

ROUGH CAPTION FILE TRANSCRIPT

OCTOBER 10, 2018.

WILD HORSE AND BURRO ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

>> IF EVERYBODY CAN TAKE THEIR SEATS, WE'LL GET STARTED.

IT'S ALMOST 8:00, AND I LIKE TO KEEP EVERYTHING ON TIME IF WE CAN.

>> I WOULD LIKE TO WELCOME EVERYBODY TO THE MEETING OF THE NATIONAL BLM WILD HORSE AND BURRO ADVISORY BOARD MEETING.

IF THERE ARE VETERAN IN THE ROOM, WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO STAND AT THIS TIME SO WE CAN RECOGNIZE YOU.

IF YOU REMAIN STANDING AND EVERYONE ELSE STAND TOO, WE'LL SAY THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

>> I PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND TO THE REPUBLIC FOR WHICH IT STANDS, ONE NATION UNDER GOD, INDIVISIBLE WITH LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL.

THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH.

AT THIS TIME, AS WE GET STARTED, I'M GOING TO TURN THE MICROPHONE OVER TO OUR MODERATOR.

DANIEL IS GOING TO TALK TO US, DANIEL ADAMS.

DAN, IF YOU WOULD, HAVE AT IT.

>> DAN: GOOD MORNING, EVERYBODY.

GLAD TO HAVE YOU HERE.

I'M GOING TO GO OVER A COUPLE OF LOGISTICS SO WE HAVE AN EFFECTIVE MEETING TODAY AND TOMORROW.

EVERYBODY SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED THIS SHEET AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE.

WE'LL WALKTHROUGH THIS QUICK.

THESE ARE WHAT WE CALL THE RULES OF THE ROOM.

OUR HOPE AND INTENT IS THAT BY EVERYONE LISTENING AND FOLLOWING THE RULES, WE'LL HAVE A GOOD MEETING.

FIRST IS ABOUT SEATING FOR ATTENDEES.

IF YOU WISH TO STAND, THAT YOU WOULD DO SO IN THE STANDING AREA IN THE BACK.

WE WANT TO MAKE SURE EVERYONE CAN SEE THE BOARD.

IF YOU CAN STAY SEATED, THAT HELPS A LOT.

SPEAKERS WILL BE SEATED AT THIS TABLE.

THE COMMENT PERIOD IS TOMORROW.

THERE WILL BE A ROSTER SET UP TO DO THAT.

WE ASK PEOPLE NOT TO COME FORWARD PAST THE RED LINE IN FRONT OF THE CHAIRS.

YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED TO APPROACH UNLESS YOU HAVE APPROVAL FROM THE CHAIR.

THE MEDIA, THERE IS A TAPED OFF SPACE IN THE BACK OF THE ROOM FOR THE MEDIA TO SET UP.

ATTENDEES ARE NOT ALLOWED TO PLACE MICROPHONES OR CAMERAS IN THE SPACE SET ASIDE FOR THE BOARD MEETING.

WE ASK YOU TO KEEP THOSE IN THE BACK.

NUMBER FIVE, ALL ATTENDEES SHOW MUTUAL RESPECT FOR EACH OTHER AND THE BOARD.

WE ASK YOU TO REFRAIN FROM USING CELLPHONES OR TALKING DURING THE MEETING.

IF YOU HAVE A PHONE CALL, WE ASK YOU TAKE THAT OUTSIDE.

IF ANYONE DISRUPTS THE MEETING, THEY'LL BE ASKED TO LEAVE OR ESCORTED OUT.

THOSE WISHING TO ADDRESS THE BOARD, AS I MENTIONED, THERE IS A SIGN UP IN THE BACK.

THE COMMENT PERIOD IS TOMORROW.

THIS MEETING IS FOR THE BOARD.

WE ARE HERE TO HELP THEM AND GET THEM THE INFORMATION THEY NEED TO DO THE WORK THEY DO.

ONE OF THE THINGS, WHY IT'S IMPORTANT FOR YOU TO SIGN UP, WHEN WE HAVE THE COMMENT PERIOD, TIME TOMORROW, WE'LL BASE THAT ON THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE SIGNED UP TO SPEAK, SO IT'S IMPORTANT IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK, THAT YOU DO THAT.

ATTENDEES WISHING TO PROVIDE HANDOUTS TO THE BOARD, LEAVE THEM AT THE TABLE WHEN YOU COME IN.

HANDOUTS WILL NOT BE AT THE SPEAKER TABLE AND NO ONE MAY APPROACH THE BOARD WITH HANDOUTS.

ATTENDEES MAY NOT OBSCURE THE VIEW OF PARTICIPANTS OR DISRUPT THE MEETING.

NUMBER 10, THE BOARD WILL NOT BE ALLOWED COMMENTS DURING THE MEETING.

THIS DOES NOT MEAN THE BOARD AGREES OR DISAGREES WITH ANYTHING SAID.

THE BOARD HAS THE RIGHT TO SHARE COMMENTS DURING THE PERIOD AND WE MAINTAIN THE RULES FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL INVOLVED AND APPRECIATES THE COOPERATION OF THE RULES.

WE SHARE IN COMMON THAT WE WANT TO DO THINGS GOOD FOR WILDLIFE AND THE RANGE.

WE CAN ALL WORK TOGETHER AND HAVE A GREAT MEETING.

WE ARE EXCITED TO GET STARTED AND GET GOING.

LOGISTICS, SAFETY IS IMPORTANT.

IS THERE ANY REASON TO VACATE THE BUILDING, EXITING THE BACK DOORS HERE?

TO THE LEFT OR RIGHT, THERE ARE EXITS YOU CAN GET TO.

THERE ARE RESTROOMS OUT THE DOOR TO THE LEFT AND THEN RIGHT OR PAST THE REGISTRATION DESK AT THE FRONT, THERE ARE ALSO RESTROOMS THERE.

DID I MISS ANYTHING, FRED?

>> FRED: I THINK YOU HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB.

AN OUTSTANDING JOB.

>> DAN: THANKS.

WE'LL TURN IT BACK TO FRED.

>> FRED: WE APPRECIATE EVERYONE COMING.

WE HAVE NEW BOARD MEMBERS.

WE'LL INTRODUCE THE BOARD TO YOU.

I'LL ASK THEM TO INTRODUCE THEMSELVES AND SAY A BIT ABOUT THEMSELVES, ANYTHING THEY WANT TO SAY.

WE START WITH DR. BARRY PERMAN.

>> I'M A PROFESSOR OF MANAGEMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO.

>> I'M CAP GINGER CATHERINE.

I'M A NATURAL HISTORY MAKER.

I SOUND UNDER WATER.

>> I'M JIM FRENCH FROM HUMBOLDT COUNTY, NEVADA.

I WORK FOR THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE.

>> I'M AN EQUINE VETERINARIAN.

>> I'M CELESTE CARLISLE.

I HAVE BEEN IN BIOLOGY FOR A LONG TIME.

I'M THE PROJECT MANAGE FOR RETURN TO FREEDOM, WILD HORSE CONSERVATION.

>> I'M STEVEN YEARDLEY.

I'M A CATTLE RANCHER IN YOU SAW.

I'M HERE TO PRESENT LIVE STOCK MANAGEMENT ON THE BOARD.

>> I'M BEN MASTERS.

I SIT AS WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT ON THE BOARD.

I'M FRED WOOL.

I HAVE THE HONOR AND PRIVILEGE TO SERVE AS CHAIRMAN OF THIS BUNCH OF CATS.

IT'S LIKE HERDING CATS, BUT IT'S FUN.

WE HAVE WITH US TODAY MR. KRISTIN BAIL.

SHE'S THE ONE IN CHARGE OF THE MEETING.

I'M TURN IT OVER TO HER TO HER GIVE YOU COMMENTS THIS MORNING.

KRISTIN, IT'S YOURS.

>> KRISTIN: THANK YOU, FRED.

ONE THING I DON'T HAVE IS A GOOD VOICE.

I APOLOGIZE.

THANK YOU ALL FOR BEING HERE.

I KNOW SOME OF YOU TRAVELED QUITE A WAYS.

I HAVE BEEN IMPRESSED BY THE PASSION AND DEDICATION OF EVERYONE INVOLVED IN THE PROGRAM AND WHO CARES ABOUT THE HORSES AND RANGE LAND UPON WHICH THEY ATTEND.

THANK YOU FOR THOSE ATTENDING TODAY AND FOR THOSE ATTENDING ON LIVE STREAM.

WE HAVE A GREAT GROUP OF FOLKS THAT TRAVEL HERE AND DO AN AMAZING AMOUNT OF SETUP TO BRING THE LIVE STREAM TO YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR WORK ON THAT.

I WANT TO INTRODUCE BRUCE RITTENHOUSE. HE IS FILLING IN FOR DEAN. I AM KRISTIN BAIL, DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES AND PLANNING. TODAY I AM THE DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL FOR THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO

ADVISORY BOARD. I WANT TO THANK OUR MEMBERS FOR THEIR SERVICE, THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO DEALING WITH TOUGH, COMPLEX AND IMPORTANT ISSUES. DR. MCDONNELL, ONE OF OUR BOARD MEMBERS HAD A PREVIOUS COMMITMENT AND SHE WAS UNABLE TO ATTEND IN PERSON. SHE IS PARTICIPATING THROUGH THE PHONE. I WANT TO THANK HER FOR TAKING TIME TO CONTINUE TO PARTICIPATE EVEN WITH THE CHALLENGES OF COMMITMENT. I WANT TO JOIN FRED IN WELCOMING OUR NEW MEMBERS, DR. PERRYMAN, DR. LENZ AND CELESTE CARLISLE. THANK YOU FOR JOINING US. IT TAKES A LARGE TEAM TO PUT THESE MEETINGS TOGETHER. I WANT TO THANK OUR WASHINGTON OFFICE, WILD HORSE AND BURRO BOARD STAFF.

TODAY, WE'LL START TWO DAYS OF DIALOGUE ON A VARIETY OF ISSUES. THE HEALTHY, CONSTRUCTIVE DIALOGUE IS FOR THE BOARD MEMBERS. WE HAVE THE PRIVILEGE OF HAVING A VARIETY OF IMPORTANT PRESENTATIONS. THAT IS TO INFORM ALL OF US AS WE MOVE FORWARD IN THE PROGRAM TO HELP THE BOARD PROVIDE RECOMMENDATION TO THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT. WE CONTINUE TO LOOK FOR THE BOARD'S AND OUR PRESENTER'S INSIGHTS AS WE WORK TOWARD HAVING A HEALTHY, PRODUCTIVE AND THRIVING ECOLOGICAL BALANCE FOR OUR HORSE HERDS. ONE THING WITH THE NEW BOARD MEMBERS, AND SOME OF YOU MAY BE LESS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT ADVISORY BOARD ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES, AND I WANT TO TAKE A MINUTE TO EXPLAIN THOSE. AN ADVISORY BOARD IS A SPECIAL PRIVILEGE GIVEN BECAUSE THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT PRETTY MUCH GIVES BOARDS THE RIGHT TO PROVIDE GROUP ADVICE TO AN AGENCY. THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN OUTSIDE OF A CHARTERED ADVISORY BOARD. THE BOARD IS HERE TO OFFER ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE SECRETARIES OF BOTH INTERIOR AND SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

WE HAVE FRIENDS FROM THE FOREST SERVICE HERE TODAY PROVIDING PRESENTATIONS. THEY PROVIDE INPUT TO THE AGENCY RESPONSIBILITY YOU SAID THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO. FORMAL BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DONE BY A VOTE. THAT VOTE DOES NOT REQUIRE UNANIMOUS CONSENT. RECOMMENDATIONS ARE APPROVED EVEN IF THERE IS NOT A 100% CONSENSUS. JUST A MAJORITY. WE DO ENCOURAGE THAT THE BOARD MEMBERS WORK TO ACHIEVE CONSENSUS, BUT THESE ARE TOUGH ISSUES. IT IS TOUGH BECAUSE WE ALL HAVE STRONG, VALID APPROACHES TO WHAT SHOULD BE DONE, AND WE DON'T ALWAYS REACH 100% AGREEMENT ON HOW THAT IS FORWARD. WE DO WORK VERY, VERY MUCH TOGETHER TO WORK ON THOSE AREAS THAT WE HAVE AGREEMENT. I CALL WORKING ON THE VIOLENT AGREEMENT THAT WE ACHIEVE IN A LOT OF

AREAS. WE WANT TO CONTINUE TO HAVE THAT DIVERSE, IMPORTANT, CHALLENGING DIALOGUE, AND MOVE TOGETHER TO REACH CONSENSUS WHERE WE CAN.

IT'S OKAY IF YOU WONDER WHY WE DON'T HAVE UNANIMOUS VOTES. IT'S OKAY BECAUSE WE WANT TO HONOR THE FACT THAT THERE ARE DIVERSE OPINIONS, AND THE BOARD CAN'T ALWAYS REACH CONSENSUS. I MENTIONED ADVISORY BOARDS AND COUNCILS. THE BLM HAS 37 CHARTERED RESOURCE ADVISORY COUNCILS SIMILAR IN FUNCTION BUT DIFFERENT IN THEIR MAKEUP COVERING LAND MANAGEMENT BOARDS. THEY CAN INCLUDE MEMBERS OF TRIBES, MEMBERS OF INDUSTRY, ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS, RECREATION INTERESTS, ETC. THEY ALL HAVE A CHARTER LIKE THE ADVISORY BOARD DOES. ONE THING WE HAVE CARRIED OVER FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS IS FINDING WAYS OF VARIETY OF BOARDS THAT WE HAVE TO TALK AND INTERACT BECAUSE SO MANY INTERESTS INTERSECT. WHETHER YOUR INTEREST IS IN HUNTING, FISHING, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT, ETC. AS WE MOVE FORWARD, WE CONTINUE TO LOOK FOR WAYS WHERE WE HAVE INTERACTION AND CROSS POLLINATION, AND MORE IMPORTANTLY, ALSO HAVE A CLOSE TIE TO WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE FIELD.

THE RACKS ARE CLOSE TO WHAT IS HAPPENING ON THE GROUND IN THEIR AREA AND HOW TO INFORM EACH OTHER WHAT IS GOING ON IN LOCAL CONDITIONS. I LOOK FORWARD TO OUR DIALOGUE OVER THE NEXT TWO DAYS. I'M HOPING WE CAN BUILD ON OUR SUCCESSES, CONTINUE TO ROLL UP OUR SLEEVES AND DEAL WITH OUR CHALLENGES, AND WORK TOWARD THE THRIVING ECOLOGICAL BALANCE WE ALL SEEK, AND ALSO CONTINUE TO WORK TOWARD THRIVING RELATIONSHIPS ON BEHALF OF THE LAND AND VERY IMPORTANTLY ON BEHALF OF THE WILD HORSES AND BURROS. IF THERE ARE QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD, I WOULD BE HAPPY TO TAKE THEM OR I CAN TRANSITION TO THE NEXT PART OF THE AGENDA. THANK YOU AGAIN, TODAY.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH. IT'S INTERESTING WE HAVE AS MANY PEOPLE AS WE HAVE HERE. WE HONOR WE HAVEN'T HAD SINCE I HAVE BEEN ON THE BOARD. EVEN THOUGH HE'S AN ACTING DIRECTOR OF THE BLM, HE'S STILL IMPORTANT AND IMPORTANT TO THE OVERALL HORSE PROGRAM, MR. BRIAN STEED. I'LL LET KRISTIN INTRODUCE HIM. SHE IS BETTER THAN ME.

>> KRISTIN: I'LL APPRECIATE FRED AND WELCOME BRIAN. HE IS THE SON OF UTAH. HE KNOWS WESTERN ISSUES. HE CARES ABOUT WESTERN ISSUES AND HAS BEEN REFRESHING AND ENGAGED IN THIS PROGRAM AS WELL AS THE OTHER CHALLENGING AND DIVERSE PROGRAMS THAT THE BLM WORKS IN AND FACES EVERY DAY. IT IS MY PLEASURE TO WELCOME BRIAN STEED TO OUR MEETING AND WELCOME HIS REMARKS SOON COMING. TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS OPPORTUNITY. YOU ARE TALKING TO A LEADER FOR THE BLM AND DEPARTMENT AND THE FUTURE WILD HORSE AND BURRO PROGRAM. FOR THOSE THAT DON'T KNOW BRIAN, I'LL ASK YOU TO STAND UP TO LET FOLKS KNOW WHAT YOU LOOK LIKE. PLEASSED TO HAVE YOU. THANK YOU.

>> BRIAN: I NOTICED AN EMPTY SEAT WITH MY NAME ON IT. I APOLOGIZED FOR NOT TAKING MY RESPECTIVE PLACE. BY THE TIME I REALIZED, MY FRIEND JOHN TOLD ME, YOU HAVE BEEN HERE FIVE MINUTES AND ALREADY SCREWED IT UP. THANKS, BRIAN. I'M DIRECTOR OF POLICY AND PROGRAMS, BUREAUX OF LAND MANAGEMENT. IT'S A GROUP OF PEOPLE I HAVE LONG ADMIRER, A FUN JOB. I WANT TO THANK KRISTIN AND BRUCE FOR THE HARD WORK THEY PUT INTO THIS PUBLICLY, AS WELL AS THE OTHER TEAM MEMBERS HERE. I WANT TO THANK EVERYONE IN THE PUBLIC FOR ATTENDING TODAY. THIS IS AN IMPORTANT ISSUE, AN ISSUE THAT INSPIRES A LOT OF PASSION, AND PASSION ON MULTIPLE SIDES. IT'S IMPORTANT TO HAVE DIALOGUE IMPORTANT POINTS.

THOUGH WE MAY NOT AGREE, WE CAN COMMUNICATE IDEAS, DISCUSS CONCEPTS AND DO SO IN A CIVIL WAY THAT WE CAN ACTUALLY COME TO RESULTS AND SOLUTIONS. I LOOK FORWARD TO HEARING THE CONVERSATION TOMORROW. ALSO, I WANTED TO GIVE A SPECIAL THANKS TO OUR ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS, ALL NINE OF THEM. YOU HAVE BEEN GIVEN A DIFFICULT JOB. I HAVE ONLY WORKED ON THIS PROGRAM IN AN OFFICIAL CAPACITY FOR THE LAST YEAR. I STARTED MY JOB WITH BLM IN OCTOBER. I HAVE TO SAY IT'S AN ISSUE THAT INSPIRES MANY STRONG EMOTIONS. THOSE STRONG EMOTIONS, I THINK, ARE OFTEN COMMUNICATED TOWARD YOU ALL. I APPRECIATE THE TIME, DEDICATION AND PASSION YOU PUT INTO THIS. IT'S FUN TO SEE SO MANY OF YOU AGAIN. MY PREVIOUS JOB WHEN I WORKED ON CAPITOL HILL, I HAVE WORKED WITH SOME OF YOU BEFORE. IT'S FUN TO MEET NEW FRIENDS AS WELL. TO MISS CATHERINES, I WAS INTRODUCED THROUGH CLOUD. WE ARE AT A JUNCTURE. WE ARE FACING A TIME WHERE NO ACTION IS NOT AN ACTION -- OR IS NOT AN OPTION. ALLOWING THE PRESENT COURSE IS CONTRARY TO THE BLM'S MISSION. AS EQUINE POPULATIONS CONTINUE TO GROW, WE HAVE SEEN NEGATIVE

CONSEQUENCES FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE ANIMAL RELYING THERE ON.

WE AT THE BLM NEED TO REACH THE APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT LEVELS, AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO A CONSTRUCTIVE DIALOGUE WITH YOU ALL ON HOW WE FIND ACTION THAT PROTECTS THE LONG-TERM HEALTH AND WELFARE OF THE ANIMALS AND RESOURCES ON THE RANGE. WE ARE COMMITTED TO ADDRESSING PRESENT CHALLENGES ON POPULATION ON THE RANGE AND ALSO OFF RANGE, WHICH IS AN INCREASINGLY OPPRESSIVE PROBLEM TO US FROM A FINANCIAL STANDPOINT. I DID A POWERPOINT. I APOLOGIZE. I USED TO BE A UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR. I GOT IN THE HABIT OF DOING IT. THIS IS MORE FOR MY BENEFIT THAN YOURS. YOU CAN SEE EXCITING SLIDES LIKE THIS ONE. HERE IS THE SITUATION. WE HAVE AN ON RANGE VISION OF HEALTHY HORSES AND RANGELAND. WE BELIEVE THAT HEALTHY HORSES AND RANGELAND EQUALS HEALTHY COMMUNITIES. THAT'S WHAT WE ARE STRIVING FOR ON THE RANGE.

OFF RANGE, WE ARE WORKING HARD TO FIND PLACEMENT INTO GOOD HOMES FOR THESE HORSES AFTER SOME OF THEM HAVE BEEN REMOVED FROM THE RANGE. THOSE TWO VISIONS WORK TOGETHER AND CAN'T BE SEPARATED. I WOULD ALSO BE REMISS IN SAYING THIS IS NOT ONLY THE BLM VISION BUT THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR WHO ASKED ME TO ADDRESS THIS IN A DIRECT MANNER. THERE ARE MANY HORSES ON THE RANGE. WE CURRENTLY SIT AT MULTIPLE TIMES OF WHAT WAS DEEMED TO BE THE APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT LEVELS. AS A RESULT, WE ARE SEEING IMPACTS ON THE RANGE, ALSO IMPACTS ON THE BOTTOM LINE OF THE BLM WHERE WE SPEND AN ADDITIONAL PORTION OF THE YEARLY APPROPRIATIONS BUDGET ON HORSES GATHERED OFF THE RANGE.

NOTABLY AS WELL, THESE VISIONS ALIGN WELL WITH BLM'S OVERALL MISSION OF MULTIPLE USE AND SUSTAINED YIELDS BOTH FOR FUTURE AND PRESENT GENERATIONS. THAT MEANS IT'S CRITICALLY IMPORTANT TO ACHIEVE THE VISION FOR THE OFFLINE POPULATION AS WELL AS ON RANGE. TO DO THAT, WE HOPE TO FIND A PERMANENT HOME FOR ALL OF THE HORSES REMOVED FROM THE RANGE. WE'LL TALK ABOUT THOSE THINGS TODAY. LET'S TALK ABOUT CONSEQUENCES OF OVERPOPULATION. EVEN MEMBERS NEW TO THE ISSUE KNOW WE ARE FACING A CRITICAL JUNCTURE AS MENTIONED BEFORE AND OVER POPULATION CAUSES DEGRADATION OF ANIMALS ON THE RANGE AND IMPACTS LOCAL COMMUNITIES.

THIS IS NOT JUST REALIZED BY THE BLM, CONGRESS IN 2017 NOTED FAILURE TO ADDRESS THESE PROBLEMS WILL RESULT IN IRREPARABLE DAMAGE TO THE LANDSCAPE AND CREATED THE WILD HORSES AND BURRO ACT. WE WANT TO TALK ABOUT CONSEQUENCES WE ARE SEEING ON THE RANGE. THIS IS THE PAN CAVE HMA, 438% OF AML NEAR NEVADA. THE PICTURE ON THE RIGHT, YOU NOTICE HORSES AROUND THE WATERING SOURCE, KEEPING PRONG HORN ANTELOPE AT BAY. I WISH WE COULD SAY THIS IS A UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE. WE HAVE MANY EXAMPLES OF WILD HORSES AND BURROS. AS WATER SOURCES BECOME SCARCE, HORSES ARE INDEED TRYING TO REACH AS MUCH WATER AS THEY CAN AND WE'LL HAVE SEVERE IMPACT TO THE SPRINGS OVER TIME.

AS A RESULT FOR INCREASED COMPETITION FOR RESOURCE, WE HAVE NOTICED A DECLINE IN THE HEALTH OF HORSES AND BURROS. ABOUT 1,857% OF AML ON HMA AND YOU NOTICE THE CONDITION OF THE HORSES IS SAD. AS SOMEONE WHO LOVES ANIMALS, IT'S IMPORTANT, I THINK, THAT WE PAY ATTENTION TO THE CONSEQUENCES OF OUR CHOICES AS WE ARE GOING FORWARD. ALSO, AS THERE IS INCREASED COMPETITION FOR RESOURCES, WE NOTICE THAT HORSES ARE NOT ONLY GOING TO STAY ON BLM PROPERTY, BUT INDEED WILL TRAVEL. HORSES AND BURROS HAVE SOUGHT REPRIEVE ON PRIVATE PROPERTY ANTELOPE VALLEY HMA, YOU SEE THE DAMAGED HORSES AS WELL AS THE GO SHOOT HMA. THESE ARE NOT SINGULAR ISSUES, BUT EXAMPLES WE ARE SEEING IN MANY PLACES ACROSS THE RANGE. THIS HAS LED TO ISSUES OF PUBLIC SAFETY, PINE KNOT MOUNTAIN HMA. AS YOU SEE, HORSES HAVE MOVED IN FREQUENTLY TO AN APARTMENT COMPLEX TO ACCESS THE GREEN GRASS, AND THIS CREATES A BIT OF A PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERN AS WELL. I ACTUALLY REQUESTED THE PICTURE ON THE BOTTOM LEFT BE INCLUDED ON THIS.

