to capture this idea. That's great thought.

Dr. Perryman: Yep.

Ms. Carlisle: So why don't we say, to garner additional funding courses and capacities outside of these.

Dr. Perryman: That would cover it. Commissioner, does that sound reasonable? Funding sources and capacity?

Mr. French: Yep, that works.

Dr. Perryman: Or capacities I guess would be more appropriate.

Ms. Carlisle: I got it.

Dr. Bechert: I'm okay with striking B. But I would like to somehow incorporate the spirit of A in there somehow.

Ms. Carlisle: How about at the end of the sentence that we had left it out, just saying, for example. And then we put A.

Dr. Perryman: Yeah. The reason I was going to strike it is because we don't need to be telling them what the partnership should be doing. Some type of development of partnerships. I have no issues with that at all.

Ms. Pearson: And I would say, herd management plans are already being developed, every specific HMA. Correct me if

it I'm wrong. I think they're on a ten-year renewal. At least that's what we do in our area. But I think each HMA has its own herd management plan. So, it's not like they've never been developed.

Ms. Carlisle: My understanding is that many offices do have management plans more than is sort of storied. But many are also out of date. And with-- especially from information we learned yesterday.

We don't want to add tremendous workload but we want to start to encourage the development of local partnerships in working towards those management plan so they are locally relevant.

Ms. Pearson: Right.

Ms. Carlisle: So, I'm not sure if we're communicating that well enough. But I think that is the intention.

Dr. Bechert: Maybe a compromise is, you know, that first sentence, and then the EG with the Colorado bill like Barry said. And after that say something like, proactively facilitating development of partnerships to collect data which is a huge thing. Would facilitate efforts to learn more about local rangeland health trends so that effective herd management plans can be developed, or something like that. Put it in the very end after the Colorado example.

Ms. Carlisle: That acceptable to everybody? Can we move on? The last few are shorter. So-- five which is six, which is now five.

Dr. Lenz: On five I would strike "should" from the first line. And then I would, you have A and start back up with facilitate. I would make that B. And strike the sentence with management. That should be B. We have A. And we skip over. That should be under B. We recommend that management of feral horses on tribal lands be explored. B, we recommend--Just started with management.

Ms. Carlisle: Right.

Dr. Lenz: Be explored, and can I take these horses, not just that, hoes. Don't recognize that I'm not too keen on political. I don't know if you use national or what word you use there.

Ms. Carlisle: Boundaries?

Dr. Lenz: I don't know how you want to describe boundaries. I would use national. But I wouldn't use political--

Dr. Perryman: That sends a little casual. It needs to be reset. But I agree. And I want, let's give Chuck and Teresa a roll of Roloids real quick because A is going to be a problem for them as well here. So, for the same reasons that the bureau, there are certain things they can do in the budgeting progression. But they can't go slam their fist on the table and demand that some things happen. So, we're probably going to have to have either or both of them weigh in on that statement as well. But before we do that, give them a second to think about it. The first sentence there, BLM and the Forest Service should initiate, maintain discussions with other groups, I think we're talking about other governments here primarily. Tribally. Other governments responsible for free-roaming horse populations in the U.S. We move to that idea to the U.S. Forest Service. It's a big jump in logic there if that was the intent was to include tribal governments in this issue. Because we go-- because it goes onto say, territories that are not undermined by immigration. We also have immigration. It probably needs to be included in that, too. Immigration and emigration. So, the spirit of this whole thing here was with tribal governments, I thought. And all of a sudden we're jumping to the Forest Service asking for their own line item to fund the program. It seems a bit disconnected.

Dr. Drotar: And you put down U.S. Forest Service advocate for its own separate budget. We already do that. But we can only do so much.

Dr. Perryman: Right.

Dr. Drotar: Yeah.

Dr. Perryman: Yep.

Mr. French: I thought by leaving that in there, is I thought the same thing when I read that item. But I think this is an opportunity for this board to weigh in on the notion that there should be an independent budget from them. That's the only reason I left it in.

Dr. Perryman: I agree we should be doing that. I don't know if this is, if we're going to do that and this one, we need to massage the preamble language here. So that's not just specific to other government. I mean, the Forest Service may be a little independent sometimes. But they're not their own government.

Mr. French: Right. We have to separate them now. [Laughter].

Dr. Bechert: Yeah, I think the intent here was to think more about how horses of month. Even if it you have a perfectly managed HMA, it's not going to stay that way if it's next to another piece of land. The intent was to look at the other two big groups. Happy to word Smith whatever--

Dr. Perryman: Yeah, I think you're right. And everybody understands, if you have crowding effects and suddenly you release some side or some aspect of that crowding effect, then there's going to be the vacuum that's going to be filled. That's what we're talking about here, is that immigration and emigration across boundaries.

Dr. Lenz: If you can almost take A and move it under the next recommendation.

Mr. Oliver: That's a good part. I was going to suggest that. The way this reads, it stands alone by itself. The issue about other horse populations other than wild horse and burros. It's another funding source.

Dr. Perryman: I agree.

Dr. Bechert: So then maybe we can strike A and B. And in the first sentence just say, BLM, U.S. Forest Service tribal lands should maintain initiate discussions.

Ms. Carlisle: I'm sorry. Repeat that.

Dr. Bechert: So, we can do away with A and B in this section. But in the first sentence include tribal lands instead of just BLM and U.S. Forest Service. I think gets more to what Barry's saying, too.

Dr. Perryman: I would prefer on a personal note, I would prefer the use of government entities rather than tribal lands or tribal governments.

Mr. French: It yeah, I think also it's important, you know, we separate BLM and U.S. Forest Service in that language. But we're not talking about other-- there are other examples of Federal Agencies that aren't coordinating. I'm thinking about the Sheldon refuge that pushed all their horses off their range, under the hot springs allotment. I'm thinking about National Park Service in interprets of how they gather and what not. I think there should be language that captures that.

Ms. Carlisle: I have the BLM and U.S. Forest Service and tribal governments initiate/maintain discussions with other governments responsible for management _ -- _.

Dr. Perryman: Yeah. Yeah, that works. It may be other government agencies because you've already listed tribal governments. So maybe it's with other government agencies.

Dr. Drotar: Or entities might be a word. Entities because are they an agency within the tribal? Not sure if its proper term. [Speakers Overlapping]

Ms. Carlisle: Right.

Ms. Pearson: And are we already addressing the states in the previous numbered thing or would this be included as well even though it's not really state?

Ms. Carlisle: Tell me the number you're referring to.

Ms. Pearson: I'm just saying, Barry talked about the Colorado legislation. Is that just naturally including states in that upper--

Ms. Carlisle: That's using the Colorado is that the Bill as an example.

Ms. Pearson: Yeah, but I'm saying that includes states in that previous number or would states also come under number five? As government entities?

Dr. Perryman: I think well--

Ms. Pearson: We're talking more about funding, right? In the previous number. Number 4. That's where states come in. It helps your funding.

Dr. Perryman: Our language needs to be inclusive of state, governments, and tribal governments as well as other Federal Agencies. State and tribal of the goes might capture it.

Ms. Pearson: Yeah. So State and federal, other government entities

Ms. Carlisle: For number--

Ms. Pearson: Just on that first line on number 5.

Dr. Perryman: The BLM and Forest Service should initiate, maintain discussions with—

Ms. Carlisle: Other government entities, comma, states.

Ms. Pearson: And tribal--

Ms. Carlisle: Okay.

Ms. Pearson: I don't want to exclude states.

Dr. Perryman: Point well taken.

Ms. Pearson: There are a lot of times they're very good partners.

Ms. Carlisle: Number 7 which is actually number 6. That would be remarkable. The next one.

Dr. Perryman: Yeah. We more or less covered that one in the previous one, right?

Ms. Carlisle: Well, no. Number 6-- number 6 is specific to an actual sit down with a facilitator for an updated especially in terms of what we learned yesterday. Cooperating extremity. Where both agencies are able to communicate what's needed now which may be different than--

Dr. Perryman: This is the interagency concept.

Ms. Carlisle: Yeah.

Dr. Perryman: Okay.

Ms. Carlisle: Because the act says that these organizations are working together. And number 6--

Dr. Drotar: Did you talk about moving the A and B points under that one from the previous one?

Ms. Carlisle: Yes.

Dr. Drotar: Yes.

Dr. Lenz: Change president cooperating-- (away from mic)

Ms. Carlisle: I was trying to represent that they may determine that it's not a cooperative agreement they need but something else. So, any type of cooperating agreement.

Dr. Lenz: Yeah. Which includes an MOU or something like that.

Ms. Carlisle: Right.

Dr. Perryman: So, Chuck, are you guys comfortable with us telling you to do something that you already are doing all the time? I mean --

Mr. Oliver: Which one specifically?

Dr. Perryman: A.

Mr. Oliver: The budget?

Dr. Perryman: Yes, this budgetary language here.

Mr. Oliver: I think it's good for us to have that expressed. That we're doing enough.

Dr. Perryman: I think from the board's perspective, and I don't want to speak for the board here, but it would seem to me that it would be more appropriate to use the language that you just suggested which is the board supports the Forest Service's continuing efforts to A, B, and C, do what is stated here. Would that make more sense?

Mr. Oliver: That works. Yeah, recognizes that we are already trying to do something. But don't stop.

Dr. Perryman: So Madam Chair, our quick sideboard discussion there was, it would make more sense-- I don't know if that's the appropriate way to explain it or not-- but it seems as though it would be good to have the board, have the language say that the board supports the Forest Service's ongoing efforts to advocate.