I THINK IT SHOWS HOW CLOSE THEY COME TO HUMAN ACTIVITIES. THIS WOULD BE DIFFERENT IF THEY WERE DOMESTICATED ANIMALS. THEY ARE NOT DOMESTICATED ANIMALS. THEY ARE WILD ANIMALS. ON THE RANGE AND VISION, HEALTHY RANGE LANDS EQUAL HEALTHY COMMUNITIES. HOW DO WE GO ABOUT DOING THAT? I WOULD BE LYING IF I SAID THAT THERE IS AN EASY PATH FORWARD. WE ARE FACED WITH A NUMBER OF DIFFICULT CHOICES AS AN AGENCY, AND INDEED ARE TURNING TO THE ADVISORY BOARD AS LOOKING FOR GOOD IDEAS ON WHAT IS A PRESSING PROBLEM EVERY SINGLE YEAR. I'LL MENTION, ANECDOTALLY, THERE ARE TWO THINGS I VIEW AS THREATS TO THE BLM. ONE IS WILDFIRE. THE OTHER IS WILD

HORSES. WE ARE IN A TREND LINE TO WHERE HORSES ARE CONSUMING A LARGE PORTION OF OUR BUDGET. I'M NOT ENTIRELY SURE HOW TO GET ENTIRELY IN FRONT OF THAT IN THE TIMEFRAME THAT WE HAVE.

WE HAVE A BUDGET OF \$81 MILLION PER YEAR FOR THIS PROGRAM. OVER HALF OF THAT IS SPENT ON HOUSING HORSES OFF RANGE. THAT MEANS WE HAVE LESS MONEY TO SPEND. WHILE I WISH THERE WAS A BIG POT OF MONEY OUT THERE THAT WE ENVISION GETTING IN THE FUTURE, I'M NOT SURE WHAT CONGRESS WILL DO WITH THIS INFORMATION. MY FEAR IS THAT WE'LL BE INCREASINGLY ASKED FOR OTHER PARTS OF THE BLM TO SUPPORT THIS PROGRAM, WHICH I THINK IS A FRIGHTENING PROSPECT INDEED. HOW DO WE GET THERE? YOU KNOW WE HAVE LIMITED TOOLS IN THE TOOL BOX. ONE OF THE TOOLS WE HAVE USED AGGRESSIVELY AS WE CAN OF LATE IS GATHERS. GATHERS REMAINS AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE MANAGEMENT PORTFOLIO. I SAY THAT BECAUSE WE HAVE AREAS -- AND THIS YEAR HAS BEEN PARTICULARLY ROUGH, WHERE WE HAVE ANIMALS IN DECLINING HEALTH, AND ANIMALS THAT ARE CLEARLY ON A PATHWAY TO WHERE THEY WON'T SURVIVE IN CERTAIN AREAS. WE HAVE BEEN INSTRUCTED AND HAVE BEEN INSTRUCTING -- I HAD A CONVERSATION EARLIER IN THE YEAR WITH THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR. THOSE ANIMALS DEPLETING WATER SOURCES AND ARE IN PERIL, WE HAVE BEEN DOING THAT AND IT WILL CONTINUE TO BE AN IMPORTANT MANAGEMENT TOOL GOING FORWARD.

ALSO, THE SECRETARY -- THE SECRETARY HAS INSTRUCTED US TO LOOK FOR ADDITIONAL MEANS OF POPULATION GROWTH DEPRESSION. WE SUBMITTED A REPORT TO CONGRESS DETAILS SEVERAL OPTIONS ON PATHWAYS FORWARD. ONE OF THE OPTIONS THAT WAS PRESENTED THERE INCLUDED EXTENSIVE USE OF POPULATION GROWTH SUPPRESSION, METHODOLOGIES, BOTH INCLUDING TEMPORARY VACCINE BASED AS WELL AS SPAY AND NEUTER TECHNIQUES. WE ARE PURSUING BOTH AS EXPEDITIOUSLY AS WE CAN GIVEN THE CONSTRAINTS THAT WE FACE. I THINK BOTH CERTAINLY HAVE MERIT. THE VALUE OF BOTH MEAN THAT THE MORE POPULATION GROWTH SUPPRESSION WE EMPLOY ON THE RANGE, THE LESS NEED WE HAVE FOR GATHERS AND LONG TERM HOLDING OF THE ANIMALS, A COSTLY ENDEAVOR. WE LOOK TO DOING MORE OF THAT IN THE FUTURE, AND WE CONTINUE TO DO THAT AS AGGRESSIVELY AS WE CAN.

WE ARE ALSO ENGAGED IN ACTIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM TO IMPROVE FERTILITY CONTROL METHODS THROUGH VACCINE-BASED AS WELL AS SPAY AND NEUTER TECHNIQUES. LASTLY, I WANTED TO TALK ON THE OFF-RANGE

VISION. WE HAD ABOUT 46,000 HORSES IN HOLDING AT THE BEGINNING OF THIS YEAR. EACH OF THOSE HORSES WILL COST, DEPENDING ON WHAT WE DO WITH THEM OVER SHORT-TERM OR LONG-TERM HOLDING, IT COULD CAUSE \$4,800 A HORSE HER LIFETIME. THAT'S ABOUT A BILLION DOLLARS TO CARE FOR THE HORSES OVER THEIR LIFETIMES. THIS YEAR WE HAVE AN ADDITIONAL 11,000 HORSES OFF OF THE RANGE. WE HAVE NOT SEEN THE EXACT NUMBERS YET ON HOW MANY HORSES, BUT IT'S ALMOST CERTAINLY NORTH OF 50,000 HORSES OFF RANGE. THAT MEANS THE PRICE TAG OF HOLDING THE HORSES LONG TERM IS INCREASING. WE ARE LOOKING FOR AGGRESSIVE MEANS TO MOVE THE HORSES INTO GOOD HOMES, LOOKING TO PURSUE ADOPTIONS AND SALES.

ONE OF THE THINGS UPCOMING IS ADOPTION INCENTIVES, A THOUSAND DOLLARS INCENTIVES, DISTRIBUTED \$500 AT A TIME OF ADOPTION AND \$500 TITLING THE HORSE AT THE END TO PROVIDE THE BOOKENDS FOR THE YEAR WE ARE SEEING THE ANIMALS AND HOW THEY ARE DOING SO WE ARE ABLE TO MAKE SURE WE ABIDE BY THE MANDATES OF THE BURRO ACT IN TERMS OF ADOPTION. IT'S A NOVEL IDEA. SOME PEOPLE WANT TO EXPRESS THIS BY LOOKING AT ME LIKE I'M INSANE. AVERAGE HORSE THAT SAVES US \$200 PER HORSE EACH YEAR NOT COUNTING YEARS TWO THROUGH END, WHATEVER THE HORSE'S LIFE EXPECTANCY IS. LOOKING AT THAT SEEMS TO MAKE SENSE AND THIS INCREASES OUR LONG-TERM HOLDING CAPACITY FOR HORSES. IF WE PUT THEM IN SHORT-TERM CORRALS, IT'S MORE EXPENSIVE THAN TO HOLD THEM OFF RANGE IN LONG-TERM PASTURES. WE'LL BE ROLLING OUT THE ADOPTION INCENTIVE THIS FALL. WE HOPE TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF SALES TO GOOD HOMES AS WELL. WE HAVE BEEN PARTNERING WITH A VARIETY OF PARTNERS TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF SALES AND MAKE SURE THEY ARE GOING TO HOMES THAT TREAT THEM WELL. WE ENVISION THAT GOING FORWARD.

LASTLY, WE CAN'T DO THIS BY OURSELVES. WE ARE LOOKING FOR PARTNERSHIPS WITH ANYONE WILLING TO PARTNER WITH US TO MAKE SURE THAT WE CAN MAINTAIN A VIABLE HORSE AND BURRO POPULATION, TO MAINTAIN HEALTHY HORSES ON THE RANGE. WE HAVE BEEN IN DISCUSSIONS WITH MANY ADEQUACY GROUPS AS WELL AS A VARIETY OF OTHER GROUPS OF INDIVIDUALS TO ENSURE WE CAN MEET OBLIGATIONS. AS I SAID BEFORE, WE HAVE AN APPROPRIATION FIXED ON THIS, AND SO WHILE WE ARE AS CREATIVE AS WE CAN BE, WE ALSO NEED AS MUCH HELP FROM OUR PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS AS POSSIBLE. WITH THAT, LET'S TALK ABOUT WHAT COMES NEXT.

THE BLM IS MOVING AHEAD ON NEW INNOVATIVE TOOLS AND STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS ON RANGE POPULATION, INCREASING PLACEMENT OF ANIMALS INTO GOOD HOMES. I WOULD BE FOOLISH TO SAY THIS WILL BE EASY. IT WILL NOT. WE NEED AS MUCH CONSENSUS GOING FORWARD ON THAT. THIS WILL NOT BE DONE NEXT YEAR. IT WILL TAKE US SOME TIME. IT'S TAKEN US SOME TIME TO GET INTO THE SITUATION WE ARE IN, AND IT WILL TAKE TIME TO GET OUT OF THE SITUATION, BUT I'M OPTIMISTIC. THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO POPULATION IS IN MANY MAJORS A PRODUCT OF HUMAN PREFERENCE. I'M ABSOLUTELY OPTIMISTIC THAT AS WE GO FORWARD AND EDUCATE AS MANY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE ON THIS ISSUE, THERE ARE REAL LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS FOR IT. I LOOK FORWARD TO HEARING FROM THE BOARD WHAT YOUR PERCEIVED SOLUTIONS ARE AND WORK WITH YOU AS WELL AS MEMBERS TO FIGURE OUT. WE PROBABLY HAVE TO MAKE HARD DECISIONS, BUT I'M OPTIMISTIC THAT WE CAN MAKE THE DECISIONS AND HAVE A VIABLE AND LONG-LASTING PROGRAM BENEFICIAL TO THE RANGE AS WELL AS THE HORSES.

WITH THAT, I'M HAPPY TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS YOU MIGHT HAVE.

>> FRED: THANK YOU, BRIAN. ONE OF THE THINGS I WOULD LIKE TO BRING UP, THAT ADOPTION INCENTIVE PROGRAM WAS A BOARD RECOMMENDATION BACK IN 2015. WE ARE TICKLED TO SEE THAT COMING BACK.

>> BRIAN: I READ THAT, ACTUALLY. I'M GLAD TO SEE THAT COME TO FRUITION.

>> FRED: SOMETIMES NEW BOARD MEMBERS DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT WE MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE TO BE APPLIED TO GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS. THEY MAY NOT BE THE EXACT SAME THING, BUT THEY ARE CLOSE. A LOT OF COMMENTS YOU MADE, THE MAJORITY STANDS BEHIND THAT -- THE MAJORITY OF THE BOARD. WE AGREE WITH WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT. DO ANY OF THE BOARD MEMBERS HAVE QUESTIONS THEY WOULD LIKE TO ASK, OR COMMENTS?

>> BEN: I WANT TO SAY THANK YOU FOR COMING. WE HAVE NEVER HAD AN ACTING DIRECTOR COME. IT MEANS A LOT TO HAVE SOMEONE FROM THE HIGHER UPS, COME AND TALK FACE TO FACE. TO ME, IT SHOWS YOU HAVE A DEDICATION TO TACKLE THIS. I HOPE THAT ALSO EXISTS UP ON THE HILL AS WELL. THAT WAS GOING TO BE MY QUESTION TO YOU. WE WANTED TO HAVE THIS IN WASHINGTON D.C. TO GAUGE, IS THIS AN ISSUE PEOPLE WANT TO ADDRESS. IN YOUR OPINION, IS THIS A TOPIC BEING DISCUSSED IN WASHINGTON D.C.? DO PEOPLE WANT TO FIND A SUSTAINABLE SOLUTION?

ARE THEY WILLING TO PUT MONEY INTO MAKING THAT HAPPEN? WHAT IS THE TALK ON THE HILL, FOR LACK OF BETTER WORDS, REGARDING THE TOPIC?

>> BRIAN: I WORK FOR THE ADMINISTRATION. IT'S HARD TO GAUGE ALL OF THE TALK. I HAVE BEEN ASKED ABOUT IT MANY TIMES BY COLLEAGUES ON THE HILL. THERE IS A REAL INTEREST IN HOW WE CAN HELP THIS PROGRAM GET TO A BETTER PLACE. I DO THINK THERE IS INTEREST ON THE HILL. I THINK THERE IS INCREASED AWARENESS THAT THE WAY IN WHICH WE HAVE DONE THINGS IN THE PAST IS PROBABLY UNSUSTAINABLE. LOOKING AT THAT, I THINK THAT IT'S EITHER GOING TO TAKE MORE MONEY OR MORE TOOLS, AND EITHER OF THOSE SITUATIONS IS UP TO THEM. I CAN'T MAKE THAT DECISION ON MY OWN.

>> HI, BRIAN. ANOTHER QUESTION -- THANKS, LIKE BEN SAID, FOR COMING OUT HERE AND SUPPORTING US AND FOR THE DISCUSSION. IT'S GOOD TO GET SOMEONE IN YOUR POSITION OUT HERE. YOU MENTIONED, THOUGH, ABOUT HEALTHY HORSES, UNHEALTHY RANGES, AND YOU MENTIONED TWO MAJOR CONCERNS THAT YOU HAVE FOR THE BLM. ONE WAS WILDFIRE, AND ONE WAS WILD HORSES, AND REALLY, THE RAMIFICATIONS FOR BOTH ARE MAJOR ECOSYSTEMS BEING DESTROYED. IN SITUATIONS WHERE OVERGRAZING IS OCCURRING FROM EXCESS POPULATIONS OF ANY LARGE AMULET. WHEN THERE IS A WILDFIRE, FIRST THING WE DO IS RUN TO PUT IT OUT. SPEAKING OF HUMBOLDT COUNTY, THEY HAD A WILDFIRE BURN OVER 62,000-ACRES. YOU CAN IMAGINE THE DAMAGE THAT DID. WE HAVE 31,000,000-ACRES WILD HORSES RUN ON. A LOT OF CASES, AND YOU SHOWED SEVERAL OF THEM, WHERE THE POPULATIONS ARE IN EXCESS FIVE, SIX, UP TO 18 -- 18 TIMES THE AMOUNT OF HORSES THAT SHOULD BE ON THERE. THE AMOUNT OF DAMAGE BEING DONE IS EQUAL TO THAT OF A WILDFIRE, BUT WHEN THERE IS A WILDFIRE, EVERYONE HEARS ABOUT IT. THERE IS A LOT OF PUBLICITY ABOUT IT. PEOPLE IN CONGRESS FIND OUT ABOUT IT. IS THERE THAT KIND OF URGENCY TOWARD THE WILD HORSES PROGRAM? DO CONGRESSMEN UNDERSTAND WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE WEST? DO THEY CARE ABOUT IT? WHAT IS YOUR PERCEPTION ON THAT?

>> BRIAN: I THINK IT'S MIXED. I WORKED FOR FIVE YEARS ON THE CONSERVATION CENTER FOR UTAH. WE HAD A CHANCE TO TALK ABOUT THIS A LOT WITH OTHER COLLEAGUES, ESPECIALLY IN MISSISSIPPI. I THINK THERE IS AN INCREASED UNDERSTANDING. I DON'T THINK EVERYONE HAS THAT SAME UNDERSTANDING WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THE WILD BURRO POPULATIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES THEY FIND THEMSELVES IN. I FIND THEM WORKING ON IT. I THINK, AND THIS IS AN OPINION ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WILD HORSES AND WILDFIRES. WILD HORSES HAVE BEEN A SLOW BURN, TO USE THE ANALOGY. IT'S TAKEN TIME TO GET TO WHERE WE ARE. I

THINK THERE IS A VARIETY OF VIEWPOINTS ON THAT, WHAT WE SHOULD DO ABOUT THAT. WHEREAS WILDFIRE, THERE IS CONSENSUS ON WHAT SHOULD BE DONE. YOU SEE A CATASTROPHIC WILDFIRE, YOU FIGHT IT, WHERE THERE IS A CONSENSUS NATIONWIDE ON THE WILD HORSE PROGRAM.

>> SOMETIMES THE FIRE THAT BURNS SLOWEST BURNS THE MOST, THOUGH.

>> BRIAN: THAT'S TRUE. THE TWO ARE NOT COMPLETELY SEPARATED. WE HAD A DISCUSSION THIS WEEK ON THE FIRE BEING DISCUSSED. THE REASON WE ARE GATHERING THE HORSES, THE FIRE BURNED UP ALMOST THE ENTIRETY OF THE FEED. IF THE HORSES ARE TO REMAIN, WE TOOK 800 OFF OF THE RANGE TO SAVE THEIR LIVES.

>> AND THEY ARE CONNECTED, IF YOU REMOVE THE PERENNIAL SHRUBS AND GRASSES AND THEY ARE REPLACED WITH INVASIVE SPECIES, BURN CYCLES INCREASE TO EVERY SEVEN YEARS.

>> BRIAN: I THINK DR. PERRYMAN CAN SPEAK BETTER ABOUT THAT THAN I COULD. CHEEK GRASS IS THATCH WHERE BUNCH GRASSES AREN'T. THEY LAY OVER EACH OTHER AND BUILD FUEL STALK MORE THAN OTHER NATIVE GRASSES THAT DON'T BURN AT THE SAME RATE THAT NONNATIVE GRASS DOES.

>> THANK YOU.

>> BRIAN, THANK YOU FOR BEING HERE, COMING OUT TO DO THIS. OUTSIDE LOOKING AT WHAT IS GOING ON. I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S A FAIR QUESTION OR NOT, BUT -- IT'S MY OPINION THAT OUR CHALLENGES AREN'T GOING TO BE -- FOR LACK OF A BETTER WORD, FIXED. I'M NOT SURE CONGRESS HAS THE APPETITE TO TAKE THIS UP RIGHT NOW. IT MIGHT BE BECAUSE THEY ARE SO UNINFORMED AND OTHER THINGS GET IN THE WAY THAT END UPTAKING PRIORITY OVER THEIR TIME. YOU SHOW PHOTOGRAPHS HERE, AND MANY OF US HAVE BEEN OUT TO A LOT OF THE HMAS IN NEVADA AND OTHER PLACES. SOME PLACES DON'T HAVE THE PROBLEM NEVADA DOES. NEVADA IS THE 800-POUND GORILLA IN THE ROOM. THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS THAT WE HAVE MANY OF OUR HMAS THAT OVERLAP WITH A T & E SPECIES LIKE STAGE GRASS AND THESE LATE-SEASON HABITATS, WE ARE IN THE MIDDLE, WE ARE IN A TRAIN WRECK. CONGRESS NEEDS TO KNOW. I'M THAT WAY. MY WIFE -- YOU HAVE TO GET ME AND GO, LOOK AT THIS. THIS IS A PROBLEM HERE. ONCE YOU DO THAT, WE CAN TAKE CARE OF IT.

THAT'S A LONG WAY TO GO TO ASK THIS, DO YOU THINK IN YOUR OPINION THAT IT WOULD BE HELPFUL FROM BLM'S PERSPECTIVE, AND AGAIN, MAYBE IT'S NOT A FAIR QUESTION, I DON'T KNOW, BUT DO YOU THINK A MEETING OF THE ADVISORY BOARD IN WASHINGTON D.C. COULD POSSIBLY HELP GET

SOME POLITICAL APPETITE TO HELP SOME OF THE FOLKS ON THE HILL TAKE A REALISTIC, IN THE MOMENT LOOK AT WHAT WE HAVE GOT TRANSPIRING OUT HERE IN THE WEST? IS THAT A FAIR QUESTION?

>> BRIAN: I'M NOT SURE IT'S A FAIR QUESTION. CAN I SAY, NO, IT'S NOT A FAIR QUESTION AND MOVE ON? [LAUGHING]

I WOULD SAY THE MORE ATTENTION WE BRING TO THIS, THE BETTER OUTCOMES WE CAN SEE.

>> THANK YOU.

>> BRIAN: I'LL GIVE A LONGER ANSWER. I'LL SPEAK LIKE AN ECONOMIST. I USED TO TEACH ECONOMICS AT THE UNIVERSITY 80-MILES FROM HERE. THIS IS A QUESTION OF TRADEOFFS. THE TRADEOFFS ARE INHERENT HERE ON WHAT WE ARE WILLING TO TRADE OFF. RIGHT NOW, I THINK PEOPLE HAVE NEVER ENVISIONED THE HORSE PROGRAM AS A TRADEOFF. EVERY DOLLAR I SPEND ON KEEPING A HORSE IN CAPTIVITY LONG TERM IS A DOLLAR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOESN'T SPEND SOMEPLACE ELSE OR DOESN'T GO INTO THE DEFICIT. THAT'S A CONVERSATION WORTHY TO HAVE. OR THE TRADEOFFS ON THE RANGE, FOR EVERY ADDITIONAL HORSE ON THE RANGE ACCORDING TO VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE, IT'S A TRADEOFF.

MORE INFORMATION IS PROBABLY BETTER -- NOT JUST PROBABLY, MORE INFORMATION IS BETTER.

>> FRED: IN THE LAST BOARD MEETING WE HAD, THE BOARD MADE THE RECOMMENDATION THAT LONG-TERM HOLDING WITHIN THREE YEARS, WAS PART OF THE REASON TO TAKE THE MONEY. JIM, I THINK YOU HAD A COMMENT YOU WANTED TO MAKE?

>> JIM: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. BRIAN, ONCE AGAIN, APPRECIATE YOU COMING. I'M SURE YOU HAVE HEARD A LOT OF THESE REQUESTS AND CONCERNS THAT HAVE BEEN VOICED SO FAR THIS MORNING. I GUESS THAT'S WHERE SOME OF THE FRUSTRATION COMES FROM. WE SEEM TO BE TASKED WITH A JOB HERE THAT IS -- THAT HAS NO SOLUTIONS, OR THERE IS NO APPETITE FOR THE SOLUTIONS. IT MAKES IT TOUGH FOR A LOT OF US. I'M NOT COMPLAINING, JUST SAYING THAT'S WHERE THE FRUSTRATION COMES FROM. FROM THE PERSPECTIVE, AND I WANT TO FOLLOW UP ON DR. PERRYMAN'S COMMENTS ABOUT THE ECOLOGICAL DISASTER IN NORTHERN NEVADA. FOLLOWING THE FIRE BUDGETING AND SUPPORT THAT HAPPENED FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION THIS YEAR, ONE OF THE THINGS I DON'T THINK, I HAVEN'T SEEN HAPPEN WITH REGARD TO BUDGET SUPPORT HAS TO DO WITH THE RECLAMATION SIDE OF IT. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I FEEL IS -- ONE OF THE PLACES WE ARE DROPPING THE BALL RIGHT NOW, AFTER THE FIRE IS

OUT AND EVERYBODY GOES HOME TO GET THEIR TEE SHIRT AND COFFEE CUP FOR THE LAST FIRE, WE ARE FACED WITH A RECLAMATION DISASTER. THE MARTIN FIRE TOOK THE GRASS OUT OF THE ECOSYSTEM, TOOK THE PRIORITY HABITAT OUT OF IT. TALKING WITH MUCH OF THE FOLKS IN THE DISTRICT OF BURRO LAND MANAGEMENT, THE BUDGET SUPPORT FOR THE RECLAMATION THAT NEEDS TO OCCUR THERE IN THE NEXT 18 MONTHS ISN'T THERE.

AS YOU ARE WELL AWARE, WITH THE INVASIVE SPECIES ISSUES, WE HAVE ABOUT 18 MONTHS IN MUCH OF THE GREAT BASIN BEFORE WE LOSE THE HABITATS TO INVASIVE SPECIES. I WONDER WHAT YOUR PERSPECTIVE IS RELATIVE TO THAT RECLAMATION BUDGET. I KNOW MONEY IS TOUGH. THAT IS ONE OF THE REASONS THE RECOMMENDATION OFF THIS BOARD FOR SHORT-TERM, LONG-TERM HOLDING CAPITAL. ASIDE FROM THE HORSE ISSUE, WE HAVE AN ECOLOGICAL DISASTER THAT IS GOING TO CREATE MUCH BIGGER PROBLEMS DOWN THE ROAD THAT WE HAVEN'T SEEN.