Ms. Pearson: it's its own separate budget.

Dr. Perryman: They're already doing it. So we support that effort for them to enjoin into those activities.

Ms. Carlisle: Got it.

Ms. Pearson: But we're going to bring that down under 6, right?

Dr. Perryman: Under the new number 6.

Ms. Pearson: But does it have to be numbered as an A? Or is it just--

Ms. Carlisle: No, it will just be brought down here.

Dr. Bechert: Okay, perfect. So maybe I'm just slow. But I'm wondering if 6 is just part of recommending under 5. 5 is really broad. 5 is say, we'll have the discussion and then maybe these could be examples. Like there could be a cooperating agreement in the budget. Is it separate enough?

Ms. Carlisle: I don't really mind where it is personally.

Dr. Perryman: Would it--

Ms. Carlisle: But it needs to be clear what it's meant by it, but it seems like it's not. I see it as two different things. This particular number 6 is distinct in that it is a process with a facilitator that can help the agencies communicate their needs now today and what that agreement is today between the agencies. I know there is an existing agreement. There has been discussion of that agreement not being complete enough.

Dr. Perryman: Maybe if we use the word "interagency agreement" instead of cooperating. That captures-- that interagency captures more the spirit of it than the word cooperative or cooperating. It's a pathway to explore-- it's a recommendation for a pathway to explore an interagency management team or something more formal than it is now. And they can decide what that is. We can't dictate to them what it is, or what it exactly looks like. But it's a recommendation to explore that approach rather than having two entities--

Mr. French: What it boils down to, as well, in my mind I was trying to capture that need for, that was expressed by the Forest Service for a standalone budget within their appropriation. Not and I think, I was hopeful the board would express that. Because obviously, I think that that would be something you could take to the appropriators to look at and say, hey, the board looked at this. And made a recommendation that-- and then I think that's-- I think that was my thought about it as we were reading through it.

Ms. Waddell: So quick question. In more for clarification because, when I think about the existing interagency agreement, which I don't think you all have seen, there's an overarching headquarters agreement. And there are also our agreements at the states, right? In relationships out in the field. So, I want to be clear when we're talking about it. I don't think it's a necessary for the board, in my opinion, to recommend the need for interagency agreement. The direction is given by the authority of the act. It already says that for the secretary of the agriculture and interior to manage wild horses and burros. I'm not clear on what the question is, and confusion is Chuck, maybe you have a better sense of what is being asked. If it's the board supporting Forest Service allocating for a budget, then I think that's great. And I think it did state that in the recommendation above. You want to clarify it by saying, you know, the support of this budget to continue work as outlined in the act or something like that. Something relative. Otherwise, I'm not sure what this recommendation is. And I know there will be an expectation of a response.

Mr. French: Madam Chair, if I could-- one of the things that's going through my head, not just the stand-alone budget but the comments I've heard at this meeting concerning off range holding, long-term holding and the fact that interior's contracts right now are full with regard to long-term holding. And there was concerns as to whether or not there will be a place for Forest Service horses to go. I was thinking that there needed to be some sort of synergy between Forest Service and interior or an opportunity for that with regard to some of the logistics, you know, coming out of their program interfacing with yours and specifically long-term holding, short-term holding and standalone project. That's what was going through my mind.

Ms. Waddell: Got it. Chuck and Eric both agree that we've been working on the coordination efforts. And upfront planning which is why we've incorporated Teresa host a meeting with the Forest Service and both Paul and Scott are invited today that meeting. So, there's dialogue. And I think we are improving on the coordination and planning pieces. Do we have a pasture or corral specific? Does BLM have a pasture and corral specific for Forest Service animals? No. What Forest Service wants to do is begin to care for, house, and can contract for their own corrals and-- I know corrals. We're assisting them in those efforts. I think what I heard you say, Jim, is you're trying to encourage us to improve on some of that coordination. And I would agree. Yep.

Ms. Carlisle: That is completely the point of it. I don't think anyone here thought that there was not any some sort of interagency agreement. I think we were looking to helping to provide you all with assistance for enhancing that process and maybe-- you know, in our finds, that facilitated was the key part. Like giving you all some tools to bring in an outside facilitator with that process which--

Mr. French: Yep. That was my thought.

Ms. Carlisle: Some people seem to be like yes, some people no. We should clarify that. And if it's not helpful at all, we some strike that.

Ms. Waddell: All that to Chuck. I don't think it's needed. But if you do, then great.

Mr. French: Well, I-- it keeps coming back to the comments offline that I'm hearing about some of those challenges. And I'm thinking back on in Nevada side of it. It's been a while ago. But I-- I'm still hearing comments on the ground on the Sheldon refuge, for instance. And I just-- I wonder about how we coordinate. wild horses, wild horse from how we see it on this board. It's not necessarily an interior horse or the department of AG horse. But you know, you start thinking about how gathers are handles, for instance off the shelf and refuge. And how they're handled, where they go. And I know in the case, I observed on one example, where the south boundary of the Sheldon refuge, the fence was gone. And when the contractor was in the process of collecting horses, he pushed them right into the Bureau of Land Management horse. It was a huge influx of horses ended up on that hot springs range. I was thinking about that from the standpoint of coordination comment or the spirit of coordination. And the other one was the National Park Service with regard to burros and what not. I know there were issues with that off the Lake Mead national park having to do with burro collection out there and where they went with them and what not. I want to get clarification on that and hopefully get some, if there isn't already, some spirit of, cooperation between the agencies. That's what I was thinking.

Mr. Oliver: I agree with what Holle' said as far as where we are. We have a ways to go. Two different programs we're trying to figure out how we work together. My question would be, you know, from an agreement standpoint, you mentioned other agencies or other entities where you want to enter into agreements with them for the management specifically.

Mr. French: I don't know if that would be-- agreement is the vehicle I'm looking for. I'm wondering if that spirit of, cooperation we're trying to get. Depending who is running the refuge at the time or the National Park Service in Lake Mead, on the two examples I brought up, seems like there isn't a lot of synergy with regard to them. I know there was a lot of concern on the ground during the progression of that collection. I wanted to get that out on the table.

Dr. Bechert: Um, based on what I'm hearing from Holle' and Chuck, I'm wondering if this was in addition to the original recommendation. And it seems to overlap with what we are recommending earlier which is, you know, partnering, broad partnerships for everything. And it's not specifically that we're looking for an agreement. So I would propose that we strike that and make number 6 the U.S. Forest Service budget.

Ms. Carlisle: Right.

Dr. Bechert: And just keep it simple.

Ms. Carlisle: I'm fine with that. Let's go 8, that is 7. if you all are ready.

Dr. Lenz: So this is, it's kind of confusing to me. And so what I would recommend is we go back to the initial recommendation which is the board supports the commitment of the agency to the CAWP and recommended continued training and increasing public education opportunities to aid and demonstrate the level of care, handling and treatment provided by the Wild Horse & Burro program. I think that's more succinct and straightforward.

Ms. Carlisle: The level of care-- (away from mic).

Dr. Lenz: Just here's that initial-- here's our initial recommendation rather than getting into the weeds here.

Dr. Perryman: I concur. I was about to write almost the same sentence. It gets very, you know-- confusing.

Ms. Carlisle: Any other comments on that final one? I would propose that, and I will, Bryant, you can weigh in. I propose we take a short break so I can make the changes and project them again for one more read through. Hopefully right before public comment so we can sit and be thinking through additional public comments and anything else we need to add.

Mr. Oliver: I'm sorry. Apologies to the board. But--

Ms. Carlisle: It's just a suggestion.

Mr. Oliver: I mean it's a great suggestion. I wanted to go back to the discussion somehow. I missed going back to five in that last sentence, facilitate management for a horse on tribal lands. Where did you end up with that?

Ms. Carlisle: Number five is going to be the BLM and U.S. Forest Service and tribal governments initiate/maintain discussions with other entities, with other government entities and states responsible for management of free-roaming-- and then on it goes. And that 7, instead of being what is seen up on that screen is essentially going to be A. That is up there on the screen right now. Number 7 will be the board supports U.S. Forest Service effort to advocate for its own separate budget for management of wild--

Mr. Oliver: I was unclear. Thank you. Sorry about that.

It's stand-alone now.

Mr. Kuechle: Okay. So, to clarify, Celeste, we're going to take a half hour break. Is that accurate? And we will begin our public comment.

Ms. Carlisle: If we can do a 20-minute break and then I'll project the changes that are made so everyone can see it one more time before public comment. So, we can ruminate and hear the public comment that might require further shifting.

Mr. Kuechle: Got you. Sounds good. Okay, so 9:20, we'll reconvene. Thank you.

[Break]

Public Comment Period (3)

Mr. Kuechle welcomed back the public and read aloud the rules for providing public comment. Public comment then commenced with virtual comments first.