>> THANK YOU FOR THE QUESTION. WE ARE AWARE THAT RECLAMATION IS AN ENORMOUS PRIORITY. WE ARE MOBILIZING. WHEN YOU HAVE A MARTIN FIRE BURNING 440,000-ACRES, AND BY THE WAY, THAT FIRE WAS GOING 10 MILES PER HOUR AT ONE POINT, IT IS -- IT'S A DAUNTING TASK. IT'S A LOT OF LAND TO RECLAIM AND A LOT OF LAND TO RESTORE. IT'S SOMETHING WE INDEED TAKE SERIOUSLY. WE THROW AS MUCH MONEY AT IT AS WE CAN, BUT WE HAVE A FIXED BUDGET AS WELL. WE HAVE A FIXED APPROPRIATION THAT -- WE ARE WHERE WE ARE. WE HAVE TO BALANCE THE RESOURCES BETWEEN PRIORITIES.

>> A FOLLOW UP QUESTION, MR. CHAIRMAN. THE POINT OF MY QUESTION WAS, ONCE WE -- IT APPEARED TO BE THAT WE PROVIDED THE PRIORITY FOR FIRE SUPPRESSION WITH REGARD TO THE SUPPORT ON THE FIRE BUDGET. THE POINT I WANTED TO MAKE IS, WE ARE AT A POINT WHERE WE NEED TO TAKE A SIMILAR ACTION IN TERMS OF BUDGET SUPPORT FOR THE RECLAMATION SIDE OF IT BEFORE WE LOSE IT.

>> BRIAN: POINT TAKEN.

>> A REAL QUICK FOLLOW UP QUESTION TO DR. PERRYMAN AND JIM. AS FAR AS -- I HAVE TALKED WITH A LOT OF PEOPLE. THEY TOLD ME, IT'S NOT OUR JOB TO TALK TO CONGRESS. CONGRESS IS OUR BOSS. IF THEY WANT TO TALK TO US, WE CAN'T GO TO THEM. IF THERE WAS A MAJOR FIRE CONSUMING HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF ACRES ON PUBLIC LAND OCCURRING AND YOU DIDN'T TALK TO CONGRESS, THERE WOULD BE BACKLASH FROM CONGRESS ON WHY DIDN'T YOU INFORM US THIS WAS TAKING PLACE.

I FEEL LIKE WE ARE IN A SIMILAR SITUATION WITH THESE WILD HORSES. CAN THERE BE A PARADIGM SHIFT WITHIN THE AGENCY TO REACH OUT AND INFORM CONGRESS, WE HAVE THIS PROBLEM. WE HAVE TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT. WE ARE A DIRE ECONOMIC THRESHOLD BEING CROSSED AS WE SPEAK.

>> I HAVE CERTAIN RULES OF WHAT I CAN AND CAN'T DO. I CAN'T LOBBY CONGRESS. THAT'S SOMETHING BY LAW I'M NOT ALLOWED TO DO. WHAT I CAN DO IS INFORM CONGRESS. THAT'S PART OF WHY WE ARE HERE TODAY. WHILE IT'S LESS DIRECT, I SPEND A LOT OF TIME ON THE HILL TALKING TO PEOPLE ABOUT THIS ISSUE AND THE RESOURCE NEEDS WE HAVE.

>> FRED: ANY OTHER BOARD MEMBER? WE NEED TO STAY ON TIME IF WE CAN. BRIAN, I APPRECIATE YOU COMING. I APPRECIATE THE EFFORT. I KNOW BUSY AS YOU ARE, AND YOU STAYING OVER FOR THE WHOLE BOARD MEETING, IT'S AN HONOR FOR YOU TO BE HERE. I KNOW HOW BUSY YOU ARE, AND HOW IMPORTANT THIS IS OR YOU WOULDN'T BE HERE. THE BOARD WOULD APPRECIATE INTERACTING WITH YOU AT ANY TIME IF THAT'S OKAY.

>> BRIAN: ABSOLUTELY. I WANT TO SAY, YOU GUYS HAVE A HARD JOB. I APPRECIATE THAT. I APPRECIATE THE EFFORT YOU PUT INTO IT, AND THE SERIOUSNESS YOU PUT INTO IT. IT'S AWESOME. WE TAKE WHAT YOU SAY SERIOUSLY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> FRED: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ONE THING AS WE GO ON, I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND EVERYBODY TO PUT YOUR CELL PHONES ON MUTE. I HAVE BEEN HEARING A DING ONCE IN A WHILE FROM TEXT MESSAGES. THAT'S NOT FAIR FOR EVERYBODY. IF YOU HAVE A CELLPHONE AND YOU WANT TO PUT IT ON MUTE, THAT'S FINE. PLEASE, DON'T INTERRUPT THE MEETING FOR THINGS LIKE THIS. WHEN I WAS A NEW MEMBER ON THE BOARD, THERE WERE TWO PEOPLE THAT MENTORED ME. THEY WERE ON THE BOARD AND ARE HERE TODAY. THAT'S CALLIE HENDRICKSON AND SUE. THEY WERE FORMER BOARD MEMBERS THAT TAUGHT ME TO BE SURE I KNEW EVERYTHING I WAS DOING. JUNE, STAND UP AND CALLIE, STAND UP WITH HER. I APPRECIATE YOU ALL MORE THAN YOU WILL EVER KNOW.

MOVING ALONG WITH THE BOARD MEETING, WE ARE HONORED TO HAVE WITH US TODAY THE STATE DIRECTOR OF THE STATE OF UTAH, MR. ED ROBERSON. HE WILL TALK TO US ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THE STATE. ED, IF YOU WOULD MAKE YOUR WAY UP? YOU HAVE THE FLOOR, MY FRIEND.

>> ED: I HAVE DONE THIS A FEW TIMES. I KNOW I SHOULDN'T BE WALKING UP AND TALKING. IT'S STRAINED, AND WE WANT THE PUBLIC TO HEAR EVERYTHING WE HAVE TO SAY. GOOD TO SEE SOME OF THE BOARD MEMBERS I KNOW, THE STAFF. WORKED WITH JUNE, OKAY? I LIKE LEANING FORWARD. ED ROBERSON, TWO YEAR EXPERIENCED UTAH STATE DIRECTOR, MOVED HERE OCTOBER 3RD, 2016, AND I AM SO PROUD TO BE HERE. I WANT TO WELCOME YOU TO SALT LAKE CITY. I WANT TO TELL YOU HOW MUCH I APPRECIATE YOU GOING OUT WITH OUR STAFF. WE HAVE GREAT STAFF IN BLM UTAH. THE TRIP TO SKULL VALLEY YESTERDAY. I DIDN'T MAKE IT BUT I HEARD IT WAS A GOOD TRIP. ONE SLIDE I ADDED, AND YOU HAVE HAD A NICE DISCUSSION WITH BRIAN ABOUT ECOLOGICAL HEALTH AND RESTORATION AND HOW WE ARE DOING OUR WORK HERE IN UTAH. I LOOK FORWARD TO SPENDING TIME WITH YOU. I APPRECIATE JUNE AND CALLIE AND THE BOARD MEMBERS THAT PROCEEDED YOU.

IT TAKES DEDICATION, PERSONAL SACRIFICE AND HARD WORK. WHAT WE NEED FOR THE BODY, IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU ALL ARE PROVIDING. THAT IS BALANCED, ENLIGHTENED, INFORMED ADVICE. WE HAVE THE SAME BOARD THAT DOES THE SAME FOR US IN ALL OF OUR PLANNING. THANK YOU FOR THE SERVICE AND THANK BRIAN FOR TAKING ALL OF THE HARD QUESTIONS. I KNOW YOU WILL BE EASY ON ME BECAUSE I HAVE THE JOB OF WELCOMING YOU TO UTAH, AND THANKING YOU FOR BEING HERE. I THINK WE HAVE A GREAT STATE. I MOVED HERE PARTLY BECAUSE I KNEW THAT LISA REID, THE STAFF WE HAVE HERE IS TOPNOTCH. WE HAVE BEEN CHALLENGED. GUESTS WILL TELL YOU ABOUT OUR HERD MANAGEMENT AREAS, OUR POPULATION. SOME OF THE THINGS WE ARE DOING TO ADDRESS SCIENCE ON THE LAND, TO LOOK AT POPULATION CONTROL AND OTHER THINGS WE ARE WORKING HARD FOR HERE IN UTAH. WE HAVE, YOU KNOW, WE ARE FORTUNATE ENOUGH TO HAVE 23,000,000-ACRES, 22.9 MILLION-ACRES OF PUBLIC LAND HERE. IT'S SOME OF THE MOST BEAUTIFUL COUNTRY, SPECTACULAR SCENERY YOU WILL EVER SEEN. YOU SAW THE GREAT BASIN PORTION OF IT YESTERDAY. YOU GO SOUTH, YOU GO EAST. YOU WILL SEE RED ROCK. YOU WILL SEE FORMATIONS ALONG THE RIVER, GREEN RIVER, AND INTO WYOMING. 32,000,000-ACRES OF SUBSURFACE. BLM MANAGES A VARIETY OF USES, THE LANDS NOT ONLY PROVIDE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, DEVELOPMENT OF MINERALS, RAISING, WE ARE ALSO STEWARDS FOR MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCES THE STATE IS ENDOWED WITH.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS YOU HAVE HAVE BEEN IN THE WEST DISTRICT, YESTERDAY IN THE FIELD OFFICE. YOU SEE ON THE MAP WE HAVE, WE HAVE

FOUR DISTRICTS AND THE GRAND STAIRCASE MONUMENT. THOSE ARE THE FIVE LINE OFFICERS THAT REPORT TO ME AND NEED AN ASSOCIATE STATE DIRECTOR. THEY ARE DOING EVERYTHING THEY CAN TO MANAGE TWO NATIONAL MONUMENTS, TWO NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREAS AND THE REST OF THE 23,000,000-ACRES ARE POSSIBILITIES WE HAVE HERE. THEY SUPPORT NATIONAL AND REGIONAL ECONOMIES. I WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE STEVE YEARDLEY WHO IS IN ONE OF THOSE LOCAL AND REGIONAL ECONOMIES IN THE SOUTHWEST PART OF THE STATE. I APPRECIATE YOUR SERVICE ON THE BOARD FROM THE INDUSTRY, THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY AND YOUR INTEREST IN HORSES AND HOW WE MANAGE THEM ON PUBLIC LANDS. SINCE MY TENURE HERE AS STATE DIRECTOR, I WALKED ON FOLLOWING THE FOOTSTEPS OF MY PREDECESSOR AND STRENGTHENING RELATIONSHIPS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL WITH THE STATE OF UTAH, WITH MY OTHER FEDERAL PARTNERS.

LAST WEEK I WAS IN ST. GEORGE SOUTH OF WHERE STEVE IS FROM WHERE WE HAVE THE FASTEST GROWING COMMUNITY IN THE NATION. WE WERE WORKING ON HOW THE LANDS AND CONSERVATION AREA COME INTO PLAY WHEN YOU HAVE THAT KIND OF GROWTH AND WE ARE THE URBAN INTERFACE INCLUDING THE RED CLIFFS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA AND BEAVER DAM NATURAL CONSERVATION LAND. WE ARE WORKING TO TAKE CARE OF THE LANDS WITH THAT FAST GROWTH AND ENSURE WHAT WE HAVE AT THE END OF THE DAY IS WHAT WE ARE CHALLENGED TO HAVE, A SUSTAINABLE SET OF RESOURCES AND LANDS UPON WHICH MULTIPLE USES CAN TAKE PLACE. THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS THAT WE ARE ABLE TO CONTRIBUTE TO. IT'S NOT US, WE ARE NOT THE ENTREPRENEURS AND PUBLIC LAND USERS THAT HELP BRING ALL OF THAT TO BEAR, BUT THROUGH BALANCED MANAGEMENT, WE HELP DEVELOP OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESOURCES DEVELOPING RESPONSIBLY.

WE WORK TO MAINTAIN HEALTHY ECOSYSTEMS. WE WORK TO ENSURE HEALTHY OPPORTUNITIES. THIS STATE, I HAVE A SLIDE ON VISITATION AND RECREATION IN A MOMENT. THIS STATE IS DRIVEN BY THAT. THIS IS ONE OF THE FASTEST GROWING STATES AS WELL. THEY MOVE HERE BECAUSE WE HAVE THINGS LIKE THE WASATCH FRONT AT OUR DOORSTOP, THE SALT FLATS, THE DEEP CREEKS TO THE FAR WEST ON THE BORDER WITH NEVADA. WE HAVE SOME AMAZING OPPORTUNITIES HERE FOR RECREATION OF ALL KINDS. IN 2017, I'M SURE THEY'LL BE HANDING IT OUT, IN 2017, OUR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES, IF YOU HAVEN'T BEEN GIVEN -- THIS IS THE 2018 SOUND INVESTMENTS, WHICH I KNOW WE'LL TALK ABOUT THE BENEFITS BLM BRINGS TO THE ECONOMY. HERE, OIL AND GAS BRINGS IN \$2.6 BILLION TO

THE ECONOMY CONTRIBUTING TO 25,000 JOBS, 4 BILLION IN TOTAL ECONOMIC OUTPUT, COAL, 750,000,000. MINERALS 72,000,000. SOLAR, WE HAVE A SOLAR SALE IN PROCESS IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN INVESTING IN SOLAR DEVELOPMENT, OF 24,000,000, GRAZING OF 170,000,000, RECREATION OF 185,000,000 AND 25,000 JOBS. WE FEEL AN OBLIGATION TO ALL OF THE PUBLIC OF THE UNITED STATES, AND ALSO TO OUR LOCAL STATE ECONOMIES. I MENTIONED I WOULD TALK ABOUT RECREATION. 2017 WE HAD 8,000 VISITORS TO BLM LANDS, COMPARABLE TO THE MIGHTY FIVE. THE MIGHTY FIVE NATIONAL PARKS PUT ON A NATIONWIDE -- I THINK THEY ARE SADDENED BY THE SUCCESS OF THE PUBLIC RELATION'S CAMPAIGN. WE HAVE FOLKS COMING TO THE MIGHTY FIVE PARKS AND LOVING THEM TO DEATH. THEY ALSO LOVE OUR BLM LANDS THAT ARE ADJACENT TO THE TUNE OF 5200 JOBS.

WE HAVE AN ABUNDANCE OF RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES. WE HAVE THE LANDSCAPE AND MORE IF YOU STAY A WHILE, AND WE HAVE VISITORS FROM ACROSS THE WORLD NOT JUST THE NATION. WE GO FROM MOUNTAIN BIKING IN MOAB, RIVER RUNNING IN WEST CANYON. OSB RIDING IN LITTLE SAHARA WHERE I WENT MONDAY WITH JOHN BUCKMEYER WHERE WE GET 28,000 PEOPLE TO SPEND TIME WITH FAMILY ON A SPECIAL WEEKEND. DRIVING OF NINE MILE CANYON. HUNTING IN THE HENRY MOUNTAINS. WE HAVE WILD BISON HERDS. IT'S AN AREA JOHN WESLEY POWELL THOUGHT IT WAS ROUGH TERRITORY DOING HIS RIVER EXPEDITIONS. WE HAVE THE PRIDE OF BEING ABLE TO SAY THAT'S ONE OF THE AREAS WE MANAGE. OUR UTAH REC JUST APPROVED FIVE BUSINESSES TO DISTRIBUTE OPPORTUNITIES ACROSS THE STATE INSTEAD OF ALL IN ZION OR ARCHES OR CANYON LAND OR PARKS OR OUR AREAS GETTING INCREASED VISITATION.

I THINK THOSE OF YOU THAT HAVE BEEN ON THE RACK FOR THE LAST TWO YEARS, YOU KNOW THE PRIORITIES OF THE BLM. I THINK YOU KNOW THE PRIORITIES OF THE AGENCY. I WANTED TO WALK THROUGH THEM A LITTLE BIT AND TALK ABOUT BLM UTAH AND OUR LEADERSHIP HERE DOES TO SUPPORT THE NATIONAL BLM NATIONAL LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES AND THE AREAS OF FOCUS. I MENTIONED JOB CREATION. WE ARE SUPPORTING WORKING LANDSCAPES. ENERGY DEPENDENCE, INDEPENDENCE, WE ARE ENCOURAGING ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIVE DEVELOP ON OUR PUBLIC LANDS IN UTAH. SHARED CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP, THE NEXT SLIDE, I'LL WALK INTO THAT AND FOR YOUR BENEFIT, IT WILL BE MY LAST SLIDE BEFORE TAKING A FEW QUESTIONS. I'LL MAKE A LOUD NOISE AND WAKE YOU UP BEFORE THAT POINT.

SAFE BORDER, WE DO A LOT HERE SUPPORTING BORDER SECURITY MOVING TO THE BORDERS WHEN NEEDED TO ASSIST. YOU ARE NEXT TO THE DUG WAY PROVING GROUND. WE HAVE HILL AIR FORCE BASE. WE HAVE LAND THAT BLM SUPPORTS THROUGH OUR COMPLIMENTARY MANAGEMENT AROUND THEM. WE ARE COMPLETING A LARGE LAND EXCHANGE ON THE UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE TO MOVE STATE LANDS OUT OF THERE SO THE LANDS WILL BE ALL PUBLIC WHEN THE MILITARY DOES TEST MISSILES FLYING INTO THE AREA. SERVING AMERICA, I THINK THE THING THAT I LIKE TO BRAG ABOUT IS I THINK WHAT GOOD NEIGHBORS WE ARE AND HAVE BEEN, AND HOW WE SUPPORT TRADITIONAL LAND USES, AS WELL AS PROVIDING ACCESS FOR HUNTING, FISHING, OTHER RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND AMAZING PUBLIC LANDS THAT SUPPORT WILDLIFE, WILD HORSES, AND LIVESTOCK. I WANT TO TALK A MINUTE ABOUT THE UTAH WATER RESTORATION INITIATIVE. I HAD THE POSITION OF SITTING IN THE POSITION KRISTIN IS IN FOR SEVERAL YEARS. THAT PARTNERSHIP THAT STARTED 13 YEARS AGO WAS ABLE TO MAKE SO MANY SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HEALTH OF OUR PRIORITY WATERSHEDS IN THE STATE.

IT'S AN ALL HANDS, ALL LANDS APPROACH. WE ARE DOING -- WE ARE PROVIDING CONTINUITY ON THE GROUND FOR THESE ACTIVITIES. WE ARE WORKING AS GOOD NEIGHBORS WITH OTHERS TO POOL TOGETHER OUR RESOURCES TO FOCUS ON THE HIGHEST PRIORITY ACTIVITIES AND PROJECTS AND TO REDUCE ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLEMENTATION. IT'S A DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES WEBSITE. MY FRIEND MIKE STYLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ON DNR WILL BE TALKING WITH YOU THIS MORNING. IT WAS HIS DEPARTMENT THAT IS THE FOCUS OF ADMINISTERING WRI. THE WEBSITE IS AMAZING. IT TALKS ABOUT THE PARTNERS. IT TALKS ABOUT HOW WE ARE IMPROVING OUR RESTORATION ACTIVITIES, AND OVER THE TIME PERIOD OF THE LAST 13 YEARS, WE HAVE TREATED 1.4 MILLION-ACRES. 400-MILES OF STREAM RESTORED TO PROPER CONSERVATION. HEALTHY WATERSHEDS. YOU CAN SEE ISLANDS OF JUNIPER CONVERTED BACK TO RANGE LAND AND SHRUB LAND TO HOST THE SAGE GROUSE AS WELL AS 300 OTHER SPECIES AS WELL AS PROVIDING HEALTHIER LANDS FOR WILD HORSES, WILDLIFE AND LIVESTOCK. OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE PUBLIC AND VISITORS TO SEE AN INTACT LANDSCAPE MORE OF A MOSAIC THAN MONO CULTURE.

WE HAD HORSES WAITING TO DRINK WATER. WE PUT TOGETHER A WATER PROJECT PROPOSAL THAT ALLOWS FOLKS TO SAY, I HAVE CONFLICTS HERE. I HAVE AREAS I COULD DO A BETTER JOB OF MOVING MY ANIMALS OUT, OR MOVING WILDLIFE OR HORSES OUT OF AN AREA THAT'S BEING HEAVILY IMPACTED SO WE CAN GET RESTORATION OF THE AREA. REALLY, TRY TO MOVE WATER TO PLACES WHERE THE ANIMALS CAN USE IT, AND GET IT OUT OF AREAS LIKE REPAIRING AREAS. IN THE 13 YEARS WE HAVE SPENT COLLECTIVELY, AND THAT'S ALL OF THE FOLKS. THERE ARE 100 TO 150 PARTNERS THAT DO IT, \$207 MILLION, ALMOST \$1.5 MILLIONS OF TREATMENT, \$24 MILLION OF IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS AND THIS YEAR ALONE WE HAVE TREATED 127-ACRES. WE ARE SNR ON THE FIRES THAT HIT US. I'LL STOP THERE. I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR JOINING US IN UTAH. I'M A BLOCK FROM THE GATEWAY MALL. IF YOU COME TO THE OFFICE, LOOK FORWARD TO ENGAGING YOU ON THE ISSUE THAT I PUT A LOT OF HEART AND THOUGHT INTO WHILE I WAS IN KRISTIN'S POSITION. WE ARE PROUD HERE, GUS AND LISA'S LEADERSHIP. WE HAVE A GREAT PROGRAM AND RELATIONS WITH FOLKS AND ENLIGHTENED MANAGEMENT. ABBY JOSIE IS OUR DEPUTY STATE DIRECTOR WHO PROVIDES LEADERSHIP AND KNOWS ONE OF TWO OF YOU FROM HER DAYS IN NEVADA.

MR. CHAIR, THAT'S -- I COULD GO ON AND ON AS GINGER KNOWS, AND OTHER, BUT I'LL STOP.

>> FRED: I MET YOU AT THE TIME I CAME ON, AND I WAS IMPRESSED AND HAVEN'T CHANGED THAT VIEW. ANYONE HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?

>> HI.

>> YES, MA'AM.

>> THANK YOU FOR COMING. THANK YOU FOR THE WORK ON THE BOARD IN THE PAST. IS SITTING OUT THERE THEN. I JUST REALLY APPRECIATE IT. WE HAD A GREAT TOUR YESTERDAY WITH GUS AND LISA. AT ONE POINT THEY SHOWED US THE KIOSK AND RULES FOR THE HMA. DO YOU HAVE PLANS FOR DOING THAT FOR ALL OF THE HMAS IN UTAH? PEOPLE LOVE TO SEE WILD HORSES. IF THE SIGNAGE IS THERE, THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

>> GUS WILL TALK TO YOU A BIT. I'LL LET HIM. I'M GETTING THE --

>> THE EVIL EYE?

>> I WANT TO KEEP YOU ALL ON SCHEDULE. I KNOW GUS CAN ANSWER THAT QUESTION. IT'S A GREAT QUESTION. MY GRANDDAUGHTERS WERE HERE OVER THE SUMMER, AND WE WENT TO THE SWELL AND SAW THE SINBAD

BURROS OUT THERE. IT HELPS TO HAVE SOME INTERPRETATION SO YOU KNOW WHAT YOU ARE SEEING.

>> I COULDN'T AGREE MORE.

>> FRED: THANK YOU, GINGER. ANYONE ELSE? STEVEN?

>> STEVEN: ONE QUICK QUESTION. WITH ALL OF THE ACTIVITIES AND ECONOMIC OUTPUTS THAT TRANSPIRE UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE BLM IN THE STATE OF UTAH AND LANDS MANAGED, WHERE DO YOU SEE THE EXPRESSIVE NUMBERS OF WILD HORSES AND ECOLOGICAL DAMAGES OCCURRING IN THE LONG LIST OF PROBLEMS AND PRIORITIES? WHERE DOES THAT LINE UP ON THAT LIST?

>> I WOULD RATHER GUS ANSWER. I THINK YOU WILL HEAR FROM MIKE STYLER. WE HAVE HAD AREAS WHERE THERE ARE SO MANY WILD HORSES ON PRIVATE LAND BASICALLY UP IN THOSE HIGH AREAS IN THE CLIFFS. DNR HAS HELPED FUND SOME OF THE PASSIVE GATHERS WE HAVE HAD. YOU HAVE HAD PRIVATE LANDOWNERS WHO HAVEN'T USED THEIR LAND FOR GRAZING FOR 15 OR 20 YEARS BECAUSE OF OVERPOPULATION. WE HAVE OTHER AREAS LIKE THAT. WHEN WE HAVE DROUGHT AND WATER SHORTAGES, AND THREE TIMES OVER AML IN THE STATE, WE HAVE TRIED TO BE STRATEGIC AND FOCUS ON WHERE YOU GO. WE KNOW IN BEAVER IRON COUNTY, TWO WINTERS AGO WE HAD SO MANY HORSES OUT THERE IN SNOW UP TO THEIR CHEST. IT WAS A HARD THING TO DO. WE COULDN'T GET THEM OUT BECAUSE OF THE SNOW. YOU HAVE -- AND AGAIN, I'LL LET GUS, IF YOU WOULDN'T MIND, LET HIM GIVE YOU THE REAL LAY OF THE LAND AND WHAT OUR PLANS ARE.