Gracie Kuhn

Great. To the members of the Advisory Board, my name is Grace Kuhn, for the American Wild Horse Campaign, speaking on behalf of-- troubled by the round up. Our main concerns lie with the inhumane violations of the wild horse program that observed in round ups last year by the Bureau of Land Management and contractors. These violations include not limited to running foals in high heat, resulting in tragic death. Funneling over 120 stressed Mustangs, entirely too small, resulting in the pen collapsing and multiple deaths. And of course, deaths caused by you have suffered broken necks, skulls, and excessive and improper roping. Last year the BLM'er Naos CAWP assessment from Congress. They were meant to identify violations during round ups and holding facilities. An A striking a burro, the final C CAWP was deemed as quote, with 96% of standards being met. While the CAWP did recommend that the responsible employee be removed from task until received proper training, it's disheartening to see the one who abused an animal was given a second chance. CAWP reported excessive use of electronic products during the handling of wild horses and burros. The overall of that assess many was considered good with an 82% rating. No recommendations were made with the excessive use of electric products. We will have observers on the ground documenting these egregious violations. It's been [

difficult to hear moderator] To obtain meaningful access to this. Photographers are placed a mile and a half from the trap sites, limiting transparency. This lack of transparency, that deems the contractor striking the animal is concerning. Request that this Advisory Board make recommendations to improve observation gathering observation to allow transparency in this program. We urge the establishment of an independent CAWP that doesn't consider the list of employees. These measures will ensure the protection and protection of our wild horse and burros. Thank you for the consideration.

Mr. Kuechle: Thank you, Grace. Up next we have Marie-- and the next person that is with us here, Amelia. If you did sign up for this online public comment period and you have other not yet joined the meeting, please do so by the conclusion of the online portion. At that time we're going to move forward with the in-person comments. Mary and then Amelia on deck.

Marie Millman

This is an excerpt from a press release from the National Academy of Sciences a full decade ago. The U.S. BLM current practice of removing horses from public lands promotes a high population growth and maintaining them in long-term facilities is economically unsustainable and incongruent with public expectations. The report says that tools exist for the BLM to better manage wild horses and burros, unhealthy-- enhance public engagement and confidence and make the program more fully sustainable. It also provides evidence-based approaches that wildly inconsistently implemented can improve the management on the public lands. Addressing those issues with science-based management approaches better applied consistently and communicated transparently to the public who help increase the public confidence in the Wild Horse and Burro program and benefit our public lands and wild horses and burros. Transparency promotes accountability and provides citizens of the United States about what the government is doing. Information maintained by the Federal government is a national asset and the basis for improved public confidence. Minimizing public comments will not accomplish nor create public confidence nor improve the Wild Horse and Burro program management. Accountability and notes transparency is required and currently is inadequate. There are no records online in arts to flight data, range line, vet reports, facility data, facility report after a gather, et cetera. Of which increases the workload of the BLM employees by responding to lawyers and other external communications. The reduction of paperwork partially be accomplished by making the data available. We gather update page provides minimum information but yet the BLM recommends to check the website. The catch phrase appears to be, doing hard things is so complicated that they can't do anything because it's so complex. BLM accomplishes moving mining, green energy, oil and gas projects that are much more complex than wild horse and burro management, but yet the wild horse and burro program is paralyzed and reverting back to over a decade ago. My recommendations are the DM to create as defined in their handbook, the V L M, to develop an acceptable process for accountability on behalf of its employees and contractors. And the BLM is to develop a transparent portal for the public to access any factors affecting the wild horses and burros and the public land that they stand. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today.

Amelia Perrin

Hi everyone, my name is Amelia Perrin. I'm the American Law Campaign Investigation Manager. I'm here for the third year in a row to discuss the issue, the BLM adoption program. And for the third year in a row, despite irrefutable evidence of fraud and abuse, the BLM has failed, has failed to inform this program which is not caring for hundreds if not thousands (inaudible). The BLM has a legally mandated responsibility to ensure a humane outcome for all captured wild horse and burros. As my work has demonstrated year after year when BLM we've documented over 1,500 the wild horse and burros and kills even worse than that, we've identified related individuals defrauding and cheating the American public, out of hundreds of thousands of taxpayer and commercially exporting wild horses and burros all while agencies turn a blind eye and turning back on the very animals they are to protect, lemme be very clear, this program is a black mark and will be looked back on the same level of distaste and embarrassment as the slaughter symbol of the 1980s, the 1990s and the two thousands tens. These adopters abusing this program are not just a few bad actors, they're not people who have fallen on hard times and can't do their animals anymore. BLMs own records show that many of these adopters receive title to the animal and within days after are sent to kill pens. Our investigators have found those very animals in kill pens, sent after title was awarded. The agency's own number show that the most successful rate adopt out is through investing in humane training programs. According to the BLM 2,332 trained animals were adopted out while only 1,700 AIP untrained animals were adopted out. To add some perspectives, the majority of all the Mustangs and burros found in these pens have been unhandled. which is a hallmark of a I and even more the majority of all. And found that identified its clear investing in training program and transparent and staff will be a step in the right direction towards creating a viable

adoption for Mustang and burros. Don't think that laughing. This is my third year speaking with this board. I participated in countless public comment periods. I participated INS workshop on a, I've spoken to ex-BLM special investigators and the conclusion that everyone has come to including boards recommendations for the last few years and let the cap commodity patient and yet the continues to deny and mislead the public about the true consequences of adoption incentive program. It's unacceptable and its past time change. I ask the board yet again to recommend the BLM abandon its cash incentives and provide a noncash alternative. Thank you for your consideration.

Laurie Ford

Okay. In 2020, the board recommended BLM identify the behavioral physiological and social differences between wild horses and burros so that burros could be managed accordingly. The BLM has yet to follow the recommendation and still manages burros like horses. Instead, they continue to use helicopters and burro round ups knowing full well it increases stress levels and health risk burros are most prone to. Both persist long after the round up as burros are separated, processed, transported and even after adoption. When many could wind-up with existing illness that might not be life-threatening, this stress becomes a major risk factor for hyperlipidemia the major cause of death after capture due to organ failure. Because burros are more stoic than horses this ill in he is not recognized, and ensuing deaths are blamed on other condition or after adoption of the diagnosed death. A Jenny stress can affect the fetal development of their foal and the period during and after birth which can result in severe, neonatal illness or death. I can attest to these types deaths from personal experience, and it's not a pretty picture. Burros travel alone or in small groups. During the 2022 Bluewing complex round up helicopter pilots had gather and drive burros long distances in high heat before herding them into trap and directly onto trailers. Adult scatters, foals got separated and all requiring aggressive rope which was traumatizing and exhausting for the burros. Shortly afterwards, 31 burros 5% died. After a 2021 nuance gathering in the complex, 38 of 218 burros died in less than one year. Multiple FOIAs have revealed approximately 20% or more burros die within one year of capture either in holding or after adoption. Current population modeling is designed for horses, not burros, despite burros have no defined foaling season, longer gestation periods and not birthing a foal every year. During yesterday's presentation, this subject was not presented but the role fertility control plays in analysis with horse was greatly considered. If a round up occurs after the March 1 annual population estimate, the number of adults and foals captures are subtracted. Foals capture and born in holding are not subtracting despite having that included in the original estimate as a foal yet to be born. For burros who foal year-round this number is greater than those already born. And if included would reduce the following year's March 1 estimate and numbers to be removed in the future.

Pamela Zamel

Good morning my name is Dr. Pamela Zamel, I'm an echo psychologist. I have a different angle on this, bear with me. I promise you I'm not. I spend a lot of time with youth. I counsel and teach young people, young people. Our youth are in trouble. The suicide rate increased 60% among youth since 2011, almost 42% of young adults have anxiety and 11% of all youth are suffering with major depression. You might be wondering, what does this have to do with our public land? Well, there's growing by empirical evidence showing the value of nature, experiences of mental health with positive effects on positive functioning mood and restoring parasympathetic nervous function. There are controlled lab studies that have demonstrated positive psychological and physiological impact on mere exposure to native to nature photos and sounds. Some recent studies have shown that the reason why spaces are good for mental health is because they inspire all that sense of being in the presence of something greater than ourselves. That fills us with wonder. Interestingly, a study published in environment and behavior found that not all nature spaces are equal in terms of the benefits they yield. They have found that high environmental qualities such as reserves and protective habitats were more beneficial than areas with low biodiversity. There's clear and growing evidence that severe and in some cases irreversible degradation. Our public lands need protecting from increasing demands of development, extractive uses and grazing. Tragically, it seems like the removal adverse sterilization of our wild horses and burros is the primary and often sole solution to a multifaceted problem. From all my research, the science is just not there to support this. Western watershed project identified ranching as the primary cause of native species endangerment in the west as well as water pollution. More recent studies are proving that not only are horses, birds a native species, but they're also a keystone species contributing to healthy soils, feeding planned diversity, breaking frozen water sources for other species, and even forging on dried flammable, uh, vegetation reducing wild fire threat for us all. The science is very clear as far as wild horses and corals are concerned. There a natural resource that should be protected, not eliminated. My ask is quite simple. I would like to see environmental impacts that is done on each a HMA individually and by an independent third party expert, not local, so that each area can be approached and planned for as a protective habitat independent of old alliances and historical president. There should be no roundups until this is completed. Public health, mental health and public lands are more

intertwined than you might think. Please keep our youth and future generations in mind for making your future decisions about land management. Thank you for your time.

Craig Downer

My name is Craig Downer, I'm a wildlife ecologist with the Wild Horse organization in Nevada.