>> STEVEN: THANK YOU.

>> FRED: THANK YOU, ED. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OUR NEXT SPEAKER IS A GENTLEMAN, AND I'M LOOKING AT THE BOARD AND SEE "THEE GUS WARD." "I HAVE KNOWN HIM FOR A LONG TIME, AND I DIDN'T KNOW HE HAD A NAME THAT BEGAN WITH "V." WHAT DOES THAT STAND FOR?

>> THE "V" STANDS FOR VICTOR AND "A" FOR AUGUST. VICTOR AUGUST. APPRECIATE BEING HERE. I WAS LOOKING AT THIS TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW THE POINTER WORKS. ANY IDEA? NO? THEY WON'T SEE IT ON THERE.

>> FRED: OH, THAT POINTER. I HAD A GREAT TRIP YESTERDAY. HOPE YOU ENJOYED IT AS MUCH AS I DID. I WOULD RATHER BE KICKING IN THE SOIL AND BEING WITH THE HORSES. THIS IS A GREAT ENVIRONMENT. I CAN'T TELL YOU HOW MUCH WE THANK YOU FOR YOUR WILLINGNESS TO BE ON THE BOARD. YOU FEEL THE STRUGGLE WE FEEL AS BML EMPLOYEES. AT TIMES WE ARE ATTACKED. AT OTHER TIMES WE ARE PRAISED. WELCOME TO UTAH. I'M A UTAH NATIVE BORN AND RAISED. WASHINGTON WILL NEVER GET ME OUT OF

THE STATE. YOU ARE STUCK WITH ME HERE. I CAN TALK ABOUT UTAH FOR HOURS AND DAYS. LOVE THE STATE. I SPENT THE LAST 28 YEARS WITH BLM IN THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO PROGRAM. THOSE OF YOU NEW ON THE BOARD, ONE OF THE OPPORTUNITIES WE GET, WHEN THE BOARD COMES HERE, WE TELL YOU EVERYTHING WE CAN ABOUT OUR PROGRAM IN THE STATE.

I'LL DEEP DIVE INTO THE HORSE AND BURRO PROGRAM, TELL YOU ABOUT INDIVIDUAL HM AS, CHALLENGES AND SUCCESSES. I DON'T SEE A CLOCK. THROW SOMETHING AT ME FOR QUESTIONS. AS YOU SAW YESTERDAY AND HAS BEEN TALKED ABOUT, SOMETHING I HAVE TO TOUT, WE HAVE AN AMAZING HORSE AND BURRO TEAM IN THE STATE OF UTAH. IT'S NOT JUST THE STATE LEVEL. WE ARE A SMALL STATE. WE HAVE TWO FULL TIME HORSE AND BURRO EXPERTS IN THE STATE OF UTAH. WE HAVE OTHERS ACROSS THE STATE THAT WORK IN THE HORSE AND BURRO PROGRAM BUT ALSO HAVE OTHER DUTIES. THEY WORK IN THE RANGE PROGRAM, THE WEED'S PROGRAM, WHATEVER IT MAY BE. THERE ARE THREE FACILITY WORKERS. WE HAVE WONDERFUL, FULL-TIME PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICER. LISA, YOU MET YESTERDAY. WHAT MAKES OUR MANAGEMENT TEAM SUCCESSFUL IS OUR MANAGERS. ED, WHAT AN AMAZING GUY, CLEAR DOWN ABBY TO OUR FIELD MANAGER, DISTRICT MANAGERS. THEY SUPPORT US AS A TEAM AND ARE ABLE TO GET THINGS DONE. I'M PROUD OF THAT COORDINATION AND WORK.

AT OUR FACILITIES, WE HAVE A BIT OF EVERYTHING IN UTAH. WE HAVE TWO WHAT WE CALL OFF RANGE CELLS. OUR DELTA FACILITY. IT'S A 300 ANIMAL FACILITY. IT'S INSIDE THE CITY LIMITS. IT'S LIMITED IN SIZE. THEN WE HAVE THE AXEDALE FACILITY, A BURRO CONTRACT AND HORSE CONTRACT FACILITY. ONE IS FOR HORSES, HOLDS UP TO 2,000 ANIMALS. WE HAVE A CONTRACT FOR A THOUSAND ANIMALS FOR THAT FACILITY AND A BURRO FACILITY, 1200 HEAD FACILITY. IT'S PART PASTOR AND PART CORRAL. THE INDIVIDUAL APPLIED AND WAS AWARDED THE CONTRACT. WELL-RUN PROGRAM. WE HAVE AN OFF RANGE PROGRAM. WE HAVE 350 MARES THERE. WE HAVE AN OFF RANGE PASTURE IN CENTRAL UTAH. WE HAVE 19 HERD MANAGEMENT AREAS IN THE STATE. I'LL GO THROUGH THEM IN DEPTH COMING UP. WE HAVE 19 HERD MANAGEMENT AREAS TAKEN OUT OF MANAGEMENT WITHIN 29 HERD AREAS. 17 OF THOSE ARE WILD HORSES AND TWO WILD BURROS. THIS IS KIND OF A WIDE-SHOT MAP YOU ARE LOOKING AT IN FRONT OF YOU.

YOU CAN COMPARE UTAH TO THE BORDERS OF WYOMING AND NEVADA. THE BLUE AND PURPLE ARE HERD MANAGEMENT. I'M COLOR-BLIND. THE RED ONES ARE THE AREAS. WITHIN 29 HERD AREAS, 19, WE MANAGE ANIMALS AT. I'M GOING TO MOVE FORWARD. IF YOU LOOK AT, ON THE RIGHT-HAND SIDE, LET'S DEEP DIVE INTO SOME OF THESE. I'LL FOCUS ON NORTHERN UTAH. ON THE RIGHT SIDE, THOSE ARE HERD AREAS. THOSE ARE HERD AREAS THAT CREATE THEIR OWN CHALLENGE. THAT'S AN AREA WE HAVE HAD. THOSE OF YOU FAMILIAR WITH EQUINE ANEMIA, THAT'S THE COGGENS TEST FOR HORSES. THERE ARE ONLY A COUPLE DOCUMENTED THAT WE HAD EQUINE INFECTIOUS ANEMIA ON THE RANGE. WE TEAMED UP WITH THE TRIBE IN 1998. BETWEEN 1998 AND 2006 WE DID EXTENSIVE GATHERS AND AT THE TIMING. WE GATHERED A LOT OF ANIMALS AND IDENTIFIED 98 INDIVIDUALS POSITIVE FOR EQUINE INFECTIOUS ANEMIA OFF OF PUBLIC LANDS THAT HAD TO BE EUTHANIZED. VERY UNIQUE, SOMETHING OTHERS DON'T DEAL WITH.

IN 2008 THE LAND USE PLAN DESIGNATED THOSE AS HERD AREAS. NOT ONLY BECAUSE OF THE EQUINE INFECTIOUS ANEMIA, BUT WE HAVE A LOT OF TRIBAL LAND IN THAT AREA. THERE ARE ESTIMATES OF 2,000 PLUS HORSES ON THE TRIBAL LAND THAT GO BACK AND FORTH TO THE BLM. VERY CHALLENGING AREA THERE. WE HAVE THE HERD CREEK. IT HAS A JAGGED BOUNDARY WITHIN THE HMA THERE. WE DID A DEEP DIVE TO FIGURE OUT, THAT IS THE AREA WE MANAGE IT IN. THAT WAS A CIRCLE ON A MAP AT ONE TIME. WE HAVE BEEN ABLE THROUGH LAND-USE PLANS TO FOCUS ON WHERE CAN WE MANAGE THE HORSES EFFECTIVELY? IF YOU MOVE TO THE LEFT SIDE, THAT'S WHERE WE WAS YESTERDAY. YOU CAN SEE THE ORIGINAL HERD AREA OF THE ONAQUIS IS LARGE. A LOT OF IT HAS NO WATER SOURCE. THEN YOU GET TO THE MILITARY LAND. WE IDENTIFIED 200,000-ACRES IS WHAT WE CAN MANAGE ON THE ONAQUIS. THIS IS A CHALLENGE ITSELF BECAUSE OF THE VISITATION. YOU HAVE THE MILITARY COMPONENT TO DEAL WITH. EACH ZONE WITHIN UTAH HAS THEIR OWN MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES.

WHEN YOU GO TO THE SOUTHEAST PART OF THE STATE, YOU HAVE THE MUDDY CREEK AND SINBAD AREAS WE MANAGE LAND ON. ROBERT'S ROOST IS AN AREA THAT WAS A HERD MANAGEMENT AREA BUT THERE IS NOT EFFECTIVE WATER THERE. WE COULDN'T KEEP A POPULATION OF 25 TO 30 ANIMALS THERE BECAUSE THERE WENT WATER. ANIMALS WERE GOING WITHOUT WATER. THEY WERE BEING COMPROMISED. IN 2008 THE LAND USE PLAN WENT THROUGH THE PUBLIC PROCESS AND DETERMINED WE CAN'T EFFECTIVELY MANAGE ANIMALS THERE. THERE ARE STILL HORSES THERE. IF YOU LOOK TOWARD THE GRAND STAIRCASE ED TALKED ABOUT AT

HARVEY'S SPHERE, THERE ARE A DOZEN TO TWO DOZEN ANIMALS THERE, A VERY REMOTE POPULATION, SELF REGULATING THROUGH LAND. IT'S NOT A HERD MANAGEMENT AREA. ON THE WESTERN SIDE OF OUR STATE IS OUR LARGEST COMPONENT MANAGING HORSES AND BURROS IN UTAH. THE ONAQUIS, WE HAVE A LARGE NUMBER OF HERD MANAGEMENT AREAS. MOST OF THE BOUNDARY IS THE SAME AS THE HERD AREA BOUNDARY.

THEY ARE GOING THROUGH A LAND-USE PLAN TO MANAGE THE POPULATIONS. WE HAVE BEEN PARTNERED WITH OUR PARTNERS WITH THE USGS IN COLORADO STATE TO DO RESEARCH ON THE CONGERS. AT SINBAD WITH THE BURROS, WE HAVE BEEN DOING WORK THERE. WE ARE ACTIVE IN HOW TO BETTER MANAGE THE POPULATIONS. HERE ARE SPECIFIC NUMBERS. I APOLOGIZE TO YOU BOARD MEMBERS. I THINK THE SLIDE YOU HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU, THE NUMBERS -- I ADJUSTED THEM A BIT OR I ADDED SOME. AS OF 2018 MARCH, LOOKING AT OUR WEBSITE, WE HAD 5100 ANIMALS IN THE STATE OF UTAH DOWN FROM 2017. WE WERE UP 5800 ROUGHLY. TODAY, AS OF NOW, I ESTIMATE OUR POPULATION IN THE STATE OF UTAH TO BE 4842 ANIMALS. THAT'S PLUS OR MINUS 15% EITHER WAY, CONSISTING OF 4800 HORSES AND 344 BURROS. WE HAVE BEEN ACTIVE IN REMOVING ANIMALS IN '17-'18. IF YOU LOOK AT OUR APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT LEVEL, IT'S JUST UNDER 2,000. EVEN THOUGH WE HAVE BEEN ACTIVELY REMOVING, TRYING TO DO THE BEST WE CAN, WE ARE TWO AND A HALF TIMES WHERE WE SHOULD BE.

WE ARE NOT BAD AS SOME STATES. WE HAVE BEEN TRYING. WE HAVE BEEN EFFECTIVE IN SOME AREAS. WE HAVE A LONG WAY TO GO. IN MANAGING HORSES HERE IN UTAH, I HAVE FOUND WE CAN BE THE BEST MANAGERS IN THE WORLD. THIS IS A KEY FACTOR THAT DRIVES WHAT WE DO AND HOW WE DO IT QUICKER THAN ANYTHING. LIKE I TOLD YOU YESTERDAY, AND THANK YOU FOR BRINGING THE RAIN WITH YOU. IT'S OCTOBER 1ST, AND IT STARTED RAINING. WE HAVE PRETTY MUCH HAD FOUR MONTHS OF DRY NOTHING IN UTAH. BASED ON THE DROUGHT MONITOR, UTAH, COLORADO, THERE IS A BIG BLOB OF CRUCIAL DROUGHT STRICKEN -- THE WHOLE WEST. THAT'S A DROUGHT MONITOR. IF IT'S WHITE, YOU ARE NOT IN THE DROUGHT, BUT YOU CAN SEE THE WHOLE WEST IS IN A DROUGHT CONDITION. THAT DICTATES IN A BIG WAY WHAT WE DO AND PUSHES US IN ONE DIRECTION OR ANOTHER WHEN IT COMES TO LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT. WE DEAL WITH THE WATER ISSUE EVERY YEAR ON MANY OF THE HMAS. THIS IS A SLIDE I PULLED IN 2016. WE HAD SO MANY HORSES WITHOUT WATER. IT WAS BRING WATER TO THEM OR THEY WOULD BE COMPROMISED AND WE WOULD HAVE TO DO AN EMERGENCY REMOVAL.

MOST OF THE ISSUE IS THE WATER. YOU SEE THAT A LOT IN THE WEST. WE TRY TO IMPROVE THE WATER SOURCES SO WE DON'T HAVE TO HAUL WATER. THIS IS WATER CATCHMAN PONDS, CLEANING THEM OUT, SIMPLE MAINTENANCE THAT DOESN'T TAKE A LOT OF MONEY, BUT IT'S EFFECTIVE IN STORAGE CAPACITIES SO THEY DON'T GET INTO COMPROMISE. MUDDY CREEK, WE DID A MANAGEMENT THIS SUMMER. THAT'S A CHALLENGING AREA. THE SPRING SOURCE ON THE LEFT YOU SEE, WE DEAL WITH THAT EVERY YEAR. IT SUSTAINS 25 OR LESS HORSES. WHEN WE HAVE MORE THAN THAT, THE STREAM STARTS DRYING UP. LITERALLY, IT'S BEEN FOR THE LAST FIVE YEARS, AN ANNUAL PROCESS OF THREE AND A HALF HOURS INTO THIS MAKING SURE THE HORSES ARE OKAY. WE HAVE HAD TO EUTHANIZE HORSES FOR THE LAST FIVE YEARS WHERE THEY CAN'T WALK. I'M NOT GOING TO DRIVE INTO AN AREA TO SEE A HORSE IN THAT AREA AND NOT RELIEVE THAT SUFFERING.

IT'S A CHALLENGE, BUT WHEN IT RAINS, THINGS LIKE THE RIGHT SIDE HAPPENS, CAVERNS FILL UP WITH WATERS AND THE HORSES DISPERSE. THE LONG-TERM SOLUTION IS KEEPING THE NUMBERS IN CHECK. THIS IS SOME OF THE SIGNS GINGER TALKED ABOUT. I WOULD LOVE TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION. THESE ARE CRITICAL IN FUTURE MANAGEMENT TO EDUCATE THE PUBLIC. THIS TALKS ABOUT THE ONAQUIS WHERE PEOPLE LOVE THEM TO DEATH. THEY START PETTING THEM, FEEDING THEM AND MAKING PETS OUT OF THEM, THAT'S THE CONCERN I HAVE. THE KIOSKS, I WOULD LOVE TO SEE THEM ACROSS THE STATE. WE NOTICED YESTERDAY, THIS HAS BEEN UP FOR TWO YEARS. THERE ARE NO BULLET HOLES IN IT. THAT TELLS ME THE PUBLIC LIKES IT.

THE ONAQUI HMA, PARTNERSHIPS CREATE CHALLENGES. WE PARTNER WITH THE MUSTANG FOUNDATION. THIS IS THE IMPACT EVERY YEAR. IF IT WAS NOVEMBER, WE WOULD INVITE YOU UP WITH A COMPETITION BETWEEN MUSTANGS AND DOMESTIC HORSES. IT'S FANTASTIC. WE HAVE HARD CORE DOMESTIC HORSE OWNERS ADOPTING MUSTANGS BECAUSE THEY ARE BLOWN AWAY BY WHAT THEY CAN DO. THE ZOO DISPLAYS SOME OF THE ANIMALS WHERE WE HAVE THOUSANDS VISITING THE ZOO AND THEY LOOK AT THAT AND SAY, WE DIDN'T KNOW THERE WERE WILD HORSES. WE HAVE A FESTIVAL WE HAVE BEEN DOING 30 YEARS, I BELIEVE. WE HAD THE 20 YEAR ANNIVERSARY WITH BLM HORSES. THEY HAVE TO HAVE A FREEZE MARK. THEY COME TO COMPETE. WE HAVE STARTED A 4-H PROGRAM. THE YOUTH PROGRAMS WE DO, THEY ARE GREAT PARTNERSHIPS. WE LOVE OUR

PARTNERSHIPS. WE LOVE THE PARTNERS WE WORK WITH. IT'S A CHALLENGE WITH THE PROGRAM WE HAVE. THE SATISFACTION WE GET AS A TEAM TO SEE THE SUCCESS IS JUST WELL WORTH THE EFFORT WE PUT IN.

WE HAVE GREAT PARTNERSHIPS. I HAVE LISTED SOME OF THE CHALLENGES HERE. YOU CAN LOOK AT YOUR BOOKS AND ASK QUESTIONS TO GENERATE QUESTIONS. WE ARE TWO AND A HALF TIMES AML. WE HAVE SEVERAL THAT ARE FOUR OR FIVE TIMES OVER WHAT THEY SHOULD BE. THE EXTENDED DROUGHT PERIODS WE ARE HAVING, THEY ARE KILLING US. THE WATER LIMITATIONS ARE KILLING US. THE WATER SHORTAGE ISSUE, WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT IT AMONGST OURSELVES. MAYBE WE NEED TO LOOK AT THE AMLS. IF WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH WATER TO SUSTAIN THE POPULATIONS, DO WE DEVELOP MORE WATER, REDUCE AML? WHAT DO WE DO? IT'S TOUGH TO DEAL WITH. PROGRAM WIDE, BRIAN AND EVERYBODY, THE PROGRAM WIDE BUDGET LIMITATION WHERE OTHER STATES ARE TAKING THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO REMOVALS. MAYBE WYOMING WILL GET IT OR NEVADA WILL GET IT. THAT MEANS THE OTHER STATES CAN'T REMOVE THE ANIMALS THEY SHOULD. THE TRICKLE EFFECT, THE STATES NOT HIGH PRIORITY GET LEFT BEHIND. NEVADA WAS IN THAT MODE SEVERAL YEARS. NEVADA IS IN A TOUGH BOAT RIGHT NOW.

THE INCREASE PRIVATE PROPERTY AND PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS, THOSE ARE THINGS WE DEAL WITH ON A SOMETIMES WEEKLY OR MONTHLY BASIS AROUND THE STATE. THAT'S WHAT I'VE GOT. I HOPE I LEFT TIME FOR QUESTIONS.

>> FRED: YOU DID. EVEN IF YOU DIDN'T, WE ARE GOING TO ASK THEM.

>> I LOVE IT. I WOULD RATHER ANSWER QUESTIONS.

>> FRED: ONE THING WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO DO FOR THE NEW BOARD MEMBERS, CAN YOU EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENCE OF WHAT GOES INTO AN HA?

>> A HERD AREA IS THE ORIGINAL 1971 DESIGNATION. IF YOU LOOK AT THE ONAQUI HERD AREA, THAT'S THE DARK RED LINE. AFTER THE ACT WAS PASSED IN '71, THERE WAS A PERIOD BETWEEN '73, '74, '75, EACH DISTRICT HAD TO IDENTIFY WHERE WILD HORSES WERE FOUND. SOMETIMES THAT WAS DONE ON THE GROUND OR HOSPITAL OR FIXED AIRPLANE. THE BML MADE A CIRCLE ON THE MAP AND SAID THAT'S WHERE THEY WERE FOUND. AFTER THAT, BLM HAD TO IDENTIFY WITHIN THE HERD AREA, WHERE CAN WE EFFECTIVELY MANAGE THE HORSES? A HERD MANAGEMENT AREA HAS TO FALL WITHIN A HERD AREA. HOPEFULLY, THAT MAKES SENSE. THUS, WE HAVE THE HERD MANAGEMENT AREAS, A SUBSET OF THE HERD AREA OR THE

SAME BOUNDARY. A LOT OF HERD MANAGEMENT AREAS ON THE SOUTHWEST PART OF THE STATE, IT'S THE SAME BOUNDARY.

>> FRED: ONE OTHER QUESTION I WANT TO ASK BEFORE I TURN IT TO THE OTHER BOARD MEMBERS. I DON'T GET ON FACEBOOK MUCH. I HAVE GRANDKIDS. I DO THAT, BUT I HAVE A FRIEND THAT SAYS EVERYTHING ON FACEBOOK IS TRUE. RECENTLY, THERE WERE FACEBOOK POSTS ABOUT A GATHER THAT OCCURRED IN THE STATE. I HAVE KNOWN YOU A LONG TIME. SOME OF THE COMMENTS FORWARDED TO ME WERE NOT VERY -- FLATTERING. I WANTED TO KNOW IF YOU WOULD MIND SHARING THAT.

>> EVERY TIME WE DO A GATHER OR EVENT, THINGS LIKE THAT POP UP, MR. CHAIRMAN. I APPRECIATE YOU BRINGING THAT UP. WE TALKED ABOUT THIS YESTERDAY. WE HAD A GATHER CALLED THE MUDDY CREEK GATHER. WE REMOVED 150 HORSES. THERE WAS A SITUATION WITH PASSIONATE PEOPLE THERE. THEY LOVE THE HORSES. I LOVE THAT ABOUT THIS PROGRAM. PEOPLE ARE PASSIONATE AND LOVE THE ANIMALS. WE HAD THE NEED TO REMOVE ANIMALS. THEY WERE SO UPSET THAT THEY STARTED TO GET RAMBUNCTIOUS. WE HAVE A GREAT LAW ENFORCEMENT TEAM. I ASKED THE LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSON TO GO THERE AND MAKE SURE EVERYTHING WAS OKAY, JUST BE A PRESENCE THERE, WHICH HE DID. THE GATHER PROCEEDED AND IT WAS GREAT. THAT EVENING FACEBOOK AND TWITTER FEEDS WERE SHOWING UP THAT GUS WAS MAKING FUN OF PEOPLE, AS PEOPLE WERE CRYING, HE WAS MAKING FUN OF THEM. I WASN'T EVEN UP THERE. I WAS DOWN BY THE LAW ENFORCEMENT. IT'S UNFORTUNATE THAT PEOPLE HAVE SO MUCH PASSION THAT IT TAKES THEM DOWN THE ROAD OF BEING DISHONEST AND TRYING TO SMEAR SOMEONE PERSONALLY. IT'S A SAD SITUATION AT THAT POINT.

I HAVE DEALT WITH HATE MAIL AND THREAT AND YOU SHOULD DO THIS OR THAT. THAT HAPPENS. I WISH PEOPLE WOULD EDUCATE THEMSELVES ON THE TRUTH. SOCIAL MEDIA IS A LOT OF TIME A VENTING POINT WHERE PEOPLE'S PASSION AND EMOTION, I CAUTION PEOPLE TO WATCH WHAT THEY READ AND GET THE FACTS BEFORE THEY JUMP INTO THAT. THAT WASN'T THE ONLY INCIDENT. WE COULD GO ALL DAY, BUT THAT'S THE ONE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT, I IMAGINE.

>> FRED: WHEN THAT HAPPENED, I HAVE KNOWN YOU QUITE A WHILE. I DON'T KNOW ANYONE IN THE PROGRAM THAT HAS MORE PASSION THAN YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

>> FRED: ANYMORE QUESTIONS FOR GUS? BEN?

>> BEN: I HAVE TWO QUESTIONS --

>> FRED: YOU CAN ONLY HAVE ONE. KIDDING.

>> DO YOU HAVE A SYNOPSIS OR DATA OF HMA IN THE HA?

>> GUS: YES, ON OUR STATISTICS, IF YOU GO TO OUR NATIONAL STATISTICS, YOU CAN LOOK AT THE HERD AREAS. ARE YOU TALKING OUTSIDE OF THE HERD AREA BOUNDARIES?

>> CORRECT.

>> GUS: THANK YOU. OUT OF THE 4800 ANIMALS IN UTAH, WE HAVE 300 TO 400 ANIMALS OUTSIDE OF THE HERD AREA BOUNDARY. WE HAVE THAT SUBSET OF 800 TO A THOUSAND ANIMALS WITHIN HERD AREAS, SO YOU KNOW, THAT'S A BIG PROBLEM WE DEAL WITH. WHEN THE POPULATIONS EXPAND, THEY GO SOMEWHERE. HORSES AND BURROS DON'T UNDERSTAND THEY HAVE TO STOP AT THIS LINE. THEY GO OUTSIDE. IT CAN BE SIGNIFICANT, BUT IT'S DEFINITELY A SUBSET OF THE NUMBER THAT THERE ARE QUITE A FEW ANIMALS OUTSIDE. THEY HAVE BEEN ON PUBLIC LAND. DO THEY FALL UNDER THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO ACT? ABSOLUTELY. THEY ARE NOT IN A HERD AREA OR HERD-MANAGEMENT AREA.

>> THANK YOU. YESTERDAY YOU MENTIONED MOUNTAIN LION. I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH THE CLAIMS. DO YOU HAVE THAT INFORMATION AVAILABLE?

>> GUS: I WORK WITH DR. PETERSON. I DON'T KNOW ABOUT STUDIES. WE HAD STUDIES IN THE LATE '90S. I DON'T KNOW OF STUDY, BUT DR. PETERSON MAY BE ABLE TO TACKLE THAT ONE FOR US.

>> STEVEN: ONE OTHER QUESTION I HAVE. IT WAS ONE I ASKED MR. ROBERSON. HE SAID HE WOULD DEFER TO YOU. THERE ARE A LOT OF ACTIVITIES, ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES AND THINGS GOING ON WITH BLM GROUND IN THE STATE OF UTAH. IT'S A LARGE AREA. AS FAR AS ON THE LIST OF PRIORITIES AND PROBLEMS WE ARE FACED WITH, WHERE ARE THE ECOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OCCURRING BECAUSE OF THAT ON THAT LIST?

>> I WOULD SAY SINCE ED CAME TO UTAH AS OUR STATE DIRECTOR, HE UNDERSTOOD THE PROGRAM, FORTUNATE FOR UTAH, IT'S NOT UNCOMMON FOR ME TO GET TO MY DESK 6:30 IN THE MORNING AND ED WANTS TO KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON. IF HE'S CALLING ME PERSONALLY, IT'S HIGH ON HIS PRIORITY. HE'S MADE THIS A PRIORITY TO DO HIS BEST TO WORK WITH THE STATE, WITH THE LIVESTOCK COMMUNITY, INTEREST GROUPS TO MAKE THIS A PRIORITY PROGRAM. IT MAY NOT BE NUMBER ONE, BUT IT'S UP THERE. IT'S DEFINITELY HIGH.

>> FRED: TOM?

>> GUS, I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR THE TOUR YESTERDAY. THAT WAS EDUCATIONAL. ARE HORSES REMOVED FROM THE COGGENS?

>> GUS: YES, THEY ARE TESTED FOR ANEMIA.

>> IN THE CASE OF THE HERD OF REACTORS, DO YOU GO BACK TO THE HORSES REMAINING TO TEST THEM?

>> GUS: NOT ON A REGULAR BASES. THE CHALLENGE WE HAVE IS THEY GO BACK AND FORTH BETWEEN TRIBAL LANDS. WE HAVE AN AGREEMENT WITH THE UTAH STATE VETERINARIAN. WE GATHER THE HORSES AND TEST THEM ONSITE. WE WON'T SHIP THEM TO OUR FACILITY. WE HAVE TO TEST THEM. IF WE HAVE A POSITIVE AND WE HAVE A QUARANTINE ONSITE WHERE WE HAVE SPENT MONTHS IN QUARANTINE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS. IT'S A RARE, ISOLATED CASE. ANYTIME WE GO INTO THERE, WE HAVE TO HOLD THE ANIMALS AND TEST THEM.

>> THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. GUS, FIRST TIME I MET YOU WAS YESTERDAY. YOUR REPUTATION PROCEEDS YOU FOR SURE IN TERMS OF PASSION FOR THE JOB ON THE NEVADA SIDE. I HAD FOLKS ASK ABOUT YOU WHEN WE WERE TALKING ABOUT THE SCHEDULE. THE STATE OF UTAH IS LUCKY RIGHT NOW. BEN ASKED ONE OF THE FIRST QUESTIONS. I'M GOING TO DEFER TO THAT. I HAD A COUPLE OF OTHER SMALL QUESTIONS. I WAS WONDERING ON THE 1100 OR SO THAT YOU GATHERED THIS YEAR, WERE THOSE GATHERED BASED ON EMERGENCY CONDITIONS, OR WERE THEY SCHEDULED AHEAD OF TIME?

>> A COUPLE OF THEM WERE EMERGENCIES. MOST WERE SCHEDULED. WE HAD ONE PRIVATE LAND GATHER. WE HAD A COUPLE ON PRIVATE LAND. THEY WERE SMALL. ONE WAS AN EMERGENCY. THERE WAS A LACK OF WATER, NOT THE ENTIRE HMA. IT WAS THE SOUTHERN PART WITH THREE SPRINGS. THE REST WERE PLANNED WE WERE WORKING TO GET ON THE GATHER SCHEDULE.

>> THE OTHER QUICK QUESTION, YOU MENTIONED THE 4-H PROGRAM ON THE ADOPTION SIDE OF IT. DO YOU HAVE A NAME FOR A LEAD?

>> ON THE WATER PROGRAM?

>> ON THE 4-H PROGRAM. YOU HAD A SLIDE WITH THE 4-H PROGRAM.

>> GUS: THE WATER PROGRAM? IF I SAID FORAGE, I MIGHT HAVE MISSPOKE.

>> 4-H.

>> OH, IDAHO KICKED IT OFF AND WE HAVE MULTIPLE STATES DOING THE SAME PROGRAM. IT'S WORKING GOOD. WE COULD HOOK THE 4-H LEADERS UP TO HELP EACH OTHER.

>> I APPRECIATE THAT. NEVADA IS NOT DOING THAT. IT LOOKS LIKE A GOOD OPPORTUNITY.

>> GUS: IT'S SUCH A GREAT PROGRAM FOR THE YOUTH. IT'S GREAT.

>> IF YOU WOULDN'T MIND, WOULD YOU FORWARD THE CONTACTS TO ME?

>> GUS: HELP ME WITH THAT, LISA.

>> I REGRET WHAT OUR CHAIRMAN REFERRED TO ON FACEBOOK. I HAVE KNOWN YOU A LONG TIME. I CAN'T IMAGINE YOU WOULD EVER DO ANYTHING LIKE THAT. I'M NOT A FACEBOOK FOLLOWER. ON THE 4-H, WONDERFUL. IN COLORADO, STEVE LEONARD IS WORKING ON THE 4-H INTERFACE. HE'S EXCITED ABOUT IT, DEDICATED BLM EMPLOYEE. JUST ON A PERSONAL NOTE, WHEN I ADOPTED BY MUSTANG, THE BLM WAS KIND ENOUGH TO BRING IT TO GRAND JUNCTION TO PICK HIM UP. THANK YOU.

>> GUS: THANK YOU, GINGER.

>> YOU MENTIONED THE DROUGHT MONITOR. HOW ARE YOU USING THE DROUGHT MONITOR IN YOUR DECISION-MAKING PROCESS?

>> GUS: ONE OF THE THINGS, I ENCOURAGE OUR FIELD SPECIALIST TO DO, WHEN THEY ARE DOING AN ANALYSIS ON DOING A GATHER OR NOT, WHEN THEY USE INFORMATION SUBSEQUENT TO GATHER, THIS HAS TO BE PART OF THE ANALYSIS. I ENCOURAGE THEM TO LOOK AT NOT ONLY OUR UTILIZATION OR TREND, BUT USE THE DROUGHT DATA. IT'S PREDICTABLE. IT PREDICTS, LOOK WHERE WE ARE AT RIGHT NOW. THIS CAN ANSWER QUESTIONS WHY WE HAVE NO VEGETATION GROWTH BECAUSE OF LACK OF WATER. WE HAVE RAIN GAUGE WE USE.

>> THE DROUGHT MONITOR IS BASED ON SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY. THERE ARE SOME YEARS YOU CAN HAVE ALL KINDS OF FEED ON THE GROUND THAT YOU DON'T -- THERE'S NO WATER, BASICALLY. AS LONG AS YOUR STAFF IS COGNIZANT -- I CAN'T SAY THAT WORD. AS LONG AS THEY REALIZE WHAT IS GOING ON, IT'S OKAY. WE HAVE HAD ISSUES WHERE SOME OF THE BLM OFFICE HAS BEEN RELYING EXCLUSIVELY ON THE DROUGHT MONITOR AND IT CAN BE OFF BASE WHAT IS GOING ON THE GROUND.

>> THAT'S ONE GLIMPSE. THEY HAVE TO LOOK AT THE LOCAL DATA, THE LOCAL TREND, MONITORING DATA, UTILIZATION, ALL OF THE FACTORS. THAT'S A GOOD POINT. THANK YOU FOR MAKING THAT.

>> SHE FINALLY CAME AWAKE AND HAS A QUESTION.

>> WELCOME TO THE BOARD, CELESTE.

>> CELESTE: ONAQUI IS LOOKED TO FOR A SUCCESSFUL FERTILITY PROGRAM. YOU HAVE APPROACHABLE HORSES AND A TEAM SUPPORTIVE OF DOING THIS INCLUDING THE STATE LEAD. THAT'S REALLY IMPORTANT. I KNOW OTHER FIELD OFFICES HAVE LOOKED TO YOU FOR ADVICE AND

PRACTICALITY AND THE DOS AND THE DON'TS. ALSO, AS YOU BUILD AND ESCAPE UP A PROJECT WITH SUCH APPROACHABLE HORSES AT ONAQUI, HOPING TO UP THAT, HOW ARE YOU FORMULATING YOUR -- WHAT ARE YOUR LIMITATIONS FOR 60 AT THIS POINT INSTEAD OF 100, ARE THERE REASONS YOU ARE NOT JUST SAYING, 80% OF THE MARES OR WHATEVER?

>> GUS: ONE OF THE BIGGEST CHALLENGES IS WE HAVE THE MOB, THE LARGE GROUP OF HORSES. THOSE ARE APPROACHABLE. WE HAVE SUB POPULATIONS ON THE ONAQUIS THAT ARE NOT THAT APPROACHABLE. THERE ARE THOSE WE CAN'T APPROACH CLOSE. WE HAD A TRAINING THIS SUMMER WHERE WE HAD HALF A DOZEN INDIVIDUALS TAKE THE TRAINING. THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL ANIMAL IS KEY. MAKING SURE YOU HAVE THE DATABASE AND MAKING SURE YOU CAN IDENTIFY EACH INDIVIDUAL MARE SO YOU KNOW WHICH ANIMAL YOU ARE TRAINING. WE DON'T WANT TO HALF HAZARDLY DART ANY MARE WE WANT. WE WANT TO KNOW WHEN IT WAS TREATED. WE WANT TO BE PRECISE IN WHAT WE DO. OUR LIMITATIONS ARE ON THE ONAQUIS. WE ARE LOOKING AT THE MUDDY CREEK. WE HAVE A SUBSET OF MUDDY CREEK THAT ARE APPROACHABLE. THERE ARE A LOT OF THOSE IN MUDDY CREEK YOU CAN'T GET A MILE FROM THEM. TAKE WHAT YOU CAN GET. ANY SUPPRESSION WILL SUPPORT THE PROGRAM IN THE LONG RUN. I ENCOURAGE FIELD FOLK TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THAT.

>> ONE QUICK ONE, IF I COULD. IN MCCULLOUGH PEAK, THOSE HORSES ARE JUST LIKE YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT, MILE AWAY, LOT OF DUST. WHEN THEY STARTED HAVING PEOPLE WHO WERE COMING TO VIEW THE HORSES, THAT TURNED AROUND WITHIN A COUPLE OF YEARS.

>> IS THAT RIGHT? NOW THE MCCULLOUGH PEAK HORSES ARE NOT TO IGNORE YOU AS ONAQUIS, BUT THEY ARE DEFINITELY DISTANT. THE SIGNAGE, IF IT'S ANYTHING LIKE THE MCCULLOUGHPEAK, IT WAS CLOUD OF DUST IN 1994 TO SEE THE HERD.

>> WE HAVE HAD BLM DIRECTION DIRECTING US TO SAY IF YOU CAN DART HORSES, EVERY STATE SHOULD LOOK AT HMA AND WHAT IS THE APPLICABILITY. WE NEED TO EMPHASIZE THAT AT THE STATE LEVEL AND DO WHAT WE CAN, USE ALL OF THE TOOLS WE HAVE.

>> FRED: ANYBODY ELSE? GUS, I WANT TO THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THANK YOU FOR THE TOUR YESTERDAY. IT WAS A PLEASURE HOOKING UP WITH YOU YESTERDAY AND SPENDING TIME WITH YOU.

>> GUS: YOU ARE WELCOME ANY TIME. IT'S NOW 10:00. LET'S TAKE A 15 MINUTE BREAK. EVERYONE BE BACK ON STATION BY 10:15. THANK YOU ALL.

[MEETING WILL RESUME SHORTLY]

>> IF EVERYBODY CAN TAKE THEIR PLACES, WE'LL TAKE BACK UP. ONE OF THE THINGS I WAS ASKED TO DO, APPARENTLY I HAVE DONE THIS IN A LOT OF MEETINGS WE HAVE HAD IS TO SHARE A COWBOY POEM WITH YOU. THE EARLY PREDAWN SILENCE IS LIKE MUSIC TO THE EARS. OF THE RESTED AND CONTENTED WHO TAKE THE TIME TO HEAR. I HAVE MISSED THAT PREDAWN SILENCE UPON THE TRACK, BUT I WILL HAVE IT BACK FOR ONCE AGAIN I HAVE HORSES THAT HEAR MY SPIRIT'S ODE. DEAR GOD HOW HAVE I HAVE MISSED THEM, AND HOW THEY MAKE ME WHOLE.

ALL RIGHT, IF YOU WILL SIT DOWN AND WHERE IS MR. BRUCE AT? OH, SHAZAM. WE ARE HONORED AND PRIVILEGED TO HAVE THE ACTING CHIEF OF THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO PROGRAM. HE'S A NICE GUY. HE WORKED HARD TO GET THE MEETING UNDER WAY. HE'S DONE AN OUTSTANDING JOB. AT THIS POINT, I'LL TURN IT OVER TO YOU, BRUCE. YOU CAN SHARE A BIT.

>> ALL RIGHT. CAN EVERYBODY HEAR ME? THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING. FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO, AS EVERYONE HAS ACKNOWLEDGED THE BOARD MEMBERS FOR YOUR PASSION AND BEING PART OF THIS. IT TAKES A LOT TO GET YOU ON THE BOARD. I KNOW THAT NOW FIRST HAND. YEAH, SO IT WAS GREAT. ONE, IT TOOK A LOT OF WORK TO GET THIS MEETING. I HOPE -- MY HOPE PREFACE OF THE MEETING WAS IT WAS FOR YOU NINE FOLKS HERE. THANKS FOR BEING HERE. SECOND, FIRST OF ALL, IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT THAT I WANT TO THANK EVERYBODY WITHIN THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WILD HORSE AND BURRO STAFF DEDICATE TODAY THE PROGRAM, WEARING DUAL HATS. MANY, MANY PEOPLE IN THE BURRO WORK IN THE HORSE PROGRAM, RANGE PROGRAM AND OTHER THINGS. IT'S A VERY COMPLEX JOB. THANKFULLY TO THEM, THEY ARE THERE. BEING IN THIS PROGRAM, I CAME INTO THE PROGRAM FIVE MONTHS AGO. NOW I HAVE SEEN IT FIRST HAND. I KNOW PEOPLE IN THE PROGRAM ARE SOME OF THE MOST DEDICATED EMPLOYEES IN THE BUREAU, AND THEY ARE DEDICATED TO THEIR RESOURCE. THEY CARE FOR THE ANIMALS.

THAT'S MY LINE IN THE SAND WHEN THEY TALK TO PEOPLE. THEY SAY PEOPLE IN THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO PROGRAM DON'T CARE FOR THESE ANIMALS. THERE IS NOTHING FURTHER FROM THE TRUTH. THAT'S THEIR MAIN MOTIVATE FOR BEING IN THE PROGRAM. I HAVE BEEN IN THE POSITION FIVE MONTHS NOW. I WANT TO THANK ALAN SHEPHERD AND HOLLY WADDELL THE TWO BRANCH CHIEFS RESPECTIVELY. WITHOUT THEM AND THEIR EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE, I COULDN'T HAVE DONE -- I DON'T KNOW WHAT I HAVE DONE IN SOME CASES. THEY ARE THE REAL FOLKS THAT DO ALL OF THE WORK. YOU WILL HEAR FROM BOTH OF THEM LATER TODAY.

LASTLY, I FEEL FORTUNATE TO BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO THANK KRISTIN AND STEVE FORGIVING ME THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE IN THIS POSITION.

MANY HAVE TOLD ME AND I HAVE SAID IT FIVE OR SIX YEARS AGO, WHEN I NEVER THOUGHT I WOULD BE SITTING IN THIS CHAIR. WITH DUE RESPECT TO THE DIRECTOR AND KRISTIN AND OTHER STATE DIRECTORS THAT THIS IS PROBABLY ONE OF THE MOST CHALLENGING POSITIONS IN THE BUREAU AS THE DECISION CHIEF. I FEEL HONORED TO BE IN THE POSITION. WITH THAT, WE'LL MOVE ON. HOPEFULLY, I GET -- THERE WE GO. WE HAVE HAD A LOT OF GOOD CONVERSATION ALREADY. I WANT TO -- WHAT I'M GOING TO TALK ABOUT IS GROUND EVERYBODY ON THE ROAMING FREE WILD HORSE AND BURRO ACT SAYS. I'M GOING TO GIVE THE CURRENT NUMBERS OF THE PROGRAM AT A NATIONAL LEVEL. YOU HEARD GUS' PRESENTATION FOR UTAH. UTAH MIRRORS THE NATIONAL PROGRAM OVERALL. THIRD IS, AS BRIAN MENTIONED IN HIS PRESENTATION, THERE IS AN EMERGENCY. BOLD MANAGEMENT NEEDS TO OCCUR AND HARD DECISIONS WILL NEED TO BE MADE, OR WE'LL SEE -- AND WE ARE PROBABLY ALREADY SEEING PHOTOS AND WE ARE ADDING IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES. IS IT ALL HORSES? THAT'S TO BE DEBATED, BUT IT'S ONE KEY AREA. LASTLY, LET'S TALK ABOUT MANAGEMENT TOOLS THAT WE EMPLOYEE.

KIND OF BRIEFLY, THERE IS A MAP SHOWING OF HMAS IN THE WEST. NEVADA IS GROUND ZERO. UTAH, 18 OR 19. WYOMING IS ANOTHER BIG AREA WITH A LOT OF HORSES. THE PURPLE ONES ARE HORSE HERDS. THE GREEN ONES ARE BOTH HORSE AND BURRO AND THE YELLOW ARE BURRO HMAS. AGAIN, BASIC INFORMATION. PUBLIC LAW SIGNED INTO LAW DECEMBER '71. HISTORIC PIONEER SPIRIT OF THE WEST IN WHICH THE HORSES AND BURROS DO THAT. THE CULTURE AND PASSION PEOPLE HAVE FOR ANIMALS, I HAVE COME TO A GREATER APPRECIATION OF THE MAGNIFICENCE OF THE ANIMALS. IT IS TO PROTECT WILD HORSES AND BURROS AS A COMPONENT OF PUBLIC LANDS MANAGED IN A MANNER DESIGNED TO THRIVE ACHIEVING AND NATURAL BOUNDS. WE HEAR THOSE WORDS MANY TIMES. BRIAN MENTIONED EARLY ON, THRIVING ECOLOGICAL BALANCE FALLS IN LINE WITH THE MISSION TO SUSTAIN DIVERSITY AND PRODUCTIVITY FOR THE USE AND ENJOYMENT OF CURRENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS. WE GET SO WRAPPED UP IN, YOU KNOW, THE MOMENT AND THE ACTION THAT HAPPENS AT THAT MOMENT, BUT WE ARE LOSING THE SCOPE AND BEYOND WHAT IT'S GOING TO LOOK LIKE 20 YEARS FROM NOW. WHEN WE LOOK AT THE HEALTH OF THE ANIMALS AND RANGE LANDS.

THAT IS A REAL KEY THING FOR MY STANDPOINT, THRIVING ECOLOGICAL BALANCE, WE'LL SEE PICTURES. WE SAW PICTURES FROM BRIAN'S PRESENTATION. I'LL BUILD ON A COUPLE MORE ON THAT. UNHEALTHY HORSES, IS THAT A THRIVING ECOLOGICAL BALANCE? NO. GRAINS LANDS, IS THAT A THRIVING ECOLOGICAL BALANCE? NO. THE OTHER COMPONENT OF THE ACT, THE WILD HORSE AND BURROS WILL BE CONSIDERED COMPARATIVELY WITH RESOURCE VALUES. THIS IS A POINT THAT IS LOST IN THE PUBLIC VENUE OF CONVERSATION IS THAT WE HEAR A LOT OF THINGS ON THE HMAS THAT A LOT OF THE PUBLIC FEEL HMAS ARE THERE SOLELY FOR THE HORSES OR BURROS. I HAVE TO REMEMBER THE BURROS OR THEA WILL GET MAD IF I DON'T MENTION BURROS ENOUGH. THEY ARE NOT THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF LAND. THEY ARE WILD HABITAT, RANGE LAND HEALTH, MANY OTHER OPPORTUNITIES. THEY ARE CONSIDERED COMPARABLY IN THE MULTIPLE USE MANDATE. I FORGET WHO SAYS THIS, IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN ED. PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT AND MULTIPLE USE MANAGEMENT ON PUBLIC LANDS IS NOT FOR SISSIES. WE'LL GET TO WHERE THERE ARE HARD DECISIONS.

AS GUS MENTIONED, MANAGED SINCE 1991. HE WENT THROUGH THE HMA PROCESS. ANOTHER COMPONENT IS MINIMUM FEASIBLE LEVEL. THAT TERM AND THRIVING ECOLOGICAL BALANCE HAVE NEVER BEEN DEFINED. THAT'S A KEY THING THAT WE ARE DEALING WITH TERMS THAT WE DON'T KNOW HOW WE DEFINE THAT, THOSE TWO TERMS. THOSE ARE FURTHER DISCUSSIONS. ALL RIGHT, WE ARE ROUGHLY AS OF MARCH 2018, AT ABOUT 82,000 ANIMALS. THAT'S AN ESTIMATE. THAT IS A PLUS AND MINUS NUMBER THERE. CURRENTLY, FROM HOLDING, THIS IS OUR FACILITIES HOLDING REPORT, 48,000 IN 028. YOU SAID NORTH OF 50,000. I THINK WE ARE NOW AS WE HAVE BEEN REMOVING ANIMALS. ROUGHLY 48,000 SOME TIME IN SEPTEMBER. 36,000 IN OUR PASTURES. THIS PAST YEAR WE ADOPTED 4647 ADOPTED OR SOLD, AN INCREASE OF 600 FROM 550 LAST YEAR. WE ARE NOT GETTING TO THE LEVEL OF WE ARE 7,000 SHORT OF MEETING THE GOAL OF PUTTING ANIMALS INTO HOMES WE REMOVE OFF OF THE RANGE. THIS IS ANOTHER GRAPHIC HERE. WE HAVE A BETTER GRAPHIC TO SHOW WE ARE THREE TIMES OVER THE APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT LEVEL ON THE RANGE.

WE ARE AT A CROSSROADS. THE HALL OF FAME CATCHER YOGI BERRA SAID WHEN YOU ARE IN A FORK IN THE ROAD, YOU TAKE IT. WE ARE AT THE FORK IN THE ROAD. WHICH ROAD DO WE TAKE IN ONE FORK ON ONE SIDE IS NO ACTION. AS BRIAN MENTIONED EARLIER, NO ACTION AT THIS POINT IS NOT AN

OPTION. THEN THE OTHER FORK IS, WHAT MANAGEMENT -- THIS IS WHERE THE MULTIPLE FORKS ARE, HOW MANY TOOLS DO WE USE IN THE ACT? FULL LIMITATION IS THE FARTHEST EXTREME AND THERE ARE MULTIPLE ONES BETWEEN. WE ARE AT A CROSSROADS. AGAIN, EMPHASIZE NO ACTION AT THIS MOMENT IS NOT AN OPTION. CONSEQUENCES OF INACTION, I'LL SAY, OF NOT NO ACTION, BUT INACTION, ANTELOPE VALLEY HMA, SEVEN TIMES OVER AML. THIS IS A PICTURE SAME TROUGH, WE HAVE THE RED ARROW TO SHOW. I HAVE MY POINTER. THE RED ARROW SHOWS BASICALLY THE SAME TREE. PICTURE FROM 2012. YOU SEE THE WATER TROUGH THERE. THERE ARE TWO THINGS TO NOTE IN THE PICTURE, 2012-2018, IN 2018, ALL OF THE VEGETATION BETWEEN THE TROUGHS IS GONE AND BARE GROUND. SECOND, PRETTY MUCH MORE DISTURBING TO ME IS YOU SEE IN 2012 THE TROUGH IS SIX INCHES ABOVE THE SOIL SURFACE. SIX YEARS LATER, THE ENTIRE TROUGH IS EXPOSED. WE HAVE LOST 18-INCHES TO TWO FEET OF SOIL.