Our public lands are taken over by over subsidized ranchers and America's last remaining wild horse and burros are replaced by livestock as well as other exploiters of public land. Over a million cattle and sheep are allowed to illegally take the great majority of the forage and water within the millions of acres of legal habitat that times of the wild horses and burros. This is contrary to the unanimously passed Wild Horse and Burro Act, shamelessly subverted and made a mockery of because of lack of law enforcement. (Inaudible) We still must rise up and assert the rights of wild horses and burros to advocate year-round habitat sustained, long-term viable populations are hurt and people must stop messing with their reproductive system. It causes terrible suffering and disrupts their social norms. Natural selection and impedes their ability to survive. On BLM and U.S. Forest Service lands, less than 100,000 wild horses and burros survive throughout the west. Compared to millions of deer, elk and hunted animals while their natural predators, mountain lions, bears and wolves and coyotes are exterminated by millions dollars of taxpayer money given to animal services and other such agencies. Predators are the natural balancers of the species upon which they prey. Equilibrium in the large community. This situation must stop. Wild horses and burros are natural gardeners who restore ecosystem. They are preyed upon and scavenge when they pass on. See many plant species, including natives and ridge soils, all through their droppings they save many species, they open thickets and break ice crusted forage plants and iced over water sources and they also sniff out underground water and paw down to it, creating natural pools. All these natural behavior makes wider accessible for weaker animals. Animals create an oasis where amazing variety of animals as well as cats. The horses and burros are determining keystone for existence of species for entire ecosystems throughout the west, lasting many years. We must stop obnoxious disinformation campaigns, the lies about the wild horses and burros.

Lindsey Baker

My name is Lindsey Baker, I'm opposed to the horse round ups for many of the reasons we heard from the individuals that spoke before me. These scheduled round ups must not happen, not now nor in the future. A plan must be devised, this is not the right plan. I'm currently a video journalist and podcaster over the past three years I've interviewed many horse experts, advocacy groups and ecologists college scientists and authors on the subject about what it comes down to and what it does come down to are these round ups are first of all illegal because they violate the wild and free roaming horse and burro act which allocated public land to the wild horses which is already from my understanding in many of the different areas been encroached on. In the cases of cattle ranching, it's cattle ranching sheep herding and commercial enterprise. The round ups destroy family units, disrupt the natural order of ecosystems and these horses are rapidly on their way to extinction. If this continues not for long time, for a short time, they will be gone. The BLM has demonstrated in my opinion a bias towards the cattle ranchers and industrialists that have vested interest in getting rid of the horses and using the land for commercial gain. This must not be allowed to happen, and many are speaking out against this and will hold elected officials as well as appointed officials accountable. We are paying attention and there are many folks like myself that are out there allowing folks to share their messages when the mainstream media will not. I have nothing against commerce. But we have to re-think how business is done and we must collaborate to make changes and make it happen quickly. Leave the horses alone. And let's get back to the drawing board about how to produce clean energy and healthy food for everyone. Thank you for listening.

Sandee Force

My number is Sandee and I was given my first wild horse in 1974. Since then I have been active in the northwest and promoting the use of wild horses and burros and being a BLM volunteer and compliance checker. I have a lot of experience with horses, burros and livestock since I have been involved in the livestock industry since 1989. I have seen a lot of different ideas, plans, screw ups and a few great ideas within the wild horse and burro program. I have acknowledged recently that Roundups alone will no longer hold down numbers. We have passed the tipping point for anyone who does not know what the tipping point is. It's when the horse and burro holding numbers are high enough that there are more folds born than horses and burros can possibly be removed from the range, the ground up and deaths which are and tied to deteriorating health of the herd lands. This should be con considered potentially a catastrophic incident available. Countertops alone have proven not to be effective and, um, we cannot rely on them to control the numbers. Um, they have a, at best 2% growth rate and that still requires limited round us. But to use interceptive effectively, herd numbers still need to be reduced to reasonable numbers. If you add to these management methods currently available, a

spay trial on older mares to run on a larger herd, I think you would find that the BLM could actually get numbers back close to or at AML. I understand that a lot of people have a knee-jerk reaction to the idea of spaying wild merits, but the time has come to face the fact that we need spay. This spaying is to take, would take place at BLM in US Forest Service Corral. It doesn't matter whether you use Dr. Leon pill stick method or an alternative ones, the trials need to run and any organization that actively tries to pressure a vet school and to not working with the BLM on oversight needs to be called out and sanctioned by the public. There are a limited number of tools in the box for managing wild horses and burros and we no longer have the luxury of ignoring any of them. If groups and organizations want to challenge existing AML go for it. But AML has to set for range health and the health of the traditional wildlife numbers and scope and m a having listened to wildlife specialist and Ecologist, I understand that their input is required. Thank you.

Tenaya Jewell

Hello. So, the public is demanding that conservation be prioritized and land management and the government is starting to move in this direction. I've started to see resource management plans that says ecosystem health as the top priority over uses. So, things are changing. I hope that this current standard procedure of endless inhumane and unnecessary roundup is archaic and totally unsustainable. I believe the holding this type of management in place is a consistent on labeling the horses as feral and or nonnative. This too is very archaic and out of tested modern science. This change science is clear historical narrative that we've been told just doesn't hold water. Scientists start taking second look of evolution in classification of all species to include the horses. Now that we have more advanced and accurate technology using DNA other methods like civil examination or less accurate safety methods, what the data is showing is that the horses were in parts of North America before, during, and after the (inaudible) era where they were previously going to be extinct. The horses were present here before Columbus sailed the ocean blue, molecular biologist, paleontologists archeologists museum curator are confirming the data as well as so many other Americans to see their ancestors have horses all along. I'm a laboratory scientist in my lab, DNA technology to confirm our test results from other, there's no disputing it. This technology is solid evidence. We want the most scientifically correct term for the horses that feral non-native needs to stop. And I know it's not coming completely from a place of ignorance, but to the public on these, the ancestry of the buffalo, which agents that that does notify from being counted as native here, it similar, it was a very late immigrant of, it's still considered native. So why are they, if the horse isn't, even though they originated here is now classified and make a difference to people from industry or livestock operations, I'm gonna say no because they go after all the other wildlife too. But it would make a huge difference to the public at large who are relying on information to make informed decisions. The majority of public horses remain free to be of preservation given the land act that was originally designated in 1971. The numbers are currently close to extinction, they're definitely not overpopulated and unfortunately we are heading in that direction again of extinction if we don't change. Thank you.

Jim Sedinger

My name is Jim Sedinger. I am a retired faculty member from the University of Nevada Reno. I serve as the representative of the western section of The Wildlife Society to The Wildlife Society's Council. Its governing body. The society represents more than 15,000 professional wildlife biologists and managers, and we thank the board for the opportunity to provide comments today. The society supports the bureau's National Wild Horse and Burro program and its mission to ensure that healthy herds thrive on healthy range lands. However, with on range populations continuing to exceed ecologically sustainable levels, TWS is increasingly concerned about the lack of progress in substantial reducing population size. Continued overpopulation of federally managed horses and burros threatens the ecological integrity of landscapes and native wildlife. Further overpopulation results in inhumane conditions for the horses and Burroughs themselves leading to starvation and lack of water, which was exacerbated by the recent drought in the West. The society believes in management solutions that reduce populations to ecologically sustainable levels as quickly as practical placing emphasis on permanent removal of excess individuals from range lands. While TWS supports the use of fertility control for long-term population management, the current emphasis on fertility control before bringing populations to a m l only slows achieving a sustainable state to reduce on range populations in a meaningful timeframe. The society recommends bringing the number of animals on range lands down to AML within six to eight years. While upfront costs of meaningfully increasing the number of gatherers will be significant. These resources will not be required indefinitely. Pairing a short-term emphasis on removal of individuals from the range with a long-term emphasis on fertility control solutions will provide a mechanism for population reduction then stabilization. The BLM appears to be prioritizing resources to maintain herds that are already at AML. Because HMAs at AML have relatively few horses, this approach leads to an over allocation of her horses to areas with the fewest horses. While HMAs over AML continue to degrade. For example, Nevada counts for nearly 60% of all free roaming horses and burros on BLMs HMAs. But HMAs in the state

received less than 40% of gather funds in fiscal year 2022 prolonging severe ecological damage in the state. The Wildlife Society requests. The board emphasized the need for the resources required for robust gathers over the next six to eight years to achieve AML, followed by intensive use of fertility control without a significant and immediate increase in the rate of removal coupled in the long term with the use of adoptions and fertility control, these populations will continue to expand and our nation will witness the continued degradation of ecologically important and unique range land systems. Thank you for considering the views of wildlife professionals.

Saundra Holloway

Thank you for taking my comment. Thank you hear me okay? My name is Saundra Holloway. I'm a resident of California but spent many years in Reno. That is where I saw my first wild horse. I'm a taxpayer and here as voice for our wild horses. I regularly travel to wild places to catch a glimpse of the beautiful horses and burros and I would like my children's children to see them. I oppose round ups. Instead I want grazing permits for all public lands suspended physical the bureau has fulfilled the 1971 Wild and Free Roaming Horses and Burros act. The act mandates the protection and management of freeing horses and burros in a manner that promotes a thriving natural ecological balance on our public land. Our wild horses and burros out there need that forage and room to roam. It's time to stop catering to livestock ranchers. None of the herd management areas listed on your round up schedule provide any flyover or data to demonstrate an accurate population count. Post winter 2020, the winter of 2023 was so harsh in wild horse country that hay drops for domestic livestock were approved to ensure survival of livestock, but no concern was paid for horses. Hunting tag numbers were also decreased, but somehow the Bureau of Land Management wants needs and the public to think that wild horse numbers increase during the harshest winter and over a decade, we don't believe that BLM must prove that the number of wild we plan to remove is actually within their legal boundaries. BLM may very well be removing far below your designated authority until the bureau transparently demonstrates data that complies with underlying NEPA. paperwork. The small Mino Butte McColl Peak in Wyoming, little Brook Smith in Colorado, the HMAs of the complex that are California and the Calico complex in Nevada were all hit hard in the winter of 2023. We all saw how colder and wetter it was. All of these areas have removal numbers to removal numbers listed to maintain a specific number of wild horses. But not one of the management areas has provided the public with UpToDate data to justify the removal of significant numbers of wild horses. I would ask the number horses actually out in this HMAs verified before any roundups are even considered. And just for the record, I strongly oppose the use of helicopters to chase forces in these summer months. Foals have been born recently and your contracted helicopters have shown past behavior of not appearing to guidelines set up to protect both mare and foal. Thank you for your time.