IS THAT SOLELY DUE TO HORSES? THERE HAVE BEEN EXTREME RAIN EVENTS HAPPEN, BUT PROBABLY MOSTLY DUE TO HORSES. IN THE PAST, WE HAVE STRUGGLED TO GET MORE ANIMALS INTO CARE. WE ARE NOW WAY TOO MANY ANIMALS. THE GRAPH HERE, THERE ARE WAY TOO MANY POINTS TO SHARE. THE RATE OF PRIVATE CARE IS RELATIVELY STAYED DECLINED. IT'S HARD TO SEE ON THAT -- I WISH MY POINTER WOULD WORK ON THERE. IT WON'T. IT LOOKS LEAK A FLAT LINE. IT'S REALLY GONE DONE ROUGHLY 50% OVER THE LAST 20 YEARS. WE HAVE SEEN AN INCREASE IN IT THE LAST FEW YEARS. THERE ARE SEVERAL FACTORS THAT HAVE CAUSED THE DECLINE IN PRIVATE CARE OF ADOPTIONS AND SALES OF WILD MUSTANGS. I WON'T GO INTO THAT. THE BOTTOM RED LINE -- MIDDLE LINE THERE IS THE NUMBER OF REMOVALS. 2,064. THE TOP IS THE ON RANGE POPULATION, WHICH HAS BASICALLY GONE UP. THE LINE IS EXPECTED TO CONTINUE UP TO AT SOME POINT WHERE WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THE LEVEL WILL BE, 85,000, 120,000, 150,000 HORSES? WE DON'T KNOW. UNTIL THERE IS A MAJOR EVENT HAPPENING ON THE RANGE LANDS.

AS BRIAN MENTIONED, 58% OF OUR BUDGET IS STRICTLY NOW TO HOLDING ANIMALS IN LONG-TERM CARE. AGAIN, IT'S CONTINUALLY, AS OUR BUDGETS HAVE FLATTENED OUT, AND YOU SEE THE DECLINE THE LAST COUPLE OF YEAR, WE ARE BETTER AT MOVING ANIMALS INTO LONG-TERM CARE REDUCING COSTS. ESTIMATES VARY YEAR BY YEAR, BUT ROUGHLY, WE USE THE NUMBERS OF COST, \$5 A DAY PER ANIMAL IN A CORRAL AND \$2 PER DAY IN A LONG-TERM PASTURE. I WANTED TO SHOW HOW THESE COSTS

ESCALATE AND TRY TO GET PEOPLE TO REALLY UNDERSTAND AND WRAP AROUND HOW THE COSTS ESCALATE.

THIS NUMBER CHANGES DAILY. FOR 36,500 HORSES, ONE DAY TO FEED THOSE ANIMALS IN OUR PASTURES IS \$73,000. FOR ONE YEAR FOR THOSE 35,500 -- 36,500 ANIMALS, IT'S \$26 MILLION. FOR THE LIFETIME OF THE ANIMALS, ASSUMES 15 TO 20 YEARS. SOME SAY IT COULD BE LONGER. \$500 MILLION TO FEED THOSE HORSES CURRENTLY IN HOLDING NOW. ADDING THE CORRALS, YOU ADD ANOTHER 400 TO 500,000,000 AGAIN GETTING TO A BILLION DOLLARS MARK FOR HORSES CURRENTLY IN HOLDING. THE ESCALATION OF COSTS IS REALLY ASTOUNDING TO ME. WHERE ARE WE AT? THE URGENCY OF THE SITUATION. WE ARE AT A FORK IN THE ROAD. LET'S TAKE IT. WHAT FORK ARE WE GOING TO TAKE? THE ADVISORY BOARD HAS A KEY ROLE IN WHAT FORK WE TAKE. WE KNOW HOW PRETTY MUCH EVERY HMA IS OVERPOPULATED. I WOULD SAY THERE IS MAYBE -- SHEPHERD WOULD KNOW HOW MANY AT AML, BUT I WOULD SAY 20 TO 30. I'M NOT SURE. AGAIN, MANY OF THESE ARE WAY, WAY OVER. WE SAW ONE THAT WAS 19 TIMES OVER AML. WE ARE STARTING TO SEE A LOT MORE DEGRADATION OF THE PUBLIC LANDS IN THE HMAS. SOIL LOSS, VEGETATION CHANGES, CONVERSION TO CHANGES WE HAVE HEARD EARLIER ON. THIRDLY IS THAT EMERGENCY GATHERS ARE INCREASING.

THERE WERE PROBABLY 3 TO 4,000 ANIMALS REMOVED THIS YEAR DUE TO EMERGENCY GATHERS DUE TO CONDITIONS. DR. PERRYMAN, TO ADDRESS THE QUESTION YOU ASKED, GUS, ABOUT DROUGHT MONITOR, WE HAVE DEVELOPED A NEW PROCESS THAT WIND STATES WANT TO -- WHEN THEY ASK THE WASHINGTON OFFICE FOR AN EMERGENCY GATHER DUE TO RESOURCE CONDITIONS, THAT IS ONE OF THE KEY FACTORS THAT WE LOOK AT THE NATIONAL OFFICE TO SAY ARE THEY IN DROUGHT CONDITIONS? WHAT IS THE LIKELIHOOD OF CONSIDERING THE DROUGHT INDEX? AS YOU SAID, IT REFLECTS SURFACE WATER. IF IT'S A WATER-HAULING ISSUE, IT NEEDS DIRECTOR APPROVAL AS WELL. THIS YEAR MONTANA WAS NOT IN A DROUGHT. IT WOULD BE INTERESTING TO HEAR THAT SOMEONE IN MONTANA OR NORTHERN WYOMING WANTED TO HAUL WATER BECAUSE THEY WERE NOT IN A WATER-HAULING SITUATION, BUT EMERGENCY GATHERING IS BECOMING THE NORM ANYMORE WITH CONTINUING DROUGHT. WHEN THAT IS EXACERBATED WITH HIGH NUMBERS, THAT EXACERBATES THE NUMBERS OF REQUESTS WE ARE GETTING. JULY AND AUGUST, IT WAS LIKE ONE A DAY, IT SEEMED LIKE. THE LAST PART WE SAW IN PICTURES BEFORE WAS PRIVATE PROPERTY. WE HAVE MORE AND MORE HORSES AND BURROS MOVING OFF.

WE HAD SEVERAL BURRO GATHERS IN ARIZONA DUE TO ONE CASE NEAR THE TOWN OF WINDEN, ARIZONA, THERE WERE 13 COLLISION BURRO INCIDENTS.

HORSES AND BURROS MOVING ON TO PRIVATE LANDS AND AG LANDS AS WELL. ALSO, DAMAGING THEIR PRIVATE PROPERTY AS WELL. TOOLS, THE BMS CONTINUES TO LOOK AT EXCESS ANIMALS. WE STRIVE TO DO THAT IN A HUMANE WAY A HELICOPTER OR BAIT-TYPE GATHER METHOD. THE EXAMPLE GUS GAVE ABOUT THE ONAQUI, WE CAN TREAT THE MOB BUT NOT THE OTHERS BECAUSE THEY ARE HARDER TO DEAL WITH. IN NEVADA, 800,000-ACRE HMA AND YOU CAN'T GET WITHIN A MILE OF THE HORSES, THERE IS NO WAY TO DART THAT. WE ARE LOOKING AT EXPANDING TEMPORARY FERTILITY CONTROL AND EXPLORING PERMANENT. A LOT OF FOLKS ARE AWARE OF WARM SPRINGS GATHER OCCURRING RIGHT NOW, WHICH IS PROPOSING SPACE FOR MARES. WE CAN TALK ABOUT THAT IN FURTHER DISCUSSION.

WE ARE ALWAYS ON THE INCREASE IN ADOPTION AND SALES. WE ARE TRYING TO EXPAND THE MARKETS. IN THE WORK GROUP YESTERDAY, FOLKS WERE IN ON THE ADOPTION SALE SIDE. LOOKING AT MARKETING TOOLS WE HAVE CONTRACTED OUT TO REACH NEW AUDIENCES FOR ADOPTIONS. THERE ARE AREAS WE HAVE NOT TAPPED. WE KNOW THEY ARE BIG HORSE COUNTRY, SOUTHEASTERN UNITED STATES IS A BIG AREA WHERE WE HAVE A LOT OF ADOPTERS FROM FLORIDA, GEORGIA AND THAT AREA. WE ARE TRYING TO PROVIDE, AND IT WAS A BOARD RECOMMENDATION PASS TO HAVE ADOPTION EVENTS OUTSIDE OF THE CORRALS AND FACILITIES AND REACH NEW MARKETS. ALONG WITH SUPPLEMENTING ADOPTION EVENTS WE HAVE IN THE FACILITIES AS WELL. AS BRIAN MENTIONED, STRENGTHEN AND EXPAND PARTNERSHIPS. WE CAN'T DO THIS ALONE. WE NEED PEOPLE'S HELP AND ASSISTANCE. WE HAVE GREAT PARTNERS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL AND LOCAL LEVEL AS WELL. WE ARE TRYING TO WORK ON EXPANDING VOLUNTEERS. WE HAVE A CONTRACTOR WORKING WITH DOROTHEA ON TRYING TO DEVELOP A POOL OF VOLUNTEER, AND NOT JUST IN THE WEST AND NOT JUST FOR DARDING BUT FOR EVENTS THAT OCCUR IN NEW JERSEY OR THE NORTHEAST, GETTING A CADRE OF VOLUNTEERS WILLING TO HELP OUT. ANOTHER ONE WE ARE WORKING ON TRYING TO GET CONGRESS TO AUTHORIZE IS TRANSFER OF ANIMALS TO OTHER AGENCIES. OVER THE YEARS BML HAS ADOPTED 400 ANIMALS TO BORDER CONTROL.

BORDER SECURITY IS PROVIDED THROUGH BLM. SEVERAL OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES APPROACHED BLM, EXAMPLE OF NEW YORK CITY

POLICE DEPARTMENT HAS APPROACHED BLM TO SAY, HEY, FIRST OF ALL, THEY THOUGHT -- AND SOME OF OUR KEY SPOKES PEOPLE ARE NOT BLM PEOPLE, IT'S PEOPLE OUTSIDE OF THE AGENCY. ONE OF THE BIGGEST ADVOCATES WE HAVE ABOUT GETTING ANIMALS AND THE VALUE OF DURABILITY AND MUSTANG PATROL I WAS INTRODUCED TO IN WASHINGTON. HE ACTUALLY PERSUADED THE NEW YORK CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT TO INQUIRE ABOUT USING MUSTANGS AS HORSES IN NEW YORK CITY. BY VISION WAS, HOW COOL WOULD THAT BE TO BE IN TIME SQUARE AND SEE A BLM MUSTANG WITH A FREEZE MARK ON ITS NECK? TO ME, THAT WOULD BE COOL. WE ARE TRYING TO EXPAND THE MARKETS AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES AS WELL. THERE ARE A LOT OF OTHER AGENCIES THAT USE HORSES. THEY DON'T COME TO US. THERE ARE CERTAIN REASONS WHY. OTHER LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITIES, ALLEN WILL TALK ABOUT THAT WHEN HE RECAPS THE REPORT SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS THIS PAST SPRING. WITH THAT, I'M GOING TO OPEN IT UP TO QUESTIONS. I THINK WE HAVE FIVE MINUTES.

>> FRED: AND IF WE HAVE MORE QUESTIONS, WE'LL TAKE 'EM.

>> I CAN'T GET OUT IN FIVE MINUTES?

>> GUS: NO. YOU HAVE BEEN IN THE JOB FIVE MONTHS. I KNOW HOW FRUSTRATING IT IS. A FRIEND HAD 12 KIDS AND A WIFE, AND HE WAS HAVING TROUBLE FINDING A PLACE TO RENT. HIS WIFE SAID, I'M GOING TO TAKE SOME OF THE KIDS TO SEE MY MAMA WHO PASSED AWAY, IN GRAVEYARD, THE CEMETERY. SOMEONE STEPPED BY. HE SAID I WANT TO RENT YOUR HOUSE. HE SAID I HAVE 12 KIDS AND A WIFE. HE SAID WHERE ARE THE OTHERS? THEY ARE IN THE CEMETERY. HE SAID, I'M SO SORRY. YOU CAN RENT THIS PLACE FOR \$100 A MONTH. THERE ARE A LOT OF HALF TRUTHS THAT AFFECT THE WAY BLM MANAGES. I WANT YOU TO SEE HOW FRUSTRATING IT IS WHEN YOU PROPOSE A WAY TO MANAGE AND LAWSUITS ARE HAPPENING AND YOU ARE WITHDRAWN AND ALL OF THIS STUFF. AS FAR AS A MANAGER, THAT KIND OF COMPLICATES THINGS, DON'T IT?

>> NO.

[LAUGHING]

>> I'M GOING TO USE THAT STORY NEXT TIME I GET A PLACE. IT DOES, AND THERE'S ALL THAT NOISE, BUT WHEN I CAME INTO THIS JOB, I KNEW THIS JOB WAS EMOTIONAL -- OR THE PROGRAM CONJURES UP A LOT OF EMOTIONS WITH A LOT OF PEOPLE WHETHER IT'S A RANCHER OR A WILD HORSE ADVOCATE. WHEN I CAME INTO THE PROGRAM, I SAID BRUCE, DON'T LET YOUR EMOTIONS -- YOU HAVE TO BE UNEMOTIONAL. THAT'S JUST EXTERNAL

NOISE OUT THERE THAT YOU DON'T -- YOU NEED TO IGNORE IT -- OR NOT REALLY IGNORE IT, BUT, OKAY, SOMETHING, YOU KNOW, HAPPENS THAT WE HEAR. WELL, WHAT REALLY DID HAPPEN? LET'S FIND INFORMATION. MY BACKGROUND IS IN SCIENCE. I WANT TO MAKE SURE BEFORE I COME UP WITH A CONCLUSION OR WHATEVER, I HAVE ALL OF THE FACTS INVOLVED. IF NOTHING ELSE, I PUNT IT TO STEVE OR KRISTIN. OR EVEN TO BRIAN, BUT YEAH, I THINK THAT WAS THE KEY THING FOR ME COMING INTO THIS POSITION, JUST FOCUS ON THE PROGRAM, WHAT WE CAN DO. IT'S OUR SIDE BOARDS. KEEP THE EMOTIONS OUT. I'M AN EMOTIONAL-TYPE PERSON. THAT'S TOUGH SOMETIMES.

>> FRED: JIM, I BELIEVE YOU HAVE A QUESTION?

>> JIM: BRUCE, THANKS AGAIN FOR WHAT YOU ARE DOING. TOUGH JOB. WE APPRECIATE YOUR LEADERSHIP IN IT, AND THE WILLINGNESS TO DO THE JOB. I NEED TO ASK A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS, AND I THINK THEY ARE RHETORICAL AS ANYTHING. I WAS STRUCK BY THE NUMBERS IN YOUR PRESENTATION HAVING TO DO WITH SHORT, LONG-TERM HOLDING AND PROJECTED NUMBERS IN TERMS OF THE BUDGET CONSUMPTION ON THE PART OF THAT, SHORT, LONG-TERM HOLDING. WITHOUT A CALCULATOR, LOOKS LIKE THREE TO SIX YEARS DEPENDING ON HOW MANY ANIMALS WE HAVE TO REMOVE FROM PUBLIC LANDS, AND BASED ON SEEING A DOUBLING IN THE POPULATION ABOUT EVERY FOUR YEAR, WE'LL EXCEED THE PROGRAM BUDGET WITHIN SIX YEARS. I THINK IT COULD COME DOWN TO MORE THAN THAT BASED ON THE 50 --

>> 58%.

>> JIM: 58% NOW. APPARENTLY, WE ARE AT THE CROSSROADS OF THE TIPPING POINT. IT'S UNSUSTAINABLE AND UNSUSTAINABLE IN A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME. HAVING SAID ALL THAT, MY QUESTION IS, IS CONGRESS FULLY AWARE OF WHERE THIS IS HEADED RIGHT NOW?

>> I THINK WE HEARD THAT EARLIER FROM BRIAN'S PRESENTATION. I DON'T THINK THEY ARE. THERE ARE SOME AWARE. TYPICALLY, YOU KNOW, I THINK THEY BECOME AWARE WHEN THEIR CONSTITUENTS WRITE THEM LETTERS. IN MOST CASES, THE RESPONSES WE GET AT THE PROGRAM LEVEL AND RESPONSES TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, ARE THESE SNAPSHOTS IN TIME. THERE IS A CERTAIN INCIDENT THAT HAPPENED. EXPLAIN HOW IT HAPPENED, AND WHY DID IT HAPPEN? I THINK, YOU KNOW, THERE'S NOT REALLY -- WE NEED A LOT MORE -- THE PUBLIC NEEDS TO REALLY BE ENGAGED. I THINK WE HAVE SEEN AN ENGAGEMENT IN THE POLITICAL WORLD IN THE LAST FEW YEARS ON WHATEVER POLITICAL SPECTRUM THEY ARE DEALING WITH AND YOU SUPPORT. I THINK, YOU KNOW, REALLY FOCUSING ON, AGAIN, THE LONG-TERM VISION HERE IS TO ONE, WE HAVE TO FIRST STOP AND THE ONE

GRAPH THERE, THE POPULATION GROWTH GRAPH, WE HAVE TO START TO STABILIZE THAT. WITH THE NUMBER OF ANIMALS WE REMOVE THIS YEAR, WHEN YOU BUILD IN THIS YEAR'S FULL CROP, WE MAY KEEP IT FLAT. WE MAY BE AT 82,000 NEXT YEAR.

THAT'S TO BE DETERMINED, BUT THAT'S THE FIRST STEP. TO GET CONGRESS ENGAGED IS TO REALLY HAVE THE PUBLIC ENGAGE THEM. NETWORKS OF THE ADVOCATE GROUPS ARE HUGE. 120,000,000 PEOPLE. THAT'S TOO BIG FOR ME TO COMPREHEND. THEY WROTE EDUCATED LETTERS TO WHAT THE ISSUES WERE, THAT WOULD HELP. INSTEAD OF TALKING ABOUT TWO HORSES THAT MIGHT HAVE DIED IN A GATHERER, THAT DOESN'T SOLVE THE LONG-TERM ISSUE. THAT'S WHERE CONGRESS CAN BE ENGAGED IN AND BE MORE INFORMED.

>> JIM: ONE FOLLOW UP TOO, MR. CHAIRMAN. UNDER THE MANAGEMENT SIDE OF YOUR PRESENTATION, YOU TALKED ABOUT THE DECISIONS TO MAKE, THINGS LIKE HAULING WATER. OBVIOUSLY, AN OLD ADAGE MY DAD USED TO SAY, THAT'S LIKE DRILLING A HOLE IN THE FLOOR TO TAKE CARE OF A HOLE IN THE ROOF. THAT'S WHAT I'M LOOKING AT THERE. WITH REGARD TO THOSE DECISIONS TO CONCENTRATE HORSES IN A LOCATION BASED ON ARTIFICIALLY PROVIDING WATER, ARE WE EVEN THINKING ABOUT WHAT THE RAMIFICATIONS ARE TO THOSE OTHER OBLIGATE SPECIES THAT HAVE BEEN IMPACTED BY THE SHORTAGE OF WATER AS WELL? BY EXACERBATING THAT BY ARTIFICIALLY WATERING THE HORSES TO REMAIN IN THAT LOCATION, I'M GUESSING WE ARE --

>> WE ARE ENABLING THE BEHAVIOR THAT THEY BECOME DEPENDENT ON IT.

>> EXACTLY. ONE, IT REMOVES THE FREE ROAMING PART THAT THEY'LL STAY IN THE AREA. THE AREA THAT IS GOING TO BE WHERE WATER IS BEING HAULED IS FURTHER DEGRADED, LIKE THE TROUGH PICTURE, THERE. I'M SURE THE WATER HAULING PROBABLY OCCURRED THERE, BUT I THINK -- BELIEVE ME, WE HAVE HAD DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THIS THROUGHOUT THIS SUMMER, WHETHER TO HAUL WATER OR NOT HAUL WATER. YEAH, IT'S THAT ISSUE OF GETTING THE ANIMALS DEPENDENT ON THAT WATER SOURCE, AND THEN THEY DON'T -- IF HORSES ARE GOING TO MOVE, THEY ARE GOING TO MOVE. WE DON'T KNOW WHERE THEY'LL MOVE TO. WE CAN'T CONTROL THEM. THERE WAS SOMETHING YESTERDAY ABOUT POSSIBLY HURTING THEM, GOING OUT THERE WITH A COUPLE OF PEOPLE ON HORSEBACK AND PUSHING THE HORSES OUT IN A MOB MENTALITY WE SAW YESTERDAY AT THE ONAQUI. THEY ARE PROBABLY OBUTUATED TO THAT. IT'S THE DEDICATION OF PEOPLE IN THE FIELD THAT DON'T WANT TO SEE HORSES,

AND AS GUS MENTIONED, YOU PUT DOWN FOUR OR FIVE ANIMALS THAT CAN BARELY STAND.

>> IT BECOMES A QUESTION OF WHETHER OR NOT MANAGEMENT IS EXACERBATING THE IMPACT TO THE ECOSYSTEM AND SAGE BRUSH ADVOCATES ON THE GROUND. I WORRY ABOUT THAT AS MUCH AS ANYTHING.

>> IT GOES BEYOND SAGE BRUSH SYSTEMS. IT'S THE OTHER SYSTEMS WHERE WE HAVE HORSES.

>> JIM: THANK YOU.

>> FRED: AS A FOLLOW UP, AND GINGER, I'LL GET TO YOU IN A MINUTE. YOU RUN OUT OF WATER AND TAKE THEM WATER. THEY RUN OUT OF FEED AND YOU TAKE THEM FEED. IS THERE ANY ART OF THE 1971 LAW THAT SAYS YOU HAVE TO HAUL WATER?

>> NOT THAT I'M AWARE OF. YOU GO BACK TO THE FEASIBLE LEVEL.

>> FRED: NATURE IS A CRUEL TASK MASTER AT TIMES. ARE YOU REFERRING THAT WE ARE INTERRUPTING NATURE'S WAY OF BALANCING THE POPULATION?

>> I DON'T KNOW IF I'LL GO THAT FAR. I THINK, ONE, AS BRIAN MENTIONED, IT HAS TAKEN MANY YEARS TO GET TO THIS KEY MOMENT IN TIME. PROBABLY SO. I THINK, YOU KNOW, HAS THE BLM -- YEAH. WE HAVE DONE SOME ACTIONS THAT HAVE ACTUALLY ALLOWED FOR THE SITUATION TO OCCUR. YOU ARE RIGHT ON ABOUT THAT. WE ARE HAMMERED FROM ONE SIDE WHERE DON'T DO ANYTHING, JUST LEAVE THEM ALONE. LET THEM SELF REGULATE. THE KEY POINT IS THAT BY THE TIME HORSES KEY REGULATE POPULATIONS, WHAT ELSE HAS BEEN DEGRADED AND LOST BEFORE THAT? I ASSUME HORSES ARE FAIRLY ADAPTABLE. I'LL DEFER TO THE EQUINE FOLKS ON THE BOARD ON THAT. I'M NOT GOING TO MAKE AN OPINION ON THAT.

>> THANK YOU, BRUCE. GINGER?

>> GINGER: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. I DON'T WISH YOU ILL WILL, BUT WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE YOU BACK IN COLORADO.

>> THERE ARE DAYS I WISH THAT.

>> GINGER: I BET THERE ARE. THIS IS A DIFFICULT QUESTION, PROBABLY. I HAVE WONDERED, HOW WAS THE 27,000 NUMBER THAT COULD LIVE IN THE WEST, WILD HORSES AND BURROS, HOW WAS THAT ARRIVED AT? I HAVE BEEN IN COMMUNICATIONS SINCE 1993 WITH DR. GUS COSTMAN THE FOREMOST EQUINE IN OUR AREA. THAT'S 150 TO 200 ANIMALS, AND ABOUT

75% OF THE HERD AMLS ARE BELOW THAT THRESHOLD. MY BASIC QUESTION, THOUGH, IS HOW WAS THAT NUMBER ARRIVED AT?

>> THE ORIGINAL --

>> 26,710.

>> AML IS BASED ON RANGE CAPABILITY, WATER, THE HABITAT OF HORSES IN CONJUNCTION WITH PERMANENT GRAZING AND WILD LIFE USE. IN THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES REPORT, THERE WAS DEBATE THAT INDICATED THAT AML WAS NOT DONE, I DON'T THINK, IN MANY CASES IN A SCIENTIFIC WAY AND USED GOOD DATA TO DO THAT. I THINK THE BLM IS LOOKING AT THAT. AS GUS MENTIONED, EVALUATING THAT, WHERE THE COMPONENTS OF HABITAT AND MANAGING RESOURCES. IF WE HAVE MORE HORSES OUT THERE AND WE HAVE TO HAUL WATER TO THEM EVERY YEAR, IT'S AGAINST THE MINIMUM FEASIBLE LEVEL OF MANAGEMENT AND REMOVES THE FREE ROAMING. THE NUMBERS WERE DETERMINED BASED ON RANGE CONDITION AND FORGE AND SITE POTENTIAL AND THE AVAILABILITY OF WATER AND COVER AS WELL, ALONG WITH, LIKE I SAID, PERMANENT USES.

>> GINGER: YOU TALK ABOUT HEALTHY RANGE LAND AND GENETIC VARIABILITY CONTEND THAT A HEALTHY HERD IS VARIABLE. I KNOW IT'S A BALANCING ACT, BUT THE 27,000 NUMBER SEEMS INCREDIBLY LOW. I JUST WONDERED IF IT WAS SCIENTIFICALLY DONE ON EACH HERD. MAYBE THERE NEEDS TO BE A REEVALUATION OUT THERE.

>> I WOULD SAY PROBABLY NOT. IT WAS NOT DONE SCIENTIFICALLY BASED. WE WERE USING THE BEST INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME. YOU CAN DEBATE ON THE BEST SCIENCE, SOME CASES, YES. SOME, MAYBE NOT. IT WAS BASED ON THOSE FACTORS. THE NUMBERS, SECOND PART HE WAS ASKING, CAN IT BE ADJUSTED. AML WILL ALWAYS BE ADJUSTED. UP OR DOWN. I WOULD ASSUME THE GENETIC COMPONENT WOULD BE A COMPONENT TO THAT AS WELL.

>> I WOULD LIKE TO TRY TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION FOR YOU AS WELL. I'M GOING TO DATE MYSELF RIGHT NOW, BUT WHEN THE DECISION TO SET AML CAME OUT, THERE WERE A NUMBER OF PEOPLE SITTING AT THE TABLE. I WAS ONE OF THEM IN A NUMBER OF THOSE IN THE 1970S. AML WAS ESTABLISHED BASED ON A GROUP OF PEOPLE SETTING AROUND THE TABLE WITH A SET OF OVERLAYS. WE DIDN'T HAVE GIS AT THE TIME, BUT WE HAD OVERLAYS. WE TALKED ABOUT WATERSHED MANAGEMENT TO BIG-GAME MANAGEMENT TO SPECIES MANAGEMENT TO PERMITTED LIVESTOCK AS WELL AS OTHER USERS ON THE GROUND. IT WAS A DELIBERATIVE PROCESS

TO GET TO THE NUMBER. I REMEMBER TALKING ABOUT GENETIC VIABILITY. WE DIDN'T HAVE THE 200 ANIMAL NUMBER. IT WAS LESS THAN THAT. THERE ARE HMAS THAT CAME IN LESS THAN THAT. THE CONCERN ABOUT GENETIC VIABILITY ASSUMED ONE THING. THAT WAS THAT THE POPULATION WAS ISOLATED AND HAD NO OPPORTUNITY FOR GENETIC MIXING FROM OTHER HERDS. WE FOUND IN NORTHERN NEVADA THAT, THAT WASN'T THE CASE. WE DIDN'T HAVE ISOLATED POPULATIONS. ONE OF THE FIRST THINGS YOU NOTICE IS A LACK OF FERTILITY. WE ARE NOT HAVING THAT PROBLEM IN THE HORSE POPULATION NOW. I WANTED TO BRING IT FORWARD THAT IT WAS A DELIVERY PROCESS. IT WASN'T A FLIPPING OF THE COIN.

WE WORKED ON IT, SEEMS LIKE WEEKS AT A TIME TO GET ALL OF THE DATA ON THE TABLE TO COME UP WITH AML. THERE WERE CONVERSATIONS AT THAT TIME DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT -- WAS THAT A NUMBER CAST IN CONCRETE? IF NOT, COULD IT GO BOTH DIRECTIONS? THE UNDERSTANDING AT THE TIME WAS THAT IT COULD GO BOTH DIRECTIONS BASED ON DATA AT THE TIME COLLECTED ON THAT. THERE WERE SECTIONS ON THE RMPS AND HMPS THAT THE BURRO WAS DEVELOPING AT THE TIME THAT THE AML DISCUSSIONS ARE INCLUDED IN THAT.

>> WAS THE AML27000 THAT YOU ARRIVED AT?

>> WE DIDN'T DO IT ON HMAS ACROSS THE COUNTRY, THEY WERE IN THE MANAGEMENT AREA WE WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR AT THE TIME. THAT DIDN'T INVOLVE THE ENTIRE 27,000 NUMBER.

>> SOUNDS LIKE, JIM, YOU WERE ONE PERSON ON ONE TEAM THAT WAS OVER ONE AREA FOR DECIDING AMLS, BUT I WOULD ASSUME THERE WERE OTHER TEAMS YOU WERE ABLE TO WORK WITH AND OTHER AREAS DOING THEIRS. THE BEST PEOPLE ON THE GROUND IN THE AREA THEY WERE IN WERE DOING THE SAME PROCESS IN THEIR RESPECTIVE AREAS.

>> QUESTION I HAVE, WHEN YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT THE LOWER RATE OF PRIVATE CARE, IN LARGE PRINT AT THE TOP, YOU TALK ABOUT A MAJOR EVENT HAPPENING IF SOMETHING ISN'T DONE. YOU WANT TO TOUCH ON WHAT THAT MAJOR EVENT WOULD LOOK LIKE IF WE CONTINUE STATUS QUO FROM BOTH AN ECOLOGICAL STANDPOINT, FROM THE RANGE THE ANIMALS RUN ON AND FOR THE ANIMALS THEMSELVES?

>> I THINK ON THE SECOND PART, THE ANIMAL THEMSELVES SEE A LOT MORE -- WE ARE SEEING A DECLINE IN HEALTH IN SOME AREAS. I THINK THAT'S MORE WIDESPREAD AS THE NUMBER GOES UP. WE WON'T BE ABLE TO KEEP UP WITH ALL OF THE EMERGENCY TYPE OR ESCALATING ISSUE PROBLEMS THAT WE HAVE. I THINK WE'LL SEE A LOT MORE LOWER AND DECLINE IN

ANIMAL HEALTH. THAT'S FOR THE ANIMAL'S PERSPECTIVE. ON THE RANGE PERSPECTIVE, I THINK WE'LL SEE FURTHER DEGRADATION OF LANDS LIKE INVASIVE SPECIES ENCROACHMENT OR SPREADING BROUGHT ON BY THE HORSES OR A WILDFIRE AS WELL IN THE AREAS. YOU ARE GOING TO SEE RESOURCE DEGRADATION, VEGETATION CHANGES, SOIL LOSS, SOIL CHANGES. YOU MAY SEE DISPLACEMENT OF ANIMALS, WILDLIFE AS WELL. AGAIN, THAT WOULD BE MY CRYSTAL BALL. I THINK YOU CAN SAY TEN DIFFERENT PEOPLE WOULD HAVE TEN DIFFERENT ANSWERS.

>> WHICH OF THOSE HAPPENS FIRST? THE ECOLOGICAL CRASH OR THE POPULATION CRASH?

>> I THINK WE ARE SEEING AN ECOLOGICAL CRASH IN SEVERAL AREAS. WE HAVE CROSSED THE THRESHOLD IN MANY AREAS MAKING IT HARD AND DIFFICULT TO -- YOU KNOW, GET BACK TO. I MEAN, LIKE WITH A FIRE, IT'S RELATIVELY -- I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S RELATIVELY EASY, BUT IT'S MORE CLEAR CUT. WE DO SEEDING, AND WE PRETTY MUCH PULL LIVESTOCK OFF FOR A FEW YEARS TO LET THAT RECOVER FROM THAT WILDFIRE. WHEREAS WITH THE WILD HORSE PROGRAM AND ISSUES THERE, EVEN WHEN WE REMOVE A HUNDRED ANIMALS, 700 ANIMALS OVER, WE ARE NOT EVEN GETTING TO WHERE WE NEED TO BE. EVEN IF WE GOT DOWN TO THE LOW AML, WE HAVE TO DO THE RESTORATION PART. THE HORSES ARE STILL OUT THERE.

>> I'M NOT AN ECOLOGIST. I ASSUME, IT'S NOT GOING TO BE PRETTY. IN BASIC BIOLOGY, POPULATIONS CAN ONLY SUSTAIN THEMSELVES A TERN AMOUNT OF TIME, AND, PARTLY, WE ARE BLM IS CONTINUING THE INCREASE BY ONE, HAULING WATER, AND BY DOING ACTIONS WE ARE DOING. I JUST THINK THE OPTICS ARE NOT PRETTY, AND FROM AN ANIMAL HEALTH CONCERN.

>> STEVEN: THANK YOU.

>> FRED: CELESTE?

>> CELESTE: I THOUGHT YOU WERE GOING TO GO ON FOREVER. WE HEAR A LOT OF DOOM AND GLOOM PROJECTIONS. IF WE MAINTAIN THE STATUS QUO. DOES THE BLM HAVE GOOD PREDICTIONS WHAT CAN OCCUR WITH LAYERED MANAGEMENT APPROACHES? IN OTHER WORDS, THE PROBLEM IS THE POPULATION GROWTH RATE. WHAT ABOUT MANAGEMENT AREAS THAT ADDRESS THAT AND THE ECONOMY OF SCALE HAS BEEN MODELED OUT YET BY THE BLM. WE GET TO AML BASED ON CERTAIN ACTIONS. ALLEN WILL TALK ABOUT THAT MORE THIS AFTERNOON. THOSE ARE THE OPTIONS WE HAVE LAID OUT. FROM FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACT TO WHAT WE ARE CURRENTLY UNDER. THOSE ARE THE OPTIONS THAT, I THINK, AML IN EIGHT YEARS AND ANOTHER OUT TO 20 YEARS. MAYBE HOLD THAT UNTIL THE PRESENTATION THIS AFTERNOON.

>> PERFECT.

>> GO AHEAD, BARRY.

>> THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT MANAGEMENT PARADIGM CHANGES OVER MOST OF MY CAREER. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT CONCERNS ME, AND I'LL PREDICATE MY QUESTION WITH THIS, WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE, IT'S MORE STRONG THAN THAT. WHAT I WOULD WANT IS FOR ALL OF OUR HMAS TO BE MANAGED IN A WAY SO THAT THEY FALL WITHIN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PRIOR MOUNTAIN HMA. TO ME, THAT'S THE ULTIMATE END POINT. WE HAVE HMAS THAT ARE IN GOOD SHAPE. THINGS ARE DOING WELL. THEY JUST NEED A MANAGEMENT TWEAK EVERY NOW AND THEN TO MAINTAIN THINGS. THEN THERE'S THE OTHER HMAS. WE HAVE A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF THEM IN NEVADA. WHERE WE HAVE ALREADY LOST ECOLOGICAL POTENTIAL, WE HAVE LOST THREE FEET OF SOIL. THE AMLS ASSOCIATED WITH THOSE SITES HAVE NOW BEEN AUTOMATICALLY DECREASED. THE CARING CAPACITY IS NO LONGER WHAT IT WAS.

WHEN WE GO BACK TO THIS ASSESSMENT OF THESE THINGS, AND I THINK BLM WILL HAVE TO DO THIS IN PART IS ONCE WE START GETTING THIS THING TURNED AROUND, THERE IS GOING TO HAVE TO BE CRITICAL ASSESSMENTS OF THE AMLS, UP AND DOWN OR WHATEVER THE DATA SAYS, THEY'LL HAVE TO GO THAT DIRECTION. THAT IS SOMETHING THAT HAS TO BE DEALT WITH IN THE NEAR TERM. WITH RESPECT TO THAT, THE QUESTION I HAVE IS, WE HAVE IN NEVADA AND SOME OTHER STATES, SOME OF THE HMAS ARE WELL OVER AML LEVELS. A LOT OF THEM ARE WITH EME CRITTERS OUT THERE. THAT IS THE LIMITING SEASONAL HABITAT FOR SAGE GRASS. THAT'S THE PREFERRED HABITAT WITH HORSES AND BURROS OVERLAPPING IN HMAS. YOU CANNOT HAVE MORE HORSES AND BETTER BROOD HABITAT IN THOSE AREAS. THEY ARE MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE. YOU CAN'T HAVE LIGHT AND DARK AT THE SAME TIME. MY QUESTION IS THIS, DOES YOUR GATHER AUTHORITY INCLUDE THOSE REASONS IS THE THREAT TO HABITAT, DOES YOUR GATHER AUTHORITY ALLOW YOU TO GATHER FOR THAT REASON HAVE YOU HAD DISCUSSION ON THAT?

>> VERY MUCH SO. THIS PAST YEAR, YOU MENTIONED ABOUT IDENTIFYING PRIORITIES FOR GATHERS. TYPICALLY, THEY ARE BASED ON A COURT ORDER DIRECTED TO REMOVE ANIMALS. WE HAVE TO. THERE ARE PRIVATE LAND REQUESTS. WE GO GET THE ANIMALS AND REMOVE THEM. THIS PAST YEAR, WE HAVE CONSIDERED HABITATS FOR OTHER SPECIES IS ONE OF THOSE PRIORITIES. THIS PAST YEAR FISCAL YEAR '18, \$4 MILLION OF SAGE GROUSE FUNDS WAS FOR PRIORITY HABITAT. THERE WAS THAT. YOU WILL

HEAR THAT LATER ON WHEN I TALK ABOUT RESPONSES TO BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AS WELL.

>> WERE THESE REGULARLY SCHEDULED GATHERERS OR EMERGENCY?

>> THEY WERE NOT EMERGENCY GATHERERS. WE TOOK \$4 MILLION OF SAGE GROUSE FUNDS, WILDLIFE FUNDS DEDICATED TO SAGE GROUSE. WE PULLED THAT OFF AND IDENTIFIED PRIORITY AREAS FOR GATHERERS IN THE PIPELINE. WE HOPE TO DO THAT AGAIN THIS YEAR. WE ARE UNDER C.R. NOW, WE HOPE TO GET A FULL YEAR BUDGET. WE HAVE ENCOURAGED THE STATES, THE STATES GET A LOT OF MONEY FOR SAGE GROUSE INTEGRATED PROGRAM OF WORK. THEY IDENTIFY PROJECTS ON THE GROUND THAT ARE FOR RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT AND FOR SAGE GROUSE HABITAT IN THE SAGE BRUSH BIO. I HAVE BEEN TALKING TO A FEW STATES, AND SOME GET 4 TO \$5 MILLION. WE PULL OFF THOSE THAT ARE DIRECTLY TO, BUT AGAIN, IN THE HORSE PROGRAM, THIS IS WHAT I HAVE LEARNED IN THE LAST FIVE MONTHS. YOU CAN'T HAVE STATES DO THEIR OWN THING BECAUSE OF THE ISSUES OF HOLDING. IT WOULD BE GREAT IF A STATE COULD SAY, I'M GOING TO TAKE \$3 MILLION. I'LL TAKE 200,000 TO DO A GATHER FOR HORSES. THAT'S THE PROBLEM ITSELF.

WHEN YOU MOVE THEM, WHAT WILL YOU DO WITH THEM? THAT'S THE INNER LINK THAT I THINK A LOT OF PEOPLE IN THE BUREAU DON'T UNDERSTAND. I DIDN'T GRASP THE WHOLE ENORMITY OF THE ISSUE. WHY DON'T WE DO A GATHER?

>> LET ME REPHRASE MY QUESTION GIVEN YOUR ANSWER. IS IT WITHIN YOUR EMERGENCY GATHER AUTHORITY TO GO OUT AND REMOVE HORSES FROM THE PRIORITY HABITATS?

>> TYPICALLY, UNDER THE REGS AND HORSE PROGRAM, IT'S MOSTLY -- STRICTLY FOR THE HEALTH OF THE ANIMALS. THAT'S DEFINED AS AN EMERGENCY. MAYBE THE POLICY NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED. THAT WOULD BE A GREAT RECOMMENDATION, DR. PERRYMAN.

>> FROM WHAT I HAVE SEEN AND WHAT OTHERS HAVE SEEN, IF WE CAN'T MAKE A CASE TO THE PUBLIC THAT THESE PRIORITY HABITS, AND THIS IS ONE EXAMPLE.

>> IT COULD BE DESERT TORTOISE. IF WE CAN'T MAKE A CASE THAT HABITAT DEGRADATION IS OCCURRING TO THE POINT THAT OTHER CRITTERS ARE BEING AFFECTED IN A SIGNIFICANTLY NEGATIVE WAY, THEN I DON'T KNOW IF WE CAN DO ANYTHING. OUTSIDE OF THE MANAGEMENT PARADIGM BOX, WHAT ARE THE OTHER TOOLS WE CAN HAVE, THAT MIGHT BE A TOOL WE CAN IMPLEMENT? IF WE HAD IT AVAILABLE TO TAKE A CRACK AT HABITATS

LOSING THE ABILITY TO LOSE THE CRITTERS THEY ARE SUPPORTING NOW, AND LESS OF THEM IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

>> WHEN YOU MENTION REVISION OF THE MANUAL, WE ARE DOING THAT WITH THE ADOPTION SIDE. THE ADOPTION MANUAL IS OUT OF DATE. WE HAVE A TEAM DEVELOPED LOOKING AT THAT AND REVISING TO BRING US UP TO THIS MOMENT OF TIME THAT INCLUDES THE ADOPTION INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND THAT. WE HAVE NOT REALLY CONSIDERED THE START OF LOOKING AT IT FOR THE GATHERER PART OF THE HANDBOOK AND MANUALS. THAT WOULD BE SOMETHING. IF THE BOARD LOOKS AT IT, WE'LL LOOK AT IT AND CONSIDER IT.

>> THANK YOU. IN THINKING ABOUT CHANGING POLICY OR DETERMINING THAT AN AREA CAN SLOT UNDER THE EMERGENCY GATHERER PORTION OF GATHERERS, I'M NOT SURE HOW TO PHRASE THAT, BLM HAS THE PARAMETERS FOR WHAT THEY HAVE ESTABLISHED AS PRIORITIZED GATHERERS OF RECENT, UPCOMING FUTURE AND HOW HAVE THEY TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT SAGE GRASS HABITAT?

>> SORRY, REPEAT THAT AGAIN?

>> THAT'S OKAY. NOW I THINK I HAVE IT BETTER IN MY HEAD. TO CLARIFY VARIOUS POINTS THAT THERE ARE HABITATS THAT ARE GOING TO HAVE MORE PRIORITY OVER OTHERS AND HOW THEY CATALOG DIFFERENT SERIES THEY CAN TAKE, BUT BLM HAS PRIORITIZED GATHERERS UP AND COMING, HOW WERE THOSE HMAS -- WHAT WERE THE PARAMETERS FOR DETERMINING OKAY, WE ARE GATHERING THERE. WAS IT SOLELY PERCENT ABOVE HML OR SAGE GROUSE HABITAT AND OTHERS?

>> YOU MAY WANT TO ADDRESS ALLEN AT BREAK. IT WAS ABOUT HML AND SAGE GROUSE, IT WAS FOCUSED ON IF HMA HAD HABITAT, WE MAY SEE A LOSS OF POPULATION OF SAGE GROUSE. THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN A PRIORITY GATHER. IN THOSE GATHERS IDENTIFIED IN THE \$4 MILLION SAGE GROUSE. DOES THAT GET WHERE YOU ARE GOING? I THINK THERE ARE MULTIPLE THINGS. TYPICALLY, IT'S NOT JUST ONE SPECIFIC THING.

>> I THINK SHE WAS ASKING, IF I CAN PARAPHRASE THAT, WAS THE GATHERS MADE ON THE SAGE GROUSE HABITAT PRIMARILY BECAUSE THEY WERE PRIMARILY ON SAGE GROUSE HABITAT.

>> I'M TRYING TO LOOK FOR LAYERS IN DOUBLE DIPPING PROTECTING SAGE GROUSE AND ELIMINATING EVERYTHING ELSE. I COMPLETELY GET YOUR POINT. I'M TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHERE THE PROTECTIONS ALREADY EXIST. I MEAN, THAT'S THE BEAUTY OF THE BLM, I GUESS, IS TO TRY TO WEIGH THE FACTORS OUT. AGAIN, LIKE I SAID, THERE ARE HARD CHOICES WE HAVE TO MAKE. IF IT IS CRITICAL HABITAT OF A LISTED SPECIES AND THE

DESERT TORTOISE AND LANDSCAPE SPECIES AND BURROS, THAT IS A SPECIES WITH CRITICAL HABITAT. THE GOAL IS TO RECOVER SPECIES AND PROTECT THE HABITAT. AGAIN, WE ARE NOT GOING TO USE ONE FACTOR TO BASE THAT GATHER ON. THE WAY YOU PARAPHRASED IT, FRED, THAT WAS ONE KEY COMPONENT. SINCE AGAIN, NOT TO MISAPPROPRIATE FUNDS, THAT WAS CONGRESS DESIGNATED THE FUNDS FOR SAGE GRASS. WHEN YOU GET DOWN TO THE NUTS AND BOLTS OF HOW IT WAS APPROPRIATED, WE NEED TO TARGET SAGE GROUSE. WE COOPERATE DO THAT FOR DESERT TORTOISE. YOU ARE HOPING THAT THERE ARE OTHER SPECIES IN THERE. THE OTHER 250 OBLIGATES AS WELL BENEFIT FROM THE REMOVAL OF ANIMALS AS WELL.

>> FRED: I'M GOING TO END THIS NOW. WE ARE ABOUT 30 MINUTES OR SO PAST.

>> THAT WAS A LONG FIVE MINUTES, FRED. MY ASSOCIATE IS NOT HELPING ME HERE.

>> FRED: HE IS. HE'S LISTENING TO ME BECAUSE I DID THIS. I WANT THE BOARD TO BE AWARE WE ARE GOING TO BE ON TIME. WE USED UP PART OF YOUR LUNCH BREAK FOR THIS TALK HERE.

>> NOW YOU MAKE ME HURT. I HAVE AFFECTED PEOPLE'S LUNCH.

>> IF YOU WANT TO BRING A SANDWICH BACK TO EAT IT, THIS IS GOING TO COME OUT OF THE LUNCH BREAK BECAUSE WE ARE GOING TO STAY ON TIME. WE'LL TAKE A FIVE MINUTES TO LET MIKE SET THINGS UP AND COME BACK AND ORDER IN ABOUT FIVE MINUTES.

>> THANK YOU, FRED.

>> ALL RIGHT, WE ARE NOW COMING BACK TO ORDER. EVERYBODY, PLEASE TAKE A SEAT. EVERYBODY, PLEASE TAKE A SEAT.

>> MIKE STYLER, WE ARE GLAD YOU ARE HERE. YOU COME WITH HIGH PRAISE FROM PEOPLE THAT TOLD ME. YOU TAKE AS LONG AS YOU NEED BECAUSE IT'S COMING OFF OF THE BOARD'S LUNCH HOUR. HELP YOURSELF.