Peggy Coleman Taylor

Okay, my name is Peggy Coleman Taylor and I support the Wild Horse Fire Brigade. Our world has undergone profound changes necessitating a shift for new solutions. One significant issue we face is a decline of wildlife herbivores. Biologists have pointed out that the mule deer habitat has been fragmented by roads from oil, gas, drilling and mining, rendering it inhospitable for wildlife. Shockingly, despite this knowledge, the BLM in 2016 allowed up to 15,000 new oil and gas wells in critical deer habitat. Colorado parks and wildlife even blamed predators to be hunted, diverting attention from the real cause. The peons wild horse herd also occupies this area, highlighting the disregard for their protection by failing to prioritize their HMA habitat. These actions are concerning and warrant attention. Furthermore, the killing of ravens and the eradication of wild horses in the name of protecting sage grouse, that another misguided approach sacrificing two species to save another is morally questionable. It is interesting to note that Cheatgrass actually came into existence when cattle were introduced to the west over 150 years ago. Over grazing the land, the information presented wrongly points fingers at horses for the cause of cheatgrass. Additionally, while it is repeatedly mentioned that livestock grazing in the HMAs is allowed in early May, if it is detrimental to the range's health, why is it permitted? Alan Savory's thought provoking Ted talk killing 40,000 elephants believed to be the cause of land degradation. Paralleling the plight of the wild horses turned out to be the worst mistake of his life. The health of the land worsened emphasizing the inter interconnectedness of all living beings and the need for harmony in our ecosystems. Let's not repeat the same mistakes it is essential to recognize that God created all living things with a specific purpose. Horses being one of the largest herbivores are designed to be fire mitigators and our nature's farmers via reseeding. The Wild Horse fire brigade presents a solution to, to rewild excess wild horses in areas where apex predators thrive. And thus allowing the Wild Horse to live wild do help prevent catastrophic fires that ultimately cost taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars. When it comes to managing Wild Horse populations, we must consider the potential dangers of fertility control, which can disrupt the genetic balance of the herd, as well as her sizes under 150 to 200. Insufficient resources on drugs like GonaCon raises concerns as more than one dose can potentially sterilize these animals. It is worth noting that using experimental drugs

and wild animals used to be considered inaccessible efforts to slow down population growth. Through the use of fertility, drugs aimed at preventing roundups have proven ineffective. Native wild horses are still being rounded up in unprecedented numbers. The approach is slowly killing our horses with toxins. Serious corruption within the AIP program is evident. It is time to shut the program down to preserve the honor, the wildness of these horses, dumping burros and sending BLM AIP horses to slaughter is, is a tragedy. I personally am in, uh, getting these rescues and the compliance checks are obviously not gonna transfer. Thank you.

Roger Dobson

Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Roger Dobson, Director tribal cultural resources for protective wolves a tribal member founded organization who works to protect all of our children's resources. I have to call into question of whether the models that were presented yesterday for the advisory group was done only using horses. I heard no mention of other species to include livestock, sheep, and or wildlife, which is extremely concerning. It is the responsibility of the BLM to protect not only our children's resources, but our children's land. We are but the caretakers of their wildlife and lands. Yesterday, the panel also mentioned you can't focus on just one species, yet you only appear to be focused on one species being horses. The advisory group suggestions today will either prove this statement correct or inaccurate. We do not consider cattle. We, we do need to consider cattle that is allotted 60% of the food production. Horses and wildlife are restricted to 40%. So that species need to be targeted equally, not just horses and wildlife. To begin to bring back the healthy lands. We also have to include water usage. While knowing that a cow calf pairs water requirements are more than double or more when compared to horses. The cow calf pair in this scenario is based on the low end, which is, which would require 105 to 110 liters per day, which doubles if in fact it's a lactating cow compared to 49.205 liters per day. For a horse, which is towards the higher end, please take real data into consideration for focusing on all species involved in equal focus. If the above is not brought honestly into the conversation and suggestions, you will continue to cause our public lands to degrade. Further, I have serious concerns about BLMs new euthanization policy, which to me conflicts with your current policy. Your current inhumane treatment policy. It allows you to euthanize basically a wild horse for any reason, whether it's loading or it, it's not being friendly. Transparency has been brought up in the last several days and we demand more transparency, cameras at gathering and holding pens as well as front and sides of helicopters. At this point, the public sees you as very untransparent hiding facts to the point of keeping your actions private and hidden from public view. Further, this new policy language allows BLM more discretion to move horses to holding before euthanizing them in order to keep the reported onsite euthanasia, euthanasia death rate lower. How is that honest and transparent? Thereby throwing your statement of wanting more transparency right out the window. Again, with your desire to be transparent, that you claim you're wanting, your regulations are now hiding your bad actions. You can now euthanize a horse for having a bad day. That's not humane treatment. Further, why are NEPAs not completed for each and every roundup. It appears to be just another form of hiding the facts and being untransparent. Thank you

Jackie Chandler

I believe you all care. Given your legal limits and the outside pressures, your best thinking, 50 years, capture contain, sterilize, transport cell. I'm not seeing a success story here, really. Public money, public land, public confidence is low. The reason is places are overcrowded. I never seen overcrowding except at the BLM containment centers except in more documents and laws and thinking in boxes. 50 years doing the sale thing and expecting different results, insanity. Rearranging deck chairs. Ever seen a square in nature? Right. When is human law been appropriate for wildlife? Earth runs on natural law, and nature doesn't belong to us. That doesn't stop us to want to put it in a boxes. We have laws that manage fertility in women. Must be good enough for fertility in wildlife. What's the win rate on human intervention and laws for improving nature's forest, and wild time habitat our own life support. Fiscally quantitative value of 4 trillion a year. Best way forward is to look around. You spoke of collaboration. Finding agencies closer to the herds but you didn't speak about collaborating with the NGOs. Why not? You mentioned working with 4H, Bring them in and let they will recommend solutions that work with nature. Like partnering with NGOs. Here are eight things to recommend. Partnering with advocacy groups bring them into circle, bring on board. Number two transparency. Bring the public closer. Start with stewardship programs and demos. Three, keystone species, bring them back. Four, use human laws to stop killing cougars. Five stop subsidizing livestock and mining hunters and developers. Six, subsidize wildlife preserves. And you know, who'll say, sustain those tourism industry, wildlife industries in the billions. Fire brigades, number seven. Green jobs for riders, trainers and docents. And what do you need to make different decisions so we can leave a 50 year rearranging deck chair, trail of blood? The best way forward is to look around. Eight, hold the meetings outside with the

horses. Ask them what they need. Let nature and natural law lead us and you out of the box. This isn't who we are. You're walking bags of water, living and thinking in boxes. No wonder. Thank you.

Ginger Fedak

I'm Ginger from Colorado. I am the Wild Horse and Burro senior campaigner for the nonprofit in defensive of animals. I have been coming to these advisory board meetings for years in the past, the mantra was always, we must get to AML before we do fertility control. In this meeting, that has changed and you are willing to do fertility control before reaching AML. However, the broad use of the term fertility control is problematic because fertility control is not all the same and some forms are destructive. GonaCon, IUDs, ectopy via CMY and other forms of surgical, surgical sterilization should never be used in wild herds under the guise of fertility control. It is crucial to use the method that has the least impact on mares and herds. PZP is reversible, humane, and does not cause adverse effects. I am alarmed that the BLM is using GonaCon as their fertility control method of choice in more herds, knowing that it can cause sterility. I live close to Fort Collins and Colorado State University and have followed their GonaCon studies and have spoken with the researchers doing them as they were evolving. BLM is currently using GonaCon in a way, never done in the studies by giving the second dose after 30 days. A few weeks ago, Dr. Dan Baker said they never studied the 30 day interval and have no idea how it will affect the mare or her fertility. He cannot support that usage. As a research scientist myself, familiar with study protocols, I have participated in FDA regulated clinical trials and other scientific studies using a product outside the parameters of the study used for approval is considered off-label use and should not be done. Dr. Baker confirmed that in one group of mares study none, zero return to fertility after seven years and are most likely permanently sterile. By contrast, PZP has been used effectively, effectively for over 30 years on assisting and elsewhere, showing no adverse effects on mares or bands. PZP has not a pesticide as some claim is a natural sub substance that was only dumped into the pesticide category because there was no applicable category. However, PZP must be used correctly and not haphazardly, or it too can cause sterility after too many consecutive years. About five years ago, this advisory board invited TJ Holmes to report on the PZP fertility control program in Spring, spring Creek basin HMA in Colorado. She does all the darting ID and record keeping. Every mayor contributes offspring in family bands of their own choosing. Just like other wild herds, natural selection and genetic viability is preserved. Since TJ began in 2011, there has been no need for a roundup and the AML was even increased due to the success of the program. Thank you.

Linda Greaves

I'm Linda. I'm going to hit a few points that are important. First, we had an extremely harsh winter with many deaths. So real counts need to be done before any roundups science needs to be embraced and looked at often. Examples in the last two years show that eques caballus, which is the current horse, is the same that evolved here also horses were here again by the 16 hundreds all around the world. Rewilding is being done with wild horses. We need to be doing this on our HMAs. When done, native species do return after generations of being gone. All range management has to start with livestock as horses and burros are only on 11% of public lands. While most BLM land is failing range standards per BLM cattle are the number one cause. I only hear about growth control as management or the plans addressing range improvement projects that would help all the animals thrive and save money long term. This is how to get healthy horses on healthy lands. Also, geldings males is useless as it only takes one stallion to cover every mare off range pastures need to be to be addressed as no shade barriers, no shade, no wind breaks. Winnemucca needs to be scrapped. It isn't floodplain, it is not suitable for horses. Cleaning pens four times a year is unacceptable. All holding needs to be open to the public. At Roundups, you talk about acceptable deaths and injuries. They are not when caused by lack of care. The numbers do not show the deaths in holding afterwards either. In these numbers, vet reports need to be made available to the public. Again, AUMs cattle's today often outweigh horses and drink 25 to 35 gallons of water while wild horses drink 15 to 20. Also, cattle's outnumber horses when on the range 30 to one or more, and they are on the land when the critical growing is going on as discussed yesterday, AMLs when horses are protected in 1971, it was due to critically low numbers of about 27,000, which is about the current BLM. But BLM has taken them to low AML, which is under 18,000. Uh, AMLs will be addressed in HMS with and with less than 170 HMAs. You lump these horses together, but there are AMLs with zero, HMAs with zero AMLs. 12 have under 10 53 have under 50. None of these are genetic, viable, viable. All 16 HMAs have animals. Only 16 HMAs have AMLs of over 600 of 200. All 26 million acres you had sterilization. And many of these herds have no chance of survival. Justification for roundups salt wells is over a million acres and they plan to zero it out. Why, also take McCullough Peaks where they have a successful management program and are only a few over AML half of that herd are seniors. In the next few few years, they will lose many again. Why? How much is this gonna cost us? And I agree with what Ginger says about birth control. And also wanna point out, GonaCon has had no feed through studies. If a horse dies out on the range and other animals feed on it, we do not know the results of what the,

that birth control will do to these other animals. And we need to know this before that these animals are, are put on a this goes into our public lands. Thank you.

Tommy Meryl

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Tommy Meryl I was born and raised here in Nevada. I'm a tribal member of the Pyramid Lake Ute tribe. I've been a hunter my whole life and in my lifetime I have seen springs trampled, you know, and springs that used to support a diverse group of animals are now mud pits are dried up in some cases. Horses have no natural predators. It's easier to hunt and take down smaller game. They're not as dangerous to cougar, you know, their size also enables them to bully native wildlife away from resources. I think instead of, uh, holding of more holding facilities and huge roundup operations to sterilize these animals, we should be managing 'em then managing them in the same way we manage throughout their big game through hunting. Given the opportunity, tens of thousands of hunters would happily help manage these horses, you know, while filling their freezers and feeding their families. I'm not saying all horses are bad, they need to be managed. Too many horses on the land means the land suffers, the native wildlife suffers and the horses themselves suffer. Yeah, that's it.

Hayden Ballard

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the board my name is Hayden Ballard. I'm an attorney for the Utah Public Lands Office. Um, this is my first time addressing this board. So, a quick brief on who I am. Uh, like I said, I'm an attorney. I have a law degree specializing in natural resources. I have a Master of Law degree specializing in agricultural law, and I have a master's of natural resources, uh, specializing in civil pasture. Um, and, and kind of my background, I grew up on a small family cattle ranch in North Arizona and southern Utah. We have been there continuously. My family has since 1927. I love horses. I dabble in horse training a little bit. I've had the opportunity through the years. I've actually trained two, uh, geldings that were adopted through this program. So, um, I, I guess I approach this issue with, with a legal and a scientific background as well as kind of more of a hands-on dirt under my fingernails approach, um, from having dealt with these horses and, and put them through, you know, a training program, uh, start to finish. So, it's kind of a unique perspective. Um, and I'd like to address with my remaining two minutes. Uh, you know, we've heard a lot of, uh, proposed solutions to this issue. It's extremely complex. One of those solutions, um, is to eliminate livestock and reallocate forage to the wild horses. And I guess I'd just like to highlight two very specific points on that. Um, count as two, uh, economic impacts. The first, so an AUM an animal unit month is the amount of forage a cow needs to live for a month, right? Um, a horse needs 1.2 AUMs a sheep needs 0.2. Those AUMs are bought and sold by ranchers on the open market every day, um, when they buy and sell allotments. And so those AUMs go for about 300 to 650 bucks an AUM, uh, banks, the farm credit system, the Farm Service Agency, all loan on those AUMs, they create liens on those AUMs. Um, and so to simply eliminate AUMs and reallocate those to horses is a going to have a direct impact on our, on our western ranchers. B, it's going to have a direct impact on our western banking system and the farm credit system. Uh, and an extremely negative way. I mean, if each of these AUMs are worth 650 bucks, uh, it takes 12 AUMs to run one cow for one year. So if you run a hundred cows, that's 1200 AUMs, you multiply that by 650, you get a pretty big number. Uh, the second impact each a u m has a hundred dollars economic impact in the local community. Um, and that dollar gets circulated about three times according to different studies. And so the loss of that economic impact on our rural communities, many of which are identified by the EPA screening tool as economically disadvantaged, would be heartbreaking to see happen to our rural communities in the west. Um, and you know, the, the state of Utah, we encourage proper management of all uses of the land. And so I, I highlight this because prioritizing one species over all other uses, um, is extremely destructive. We would simply encourage as you make your recommendations to continue to look at how actions of horses impact, um, all other uses and to do so evenly across the board. Thank you.

Sherman Swanson

Good morning. It's a pleasure to be here and thank you for this opportunity. So I am an, uh, emeritus professor of Rangeland and Riparian Ecology and Management from the University of Nevada Reno. I spent most of my career focusing on riparian grazing management as a, a puzzle to solve. And towards the end of my career, I became concerned because I realized that most of the 800 plus species of wildlife in Nevada spend some part of their life, um, in riparian habitat or in aquatic habitats that depend on riparian functions. And the physical functioning of, uh, these riparian areas is, um, been a center of focus. Um, it is necessary to sustain the habitat for wildlife and for all other of our land uses multiple use, uh, uses mostly, um, perhaps not mining, but most all of the other, um, people who use rangelands, um, value riparian areas. And the riparian physical functions are at risk in about three quarters of the places in the herd management areas of Nevada where the they are at risk and not recovering. So, these small areas that are central to biodiversity are at risk. And

because they're at risk, they're shrinking, they shrink because the water drains away and then it's not there to support the sponge that holds the water and provides the habitat, which is really important to sage grouse for late brood rearing habitat. So late in my career, I became curious about this question of horse grazing management. I've been focused on livestock grazing management and so we selected 10 random allotments, um, and one, um, meadow within priority sage grouse habitat that looked, uh, that was in the group of meadows, uh, that we randomly selected from that were, uh, likely to be the best sage grouse late brooding habitat. We set up trail cameras. My students analyzed time lapse photographs, 1,700,000 of them. And what we found is that the livestock we're using them nine times the rate of native wildlife. The good news is livestock can be moved in recovery or duration of grazing is far more important than intensity. The second thing they found is that horses were using them, uh, 18 times more than native wildlife twice the rate of livestock. And the horses are there season long. We don't have the tool of moving them. The meadows are falling apart because of the duration of use. We have many tools for livestock. We need to use them. We have one tool for horses, AML. We need to use that. We probably need to adjust AML because a m l was set before we considered riparian areas as part of the thriving natural ecological balance. Thank you very much

Break

Advisory Board discussion and Finalize Recommendations (Board Vote)

Jordan Brock, Note Taker, The Langdon Group

Ms. Carlisle: All right. Welcome back from break. Again, thank you to the public for participating virtually and in the room. I know these are long, I know this day especially is tedious. So grateful for your input. I know we do consider the comments as we are developing recommendations. Please do not feel you have not been heard if something's not represented in the recommendation. We also have to be timely with our recommendations and be thoughtful about how many we're making, feasibility of implementation and whether it's something we're going to be continuing to come back to. So just know that those things are important to us in longer term deliberations for sure. We're going to go ahead and put on the screen those edits which you all painfully hung on through. That are now hopefully represented in this copy. probably needs to be as large as possible. Um, and I'll go ahead and quickly read through and then what we're hoping so that there won't be a heck of a lot of wordsmithing. But we may have clarification issues. First recommendation, removals and meaningful impactful fertility control of improved -- (READING) translate to diverse, bipartisan-- contraception is the common interest of so many interested public, the roared recommend operations languages (READING). Specific HMAs such contraception plans have not been developed and each territory will require a different approach. This effort can also serve as demonstration sites which can also validate Pop Equus. Board.

Dr. Bechert: Instead of plus, maybe coupled with is more chair identifying, the very first line.

Ms. Carlisle: Removals coupled with meaningful, impactful fertility control. Agreed. Anyone else? Yep. We're about to have one other, I don't know, For now. Next Number 2, due to protracted drought and other climate related issues in the west, the board recommends the BLM and USFS begin determining process of analysis that will enable locally relevant, short and long-term range health considerations to guide decisions towards AML. Number three, BLM and the USFS should further centralize their respective Wild Horse and Burro programs to increase programs effectiveness and ability to respond to emergencies. Specifically, we recommend A, continuing to manage long-term holding nationally to facilitate animal movements and better coordinate budget among different states and HMA's. Advocate for establishment of a centrally administered, separate budget for emergency gathers so that states can follow through on long-term, strategic plans to gather and contracept their horse populations. C Utilize budgets across years, In this manner BLM would best know how much they are getting year to year.

Dr. Bechert: for grammar continuing, advocating, utilizing, and then I wonder if there's a way to clearly state C without parenthesis. maybe the parenthesis would end after bill. So that planning for multiple years strategic planning can be made or something like that. Maybe the parentheses would end after bill and then something so that multiple year, whatever the rest of that sentence is. So that planning for multiple years strategic planning can be made or something like that.

Dr. Lenz: I was going to say, if you end in parenthesis after bill, you would take out the word "that." utilizing budget across years-- let me read that again. Then you take out that parenthesis. Leave it after bill and take it out after "be." there you go.

Ms. Carlisle: Space after the comma, after funding.

Dr. Bechert: Instead of the next years and following years, can we just say multiple years?

Ms. Carlisle: Yep.

Ms. Carlisle: Take out what and that before multiple-- and next-- describe multiple. And remove the S from years. I have to read it again. Go back up to where-- thanks. Just let it hold for a second so we can read it.

Dr. Lenz: Why don't you just take everything in the parenthesis out. You don't have to provide an example, do you? You just say utilizing across years?

Ms. Carlisle: Remove everything in the parenthesis and the parenthesis. Yep. And it's still a crazy sentence. Someone else has to jump in.

Ms. Pearson: How about developing budgets across multiple years would enable BLM to know how much they would be getting for strategic planning. Something like that.

Dr. Lenz: So, you have to remove multiple in front of developing budgets across multiple years would. Yeah.

Ms. Carlisle: Tom, go ahead.

Instead it should be developing budgets across multiple years would allow or provide or whatever you want to say, multiple year funding. Period. And therefore, multiple year funding, period. And therefore, BLM would know how much they'll be getting from year to year. Does that make sense?

Mr. French: How about developing--

Ms. Carlisle: Hang on. It's hard across pages and also, we have a lag in this internet and the connectivity. So, it's really slow going.

Dr. Lenz: So, if you say in this manner-- wait a minute. What happened to therefore? Therefore, BLM would know how much funding they would be getting from year to year. There you go.

Dr. Bechert: Can I read an option and just read it and see how it sounds?

Developing budgets across multiple years would enable BLM to create strategic management plans which require long-term planning.

Mr. French: That would be the preamble then? In front then or-- (away from mic)

Dr. Bechert: It would replace that sentence. Okay.

Ms. Carlisle: Jordan, Dr. Bechert is going to type that in because it's going to be way too difficult.

Dr. Perryman: I would suggest this, developing budgets across multiple years would allow BLM to create long-term strategic management plans, period. Period after plans. And then delete the rest of that language.

Ms. Carlisle: scroll back up and everyone read a grammatical read through.

Dr. Lenz: So, B, that sentence with establish with centrally administered separate budget-- do you have to say advocating for? Are we recommending that they do it?

Ms. Carlisle: We are recommending that they continue to advocate for it. They cannot be the ones to do it. But they need to reinforce that it is necessary. that was the thought behind that.

Dr. Perryman: Placing continuing-- I'll skip that one. Separate budget. There needs to be an inclusion there that carries the idea of new money. New appropriations. Separate budget from new appropriations. Otherwise, we're talking about just moving money around within the budget. And we discussed that yesterday.

Ms. Carlisle: After appropriations, the word for. everybody ready to scroll down? Scroll down so we can see C in its entirety. Good there?

Dr. Perryman: Yeah.

Ms. Carlisle: Scroll down so we can see-- any comments here? I think we should not comment on this beyond a major comment because it cannot be-- it's an image.

Dr. Perryman: I would pose the question, do we actually, since this has been cleaned up, do we actually need this diagram?

Dr. Bechert: I would say yes based on some of the previous conversations. But I'm wonder if we should reference it. Maybe after the very first sentence? Like figure one or-- maybe it doesn't matter.

Ms. Carlisle: We're good to scroll down to the next one. All right. L.M. and the USFS should explore more creative ways to garner additional funding's sources and capacities. (READING). Through the Wild Horse and Burro program specifically amount, proactively facilitating development of partnerships that would facilitate efforts to collect data to learn more about local rangeland health trends so that herd management plans can be developed.

Dr. Lenz: I would remove should. Recommend that they explore the creative ways. Right? Just--

Ms. Carlisle Yep. Yes, Jordan, you've got it. Erase.

Dr. Bechert: And maybe in A, facilitating is used twice. Maybe the second facilitate could be augment efforts.

Dr. Perryman: I think I would shorten that anyway. Proactively facilitating development of partnerships that would facilitate efforts to collect local rangeland health trends. Period.

Ms. Carlisle: After the word collect, yeah.

Dr. Perryman: Yes. Delete that. Local rangeland health trends, period.

Ms. Carlisle: Period.

Dr. Bechert: But you don't collect trends. You collect data.

Dr. Perryman: Uh, yeah, you're correct. Collect, to collect, Data to determine. Local data for on rangeland health trends. Local data. On-- just on.

Dr. Bechert: And maybe change the last part to which can be incorporated into herd management plans. Because we want to make that connection. This has been significantly whittled down from where it was earlier.

Dr. Perryman: It's pretty intuitive but yeah. The last sentence.

Dr. Drotar: You mean to include territory plans as well?

Dr. Perryman: Yeah. I think it's intuitive. I think it will cause more confusion putting anything else.

Ms. Carlisle: Which could be incorporated into agency plans because there are several different types. We want to utilize for several of them.

Dr. Bechert: Yeah, and delete "can't be developed," I'm going to start from the beginning of A to make a few changes.

Ms. Carlisle: On the second line, the word facilitate change to augment. Remove the period at the end of that sentence where your cursor is. Lowercase the very next word. And the word and should be into. And get rid of the last three words and the period. Okay. Everybody quietly read it to yourselves. We're ready for five. Can we see five in its entirety? Not much longer, everybody. All right. I'm reading it so we don't have to read them again. The board recommends that the BLM, USFS and tribal governments initiate maintain, discussions with other government entities in the states responsible for management of free-roaming horses populations in the United States to ensure actions taken in HMAs and on territories are not undermined by immigration or immigration of horses from other areas.

Comments?

Dr. Perryman: Yes. We are now recommending that tribal governments do anything. Tribal governments are sovereign governments. And they can do whatever they want to. But we can recommend that the bureau and the Forest Service initiate discussions with tribal governments.

Ms. Carlisle: Hang on. Can we add that to after it says, initiate, maintain discussions with tribal governments and other government entities-- should it be going there? Okay. Remove tribal governments from the first line or move it.

Mr. St George: Celeste? One more point of clarification. We would request a consultation with tribal governments.

Dr. Perryman: Yes.

Mr. St George: We do not initiate.

Ms. Carlisle: Initiate maintain-- okay. The board recommends BLM U.S. Forest Service initiate/maintain/request discussions. Tell me if it works when it's up there.

Dr. Perryman: There's a lot of slashes.

Ms. Carlisle: I know. Let me just get with tribal and other government entities and states. Does that work?
Other government entities--

Dr. Perryman: I would separate the board recommends that the BLM and U.S. Forest Service request-- request. Now, you can leave that. Don't cut anything yet. Request-- put request after USFS. Request consultations with tribal governments. Now, hang on a minute. With tribal governments and initiate,

Dr. Lenz: comma-- take the dash out.

Dr. Perryman: Maintain discussions with other government entities-- et cetera.

Dr. Lenz: I'd take the comma behind USFS off. Get rid of that. And initiate and take that slash out of there. Take the comma away from after "and," you can say initiate and maintain discussions with other government entities and/or-- I would put and/or. Yep, right there. There you go.

Dr. Bechert: And I have a few comments. On the first line, I would remove comma and put and before BLM and USFS. And I would delete in the U.S. I don't why we need that.

Dr. Perryman: I would jump up to discussions there on the second line and replace and with, "with." Okay. Now let's read.

Ms. Carlisle: Raise of hands in the audience how many of you feel like you're going to jump out of your skin right now? [Laughter].

Dr. Lenz: So, would you have to say government entities and states? I mean, states are a government entity. Just take out states. Now, take out government entities. Take out-- there you go.

Dr. Perryman: How do you spell migration? What is it telling us? One M?

Ms. Carlisle: There we go. All right. Are we ready to move on? Number 6, the board supports USFS efforts to advocate for its own separate budget for management of wild, free-roaming horses and burros given that 20% of the total free-roaming population is on USFS land.

Dr. Perryman: That's not written as a recommendation.

Ms. Carlisle: I thought we were just supporting their effort. Do we recommend that we support it?

Dr. Perryman: I'm just--

Ms. Carlisle: We're not recommending them to-- we're recommending that we did say that they're advocating for it. Okay. Board recommends the USFS continue to advocate for-- Erase supports. So, it says the board recommends the USFS continue to advocate. So, get rid of the word effort and write the word continue.

Dr. Lenz: They would recommend that the USFS continue-- right?

Ms. Carlisle: Yeah. Sorry.

Dr. Bechert: Do we need to change, just add burros to the statement above? Because it always just says horses since we do it below.

Ms. Carlisle: Let's-- yes. But let's finish 6. Any more comments on 6? Okay. Jordan, can you scroll back up to 5?

Dr. Perryman: What we can do is search in the end and do it all through, I think.

Ms. Carlisle: Now, scroll down to 7. We're almost there. The board supports the commitment the of the agency to the CAWP and recommends continuing internal training, increasing the level of public educational opportunities.

Dr. Lenz: So, it should be internal training and increasing the level. Okay.

Ms. Carlisle: Any other comments? Number 8, the board recommends continually refining and improving the level of care, handling and treatment provided by the Wild Horse & Burro program. Specifically, we recommend CAWP bolster and expand guideline for transportation and quarantine procedures.

Ms. Carlisle: Can we do a search and replace for horses and just make sure we've captured horses and burros at every opportunity.

Dr. Perryman: Okay, undermined by-- that's the first one is-- okay. We got most of them.

Ms. Carlisle: Okay. Okay, that one's okay. Scroll down.

Dr. Perryman: Next.

Mr. Brock: Next one is in number 5.

Ms. Carlisle: So, after that horses and burros.

Dr. Perryman: Or burros.

Mr. Brock: Okay.

Ms. Carlisle: Okay. Next.

Dr. Perryman: Are there any others?

Mr. Brock: Let me see. Let me double check here.

Dr. Perryman: That is the last right there.

Ms. Carlisle: There's one just month it.

Dr. Perryman: Are it says and burros?

Mr. Brock: Yep.

Dr. Perryman: Very good.

Mr. Brock: Yep, that's it.

Ms. Carlisle: The last two recommendations don't have horses in them. So we're-- you just want to see them? Okay.

Mr. Brock: Sorry. I'll make them bigger.

Ms. Carlisle: Jordan, thank you for your patience because this is the-- you're in the driver. And we're all in the backseat.

Does the board feel the need to scroll back up and look per page and look quietly for a minute? Okay, scroll back up to the top page. Let's just leave that for a second.

Dr. Lenz: We're going to remove potential at some is point.

Ms. Carlisle: Yeah. We'll do that. Yeah, in the title at the top of the page, remove the word potential. And remove working draft 5 for board use only, not final.

You can remove ecology subcommittee. These are all recommendations. It doesn't matter where they're from.

Ms. Pearson: Madam Chair, I've got one more thing to throw this the works. Trying to keep consistent with some of our language, so before we reviews effective fertility control proven and effective-- instead of meaningful and impactful. I don't know if that's--

Ms. Carlisle: No. That is-- leave it meaningful and impactful. Our point is that the levels, the levels that should be used should be making a difference.

Ms. Pearson: Okay.

Ms. Carlisle: And then, I think Dr. Perryman had a point about utilizing, we have used contraception and fertility control interchangeably throughout the document. Let's change contraception to fertility control.

And it can be-- it's supposed to be in the quotes because we're saying that particular thing is the common interest of so many interest in the public.

Dr. Perryman: We can stop at that-- that's great. And we need to continue on through the document with that, I think. Particularly I think it's only mentioned here.

Ms. Carlisle: Can you search for contraception and make sure we've caught that.

Dr. Perryman: I want to go back because that first sentence has run on since. Contraception plans and that needs-- it's in there several times.

Ms. Carlisle: So everywhere it says contraception, change to fertility control. We'll give you a second to do that.

Ms. Carlisle: And then, Jordan, once you've found all of those, back up to the top.

Mr. Brock: Okay. I think I got all the contraception. Just making sure. That's it. Okay.

Dr. Perryman: Health and welfare of the horses and burros and translate to-- diverse bipartisan and help the need to (READING).

Ms. Carlisle: How about a period after broad support which is in the third line down. New sentence. Get rid of the and. This-- and get rid of that. So, this will help to reflect the need. Get rid of too.

Mr. French: On that sentence it says, it will help reflect the need for robust long-term funding. Shouldn't it be from Congress and not to?

Ms. Carlisle: Uh-huh. Yep. From. Well, to and from. We're trying to communicate this concept to Congress. But we need the funding from Congress.

Dr. Bechert: I wonder if the second line, it says health and welfare of free-roaming horses and burros as well as rangeland health.

Ms. Carlisle: I don't know what you're talking about.

Dr. Bechert: Yeah, the second line, it says will improve the health and welfare of-- and I would include free-roaming horses and burros and remove on the range. And then just as well as rangeland, one word, health. Range instead of health?

Dr. Perryman: Yes, I would put rangeland.

Mr. Brock: Right here?

Dr. Perryman: Yep.

Ms. Carlisle: Free-roaming, I believe, we have always put a hyphen between. Thanks. I'm good with one. Any other comes? Dr. Bechert, did you have a concern with two?

Dr. Bechert: Yes, just the very end. Considerations to guide decisions towards AML. I think that isn't stated quite properly.

Ms. Carlisle: About AML?

Dr. Bechert: Guide decisions to help reach AML or something like that.

Ms. Carlisle: Well, we're not-- reaching AML sounds like gather AML. I thought we were communicating that decisions about AML should not only be based on number but also these rangeland health assessment considerations.

Dr. Bechert: How about towards determining AML?

Ms. Carlisle: Okay, yep. To guide decisions towards determining AML. Let's go to everyone can see.

Dr. Perryman: Madam Chair, can we jump back to number one very, very briefly? Where is the word translate? Third line. Or foster diverse, not translate to-- but foster diverse.

Ms. Carlisle: agreed.

Dr. Perryman: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Carlisle: You all better open we don't work on a scientific paper together. Number two, any other comments? All right. Let's scroll to where we can see the entirety of three-- maybe we can't. You can remove some of those spaces.

Mr. Kuechle: You can put a page break before 3. And then you can fit it all in one sheet. I think you did it in the wrong spot. There we go. Just a quick time check. We have half an hour, hard stop at noon. Half an hour.

Ms. Carlisle: We're going to be done real quick here. I think we can worry about formatting later because of how slow this connection is. But if it we just get the words, we'll format it and make it nice before it's put on the website. Or consistent, I mean. I don't know where-- second line of number 3, programs can be lowercase. Everybody good with three? Number 4. Again, we can make it pretty and consistent later. Let's look at grammar or clarity.

Dr. Lenz: Additional funding sources-- or do you want separate. It's not a funding source. It's funding and a source.

Ms. Carlisle: That was Dr. Perryman's comment. So, you'll have to clarify.

Dr. Perryman: We recommend with BLM or the board recommends--

Ms. Carlisle: The board recommends that. The BLM

Dr. Perryman: I would-- Both. And capacities, yes. Funding, sources are funding sources. And capacities are-- capacities are, for instance, gathered contractors.

Dr. Bechert: Do we need through the Wild Horse & Burro program? After the example?

Ms. Carlisle: Yeah, remove the after that parenthesis through the Wild Horse & Burro program. Strike all that.

Dr. Perryman: Period after the parenthesis. Yes.

Mr. Brock: Bring it down here.

Ms. Carlisle: Are we good with four, everybody? We're not going through them again.

Dr. Perryman: Just one moment. Let me think. I want to make sure that we encapsulate some language here that provides for professional data collection. We can't just-- you can't just go get somebody off the street and have them collect rangeland data or associated wildlife data. That is a profession. It's not an activity.

Ms. Carlisle: Well, we need to think of the right word to collect-- collect vetted local data.

Dr. Perryman: I think I could be satisfied with the word professionally stuck in there between to and collect. Our efforts to collect, to professionally collect. I could live with that, I think, at this point. Yes.

Ms. Carlisle: All right. Number five. Read it quietly. Good? 6? 7? 8?

Do I have a motion from the board to approve all recommendations as seen on this screen currently?, barring formatting changes.

Mr. French: Madam Chair, I move we accept all eight recommendations.

Ms. Carlisle: Do I have a second? Motion to approve all who agree say yay. All right. Recommendations one through eight have been approved unanimously by this board at this meeting. And we're not quite done, he can inform. We have thank you's. To this shawl room, I extend deepest gratitude to all of you online, board members, the quiet mice from it the agencies who have been working their tails off all around us, all weeklong. And very much in the months preceding, probably if the year preceding. Thank you to Dr. Bechert for her service as she walks out the door. Bye. [Laughter]. And I am going to go ahead and pass it back to our DFO for final comments and shut this thing down.

Mr. St George: Thank you, Chair. Let me just echo your thanks to everybody in particular to the members of the public who made time-out of their lives and work to come participate and join. Thank you very much. My team knows how much I appreciate them. Gentlemen, thank you for your facilitation. Thank you, board members. Let me remind everyone here that you are volunteers. And we couldn't do this productively and effectively without you. I appreciate your time and commitment as does the Directors and Secretaries for both agencies. Thank you. I think we're closed. Gavel?

Ms. Carlisle: Teresa any last words?

Dr. Drotar: I will second what Brian just said.

Ms. Carlisle: Thank you all. Biggest thanks to all, to Dorothea Boothe. Thank you. [APPLAUSE] Adjourned.

[Adjourn]