>> THAT'S THE LAST THING I WANT TO DO IS SHORTEN YOUR LUNCH HOUR. WE'LL SEE IF WE CAN GET YOU BACK ON TRACK. I'M MIKE STYLER, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES. WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY OF RESOURCES, GEOLOGIC SURVEYS, STATE PARKS, WE HAVE A DYNAMIC DEPARTMENT WITH 1500 EMPLOYEES AND ONE OF THE DELIGHTFUL THINGS I DO IS WORK CLOSELY WITH UTAH BLM. I WANT TO JUST SHARE A BIT OF MY PERSONAL BACKGROUND WITH YOU. I'M FOURTH GENERATION OWNER OF MUSTANGS. MY DAD AND MY GRANDPA, MY GRANDPA VAL AND DAD RUSSELL, THEIR RECREATION WAS TO TAKE THEIR HORSES OUT ON THE

WEST DESERT AND CHASE MUSTANGS AND LASO THEM. THE ANIMALS WERE A SOURCE OF COMPANIONSHIP. THEY USED THEM AS WORK ANIMALS. THEY USED THEM TO GATHER CATTLE AND HELPED KEEP THE POPULATION IN CHECK. THEY VALUED THEM, AND THEY USED THEM, AND THAT ETHIC HAS COME DOWN TO ME AS I HAVE ALSO ADOPTED SOME AND RAISED THEM AND HAD A LOT OF ENJOYMENT FROM THE HORSES. I HAVE HAD REAL GOOD WRECKS BY BEING THROWN BY A FILLY I HAVE. SHE SURPRISED ME WITH RANDOM RODEOS. I NEVER KNEW WHEN WE WOULD HAVE A RODEO. OUR LEGISLATURE HAS BEEN CONCERNED IN UTAH WITH THE IMPACTS FROM OUR WILD HORSE AND BURRO POPULATION. WE ESPECIALLY IN THE LAST YEAR, SUFFERED IF YOU READ TODAY'S PAPER, THE DRIEST WATER YEAR IN OUR HISTORY.

I BELIEVE THAT IS TRUE. WE HAVE BEEN WORKING FOR MANY YEARS TO OFFSET THE EFFECTS OF INVASIVE SPECIES AND DROUGHT. WE HAVE GREAT PARTNERS WITH THE BLM TO WORK ON OUR WATERSHED RESTORATION WORK. I COULD USE THE POWERPOINT HERE. ABOUT TWO YEARS AGO IN 2017 LEGISLATIVE SESSION, THE LEGISLATURE WAS TALKING TO US ABOUT WHY DON'T WE GIVE THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, WHY DON'T WE PETITION TO GIVE YOU WILD HORSE MANAGEMENT? I SAID, PLEASE, DON'T EVEN ASK FOR THAT. IF IT HAPPENED TO COME TO US, WE WOULD HAVE TO FOLLOW THE SAME FEDERAL GUIDELINES THAT BLM AND FOREST SERVICE HAVE TO FOLLOW. WE KNOW THE BURDEN THEY ARE UNDER. THEIR HANDS ARE TIED BEHIND THEIR BACKS. THE BUDGET THEY USE IS ASTRONOMICAL. I DON'T THINK OUR STATE LEGISLATURE CONTEMPLATED GIVING US MONEY, JUST TAKE IT OVER AND DO IT. THEY APPROPRIATED \$500,000 AND THEY SAID LOOK INTO WHAT YOU CAN DO WITH THE HORSE AND BURRO SITUATION WE HAVE IN UTAH.

WE THOUGHT, WHAT CAN WE DO? WE THOUGHT WE COULD DO HABITAT RESTORATION TO LESSEN THE IMPACT OF THESE ANIMALS ON THE LANDSCAPE. WE HAVE A FEW SLIDES TO SHOW YOU HOW WE PARTNERED WITH NRCS AND U.S. WILDLIFE SERVICE AND FORESTRY LAND AND PRIVATE LANDOWNERS TO LESSEN THE IMPACT OF WILD HORSES. THESE ARE BEFORE AND AFTER PICTURES. I BELIEVE THIS IS THE SAME AREA 50-MILES SOUTHWEST OF MILFORD, UTAH. WE DID JUNIPER AND RABBIT BRUSH REMOVAL. WE ALWAYS DO RECEDING AS WELL. WE DON'T JUST CUT STUFF DOWN AND MOW IT DOWN, WE RESEED. OUR DENSE JUNIPER, LOOK AT THE LANDSCAPE. IT'S BASICALLY ZERO. WE RECEDE AND WITHIN A YEAR OR TWO, THERE IS LESS SHRUBS. THAT'S WHAT WE WANT IT TO COME BACK TO.

LOOK AT THE TREES COMING BACK. SAGE GROUSE WILL NOT LIVE IN AN AREA WITH 5% TREES.

>> I HAVE ANOTHER BEFORE AND AFTER BLM PROJECT FROM A BLM EMPLOYEE. THEY MARK THE SPOT FOR THE BEFORE AND AFTER PICTURES. WITH RESEEDING AND MULCH THAT PUTS ON THE GROUND, THAT WILL BE PRODUCTIVE IN THIS AREA. THERE ARE LIVESTOCK, HORSES AND ELK. WE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THE DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE. \$454,000. WE PARTNERED WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS, THE BIG BLOCK OF WHITE IS BLM MONEY. THE BLUE IS WILDLIFE RESOURCES MONEY. SPORTSMANS GROUPS, ALL 112,000. WE LEVERAGED IT TO \$9 MILLION TO DO THE PROJECTS YOU HAVE SEEN. THAT'S PART OF OUR WATERSHED RESTORATION INITIATIVE THAT WE ARE PARTNERS WITH UTAH BLM, AND WE HAVE DONE MANY, MANY ACRES. GOING BACK TO THE PICTURE, THE LAND HAS A CERTAIN CARRYING CAPACITY. YOU CAN PUT SO MANY MOUTHS ON THE LAND. YOU ADD UP THE CATTLE, SHEEP, ELK, DEER AND HORSES, AND IT CAN CARRY SO MUCH.

ONE OF MY CONCERNS IS, WE MANAGE THE WILDLIFE. WE MANAGE THE LIVESTOCK. THERE IS NO -- BASICALLY, NO WAY TO MANAGE THE NUMBER OF HORSES. WHEN WE DO PROJECTS LIKE THIS, WE STILL CAN ISSUE PERMITS FOR DEER AND ELK. WE CAN PULL OFF THE DEER AND WILD SHEEP AND ELK, BUT OFTEN, BLM CAN'T KEEP UP WITH THE GROWTH OF THE WILD HORSE POPULATION. WE DO MORE THAN THIS. WE DEVELOP STRINGS, GUZZLERS DRILL WELLS. WE DO THAT TO SPREAD OUT THE MOUTH ON THE LANDSCAPE SO WE FULLY UTILIZE THE AMLS OUT THERE. WE HELD THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO SUMMIT. I HOPE YOU RECEIVED INVITATION TO. WHERE ARE THE PRESENTATIONS? THAT'S WHAT I WANTED YOU TO SEE, A NUMBER OF PRESENTATIONS THAT MIRROR WHAT YOU HEAR TODAY. THE SCIENCE WAS VERY CLEAR ABOUT WHAT'S HAPPENING WITH WILD HORSE AND BURROS AT THIS SUMMIT. THIS WAS ALL TAPED FOR US AT UTAH UNIVERSITY, AND THIS WAS ONLINE. LET'S GO BACK TO -- WHERE'S THE -- WHERE'S THE WEBSITE? DO I HAVE THAT? THANKS TO PAUL GOETCH FOR GOING OVER BECAUSE WE WERE PUTTING THIS TOGETHER AS HE WAS SPEAKING. WILD HORSE RANGE.ORG. IF YOU CALL THAT UP, ALL OF THE PRESENTATIONS AT THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO SUMMIT LAST YEAR ARE AVAILABLE.

I SPENT A COUPLE OF HOURS REVIEWING THOSE THINGS. I GET HERE AND SEE YOU HAVE BEEN HEARING ALL OF THE NUMBERS. THEY ARE REFRESHED IN YOUR MEMORY, SO YOU KNOW THOSE. BEN, YOU SHOWED US A MOVIE, A YEAR OR SO AGO. WAS THAT A MOVIE ABOUT WILD HORSES? YOU SPOKE. YOU SPOKE. I REMEMBER THE PRESENTATION WAS GOOD. THAT'S WHAT WE

DID WITH THE OTHER 40,000. WE REPORTED THAT BACK TO THE LEGISLATURE, AND THEY SAID, WELL, WE ARE GOING TO GIVE YOU ANOTHER 250,000, AND TRY TO THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX AND DO OVER THINGS TO HELP WITH THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO SITUATION. WE CHANGED OUR THINKING THIS YEAR. WE APPROACHED BLM AND SAID WHAT CAN WE DO TO HELP IN ASSISTING YOU TO DO GATHERERS.

>> YOU CAN SUE. WHY DON'T WE TRY TALKING TO SEE IF THERE IS SOMETHING THEY CAN DO. I KNOW THEY DON'T WANT TO SUFFER THE EFFECTS OF 4 TO 500 HORSES ON YOUR RANCH. WE HELD A MEETING. I HAVE TO TELL YOU HOW MUCH WE APPRECIATE THOSE TWO GENTLEMEN, GUS AND ED. THEY SAID WE UNDERSTAND YOUR SITUATION. WE WILL TRY TO PUT THIS IN THE QUEUE TO TRY TO GET A GATHER DONE ON YOUR LAND.

WE SAID HOW ABOUT IF WE SWEETEN THE POT BY PAYING FOR THE GATHER. THEY SAID, YOU WILL DO THAT? YEAH, WE'LL DO THAT. I WANT TO REPORT THAT EARLIER THIS FALL, THEY DID A SOFT GATHER. THEY BAITED THE WILD HORSES AS THEY CORRAL, SLAM THE GATE. THERE WASN'T NEED FOR HELICOPTERS OR STRESS. I BELIEVE 93 OR 94 HORSES WERE GATHERED. I'M TRYING TO GET THEM TO GIVE ME THE BILL. THEY HAVE TOLD ME WHAT THE BILL IS AND SAID WE'LL PAY IT. ESSENTIALLY, OUR PART OF THE BILL IS FOR THE CONTRACTOR'S COST THAT THEY CONTRACTED TO COME HELP GATHER THE HORSES. THE BLM COSTS, HOPEFULLY, THEY ARE OKAY COVERING THOSE. THAT WAS SO SUCCESSFUL, WE ARE LOOKING AT A COUPLE OF OTHER GATHERERS THROUGHOUT THE STATE. WE THINK BY CONSERVING THEIR MONEY, THEY HAVE MORE MONEY TO GO TOWARD HOUSING. MORE MONEY TO SPREAD OUT TOWARD MORE GATHERS. WE ARE HELPING PRIVATE LANDOWNERS IN GETTING THE HORSES REMOVED. WE DON'T CARE IF IT'S PRIVATE LAND OR PUBLIC LAND, WE WANT TO REDUCE THE PROBLEM. WE HAVE A WONDERFUL RELATIONSHIP WITH BLM AND CONTEMPLATING THE GATHERERS. SOME UP THERE, YOU CAN SEE THE SPRINGS COMPLEX, CEDAR MOUNTAIN, MUDDY CREEK AND RANGE CREEK ARE THINGS WE ARE CONTEMPLATING TO HELP WITH THE GATHERERS.

THEY ELUDED TO THE DRAFT, OCTOBER 1ST IS THE END OF THE NEW WATER YEAR.

THANK GOODNESS, SINCE THE FIRST OF OCTOBER, WE HAVE HAD RAINSTORM AFTER RAINSTORM. THINGS ARE LOOKING UP. THE IMPACT OF LAST WINTER'S DROUGHT AND LAST SUMMER'S DROUGHT MEANS THERE IS NO GRASS ON THE GROUND. THE PONDS MIGHT BE FULL, BUT THERE IS NO GRASS. WE ARE ESPECIALLY CONCERNED ABOUT THAT. WE HAVE WILDLIFE

RESOURCES TO DEAL WITH. DOWN IN SOUTHEASTERN UTAH, SAN JUAN COUNTY, WE COLLARED A NUMBER OF FARMS THIS PAST SPRING. BY END OF SUMMER, WE HAD LOST 100% OF THE COLORED FARMS. THAT SHOWS HOW SERIOUS THIS DROUGHT IS. OUR RANCHERS HAVE TO MOVE THE CATTLE OFF PURELY. THEY HAVE THE CATTLE HOME IN MID SEPTEMBER WHEN THEY COULD HAVE STAYED UNTIL MID OCTOBER. THEY SAID WE HAVE TO BRING THEM HOME BECAUSE THEY ARE SUFFERING. WE HAVE HAD MORE FIRES THIS YEAR. THIS YEAR IT'S BEEN 490,000-ACRES. LET ME STOP THERE A SECOND AND TELL YOU SOME GOOD NEWS. NOT ONLY DO WE HELP PUT OUT THE FIRES, BUT WE RESEED AFTER THE FIRES. YESTERDAY, I MET WITH THE GOVERNOR'S STAFF AND GAVE THEM THE PROPOSED BUDGET. THE COST IS \$6.2 MILLION. THEY DIDN'T BAT AN EYE. I THOUGHT THEY WOULD COME OUT OF THEIR SEATS. THEY SAID, IT'S SOMETHING WE HAVE TO DO. IT'S PART OF WHAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES DOES. WE RESEED AFTER FIRES.

I'M PLEASED TO REPORT THAT WE ARE PROACTIVE IN TRYING TO CHANGE THE LANDSCAPE WHEN IT GETS TO CHEEK GRASS OR PINION JUNIPER STATE, WE TRY TO RESEED TO FIRE RESILIENT GRASSES AND SAGE BRUSH SO THE WATERSHED IS HEALTHY. THAT'S THE SECRET, HAVING HEALTHY WATERSHEDS. WE HAVE TO HAVE BALANCE BECAUSE WE BELIEVE IN MULTIPLE USE. THAT'S OUR FOUNDATION. MULTIPLE USE. WE HAVE TO PROVIDE FOR EVERY USER OF THE LAND. IF WE ARE PROVIDING FOR THE USERS OF THE LAND, WE HAVE HEALTHY LANDSCAPE. IF WE HAVE HEALTHY LANDSCAPE, THE WATER WILL TURN INTO A MUDSLIDE TAKEN UP BY A ROOT SYSTEM. THAT WILL RECHARGE THE AQUIFERS IN THE SPRING. WE HAVE, INADVERTENTLY, I THINK HAVE HELPED WITH BURROS BY DEVELOPING SPRINGS AND WELLS AND PUTTING IN PONDS WHERE HISTORICALLY WHEN MY GRANDPA WAS OUT CHASING HORSES, THERE WERE SO MANY SPRINGS AND PONDS. IF THEY WEREN'T IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THAT, THE HORSE POPULATION COULDN'T GO. INCREASING FOR WILDLIFE, WE HAVE PLACES FOR HORSES TO SPREAD OUT TO INCREASE THEIR NUMBERS.

SOMETHING I WANTED TO TELL YOU, THIS YEAR, NUMBERS I GOT FROM THE WILDLIFE RESOURCES, IN RESPONDING TO THIS DROUGHT, WE HAVE INCREASED THE ELK TAG NUMBERS BY 700 TO REDUCE ELK POPULATIONS. WE HAVE INCREASED OUR BISON PERMIT NUMBERS. WE HAVE A HEALTHY HERD ABOUT 450. WE WERE ORIGINALLY GOING TO GIVE OUT 100 BISON TAGS. WE HAVE NOW RAISED IT TO 220. WE ARE GOING 220 TAGS ON A 450 HEAD HERD OF BISON. WE ARE TAKING THIS SERIOUS. WE HAVE INCREASED THE PRONG HORN TAGS ABOVE 50 PRONG HORN TAGS. THE CATTLEMEN, I

HAVE MENTIONED HAVE VOLUNTARILY REMOVED LIVESTOCK BECAUSE THERE IS NO FEED. WE NEED A SIMILAR EFFORT WITH WILD HORSE AND BURROS. MANAGEMENT IS KEY. WE CAN ALL COEXIST, BUT THERE HAS TO BE MANAGEMENT. WITHOUT MANAGEMENT, THINGS GET OUT OF WHACK AND SOMETHING WILL SUFFER. WE ARE TRYING TO DO OUR PART. I KNOW BLM IS TRYING TO DO THEIR PART. IT SEEMS THEIR HANDS ARE TIED. THERE ARE RIDERS ON THE BULL MANAGEMENT ACT. IF SOME OF THE RIDERS WOULD BE REMOVED, THAT WOULD HELP THEM. I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE THE POLITICAL WILL IN THE COUNTRY TO DO WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE, BUT WE ARE COMMITTED ALONG WITH OUR PARTNERS IN BLM TO DO WHATEVER WE CAN TO HAVE HEALTHY WATERSHEDS AND MAINTAIN THE BALANCE THAT NEEDS TO BE THERE SO WILDLIFE AND LIVESTOCK LIVE TOGETHER IN A HEALTHY ECO-SYSTEM WITH BOTH. THAT'S MY PRESENTATION. WE APPRECIATE YOU COMING TO UTAH TO VISIT WITH US.

WE APPRECIATE ANYTHING YOU CAN DO TO HELP US THROUGH THIS DIFFICULT TIME.

>> FRED: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THE MAJORITY OF THE BOARD AGREES WITH YOU THAT WE NEED TO HAVE A COOPERATIVE EFFORT MADE WITH ALL STAKEHOLDERS, AND FOR ALL OF THE BEST USE OF THE RANGE FOR THINGS THAT USE THE RANGE. WE APPRECIATE YOU COMING IN. DOES ANY OF THE BOARD HAVE ANY QUESTIONS FOR MIKE?

>> STEVEN: MIKE, I WANTED TO THANK YOU FOR THE WRI PARTNERSHIP. THERE HAS BEEN A LOT OF LAND IMPACTED REPLACING THE VIABLE FEES AND WILDLIFE. I THINK IT'S A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION IN FIRE PREVENTION, GETTING OUR WILDLIFE TO HAVE A HIGHER CARING CAPACITY. THANK YOU FOR THAT. THE OTHER INDUSTRY RELYING UPON THE LANDS.

>> MR. YEARDLEY REMINDED ME OF TWO THINGS. THEY HAVE THE GRAZING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM WHERE THEY HELP RANCHERS DEVELOP NEW WATER SOURCES, HELP WITH FENCING, HELP WITH THINGS TO HAVE MORE SCIENTIFICALLY MANAGED GRAZING, MORE INTENSIVE SHORT-TERM GRAZING, WHICH WE ALL KNOW IS HEALTHY FOR THE LAND. THEY'LL COME TO OUR WRI FOLKS WITH PROJECTS, AND WE GO TO THEM WITH PROJECTS, AND WHOEVER FITS THE PROJECT THE BEST, WE WORK TOGETHER. WE WORK ACROSS THE FENCE ALL THE TIME ON DOING THESE PROJECTS TOGETHER. WE HAVE A WONDERFUL PARTNERSHIP. I WANTED TO REPORT, WE HAVE NUMEROUS EVENTS OF FIRE THIS YEAR WHERE FIRE CAME BLOWING DOWN ACROSS A VALLEY OR MOUNTAIN THAT HIT ONE OF OUR WEAR RESTORATION PROJECTS AND STOPPED BECAUSE WE HAVE THE KIND OF COVER ON THE GROUND THAT IS FIRE RESISTANT. WE ARE DOING THAT A

LOT FOR SAGE GROUSE BECAUSE ONE OF THE DANGERS FOR SAGE GROUSE IS FIRE.

IF WE CAN GET THE RIGHT COVER WE PROTECT THE SAGE GROUSE AS WELL.

>> I HAVE ONE QUESTION TO ASK YOU. I'M FROM THE MILLS OF ARKANSAS. IS BULL HOGGING THE SAME AS BUSH HOGGING?

>> PROBABLY COULD PULL UP A PICTURE MOMENTARILY. IT'S A FRONT END MOTOR WITH A GRINDER TO THE FRONT. IT GRINDS THE TREE INTO SPLINTERS.

>> FRED: THAT'S DIFFERENT THAN THE WAY I DID IT.

>> WE CAN TAKE THIS DOWN. THIS IS A BIG DEAL. WE TAKE OUT BIG, BIG TREES WITH THIS. SOMETHING OF INTEREST TO YOU --

>> FRED: CAN I BORROW ONE OF THOSE? I HAVE CEDAR TREES THAT WOULD BE AWESOME. LOOK AT THAT.

>> THESE ARE ALL PRIVATE CONTRACTOR. THEY ARE NOT GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES. WE CONTRACT FOR THE WORK TO BE DONE, THE SEEDING DONE, ALL OF THIS IS DONE BY PRIVATE CONTRACTORS.

>> FRED: WE AIN'T GOT NOTHING LIKE THAT IN ARKANSAS. LORD! MY GOODNESS. SEE, I LEARNED SOMETHING TODAY. THAT'S AWESOME. THAT IS INCREDIBLE.

>> THAT MULCH, THE NEXT SPRING, ALL OF THE GREEN GRASS -- IT MAKES IT WONDERFUL.

>> FRED: THAT'S JUST AWESOME. WE ARE KIND OF BEHIND BECAUSE ME AND MY CHAIN SAW AND HERD OF GOATS DON'T GET IT DONE THAT QUICK. ANYWAY, ANYBODY HAVE ANY QUESTIONS FOR MIKE? HE'S GOT US BACK ON TRACK FOR LUNCH.

>> GINGER: IF YOU HAVE ANOTHER CONFERENCE, I WOULD BE HAPPY TO ATTEND. IT'S UNFORTUNATE THAT MY ORGANIZATION -- THE OTHER ORGANIZATION WHICH WOULD HAVE REALLY LIKED TO BE PRESENT, WE WOULD LOVE TO HAVE YOU.

>> WE HAVE BEEN ASKED, ARE YOU GOING TO HOLD ANOTHER. BASED ON THE TALKS AND SCIENCE PRESENTED, WE DON'T KNOW WHAT NEW INFORMATION THERE IS TO COME TO THE TABLE. WE PROBABLY WON'T HOLD ANOTHER ONE. IF YOU WOULD TAKE TIME AND LOOK AT THE PREPARATIONS THAT ARE ONLINE, IF YOU FEEL THAT THERE IS A NEED, AND THERE IS NEW

INFORMATION THAT WE SHOULD HAVE BROUGHT TO THE TABLE, WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO CONSIDER THAT.

>> GINGER: THANKS SO MUCH. I APPRECIATE IT. HOW ARE THE MULE DEER DO YOU THINK NOW? YOU LOST 100% OF THE FAWNS.

>> THAT'S THE DRIEST CORNER OF THE STATE. TOMORROW MORNING, I SHOULD BE ON A MULE DEER HUNT. MAYBE I CAN REPORT BACK.

>> GINGER: YOU WON'T BE COLLARING THEM?

>> NO, THIS IS A HUNT.

>> FRED: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT, AT THIS TIME, WE'LL ADJOURN. WE'LL COME BACK TO ORDER AT 1:15 THIS AFTERNOON AND HEAR FROM MR. BRUCE WHO WILL TALK TO US ABOUT RECOMMENDATIONS, RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS. WE ARE ADJOURNED.

ROUGH EDITED COPY

Bureau of Land Management National Training Center
Wild Horse and Burro Advisory Board Meeting
October 10, 2018

* * * *

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

* * * *

>> If I can have everybody's attention. We're a little bit late. We're going to start again. And as everybody takes their seat, I will recite another poem. There's nothing like a mustang between your knees, willing to please. On a mustang I'll find my way home. The world's mump brighter when I'm up on that throne, strapped to the topside of muscle and bone, beneath me a friend on whom I depend, on a mustang I'll find my way home. Luck is fickle, danger is quick and -- on a mustang I'll find my way home. When my trails have ended on this earthly plain and the angels above, they call out my name, please lord, carry me home on a good honest gray, on a mustang I'll find my way home. Thank you all for coming this afternoon. We're going to go ahead and start. And we've got our good friend, Bruce, that's going to talk to us about past recommendations. He's going to go through each one individually. And if at that time, if you have any questions or concerns, you need to address him at that time, and I will recognize you, and we'll go on. That way we won't wait until the end of it, knowing that you might say what did he say about that? We're going to do it one at a time.

[Humming "Jeopardy" theme song...]

>> BRUCE: All right, after lunch is a probably a good time to do this. The BLM implements those or provides rationale. So, we're going to present briefings from the last two board meetings, one from Elko, Nevada, in September of 2016, and the ones from Grand Junction last October 2017. I'll paraphrase what the board's recommendation was. So, I'm not reading so much, and then I'll read the BLM's response. So, the first recommendation from Elko, Nevada, in 2016, the board recommended that should follow the -- by -- deemed unadoptable for sale without limitation or humane euthanasia. Those animals deemed unsuitable for sale should then be destroyed in the most humane way possible. The response is that congress provides that appropriations here in shall not be made available for the destruction of healthy unadopted wild horses and burros. And with or without that prohibition, and that prohibition in our appropriations bill has been since about 2010. So, again, with or without that prohibition, one of BLM's top priorities will be continue to place animals into private care, and transfer of animals to other federal, state, and local agencies. I hope that you have all of your responses in your notebooks. They should be in there. I will open that up to questions to the board for that response.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: I will say that the fact that congress has used their appropriations authority to rewrite the wild horse and burro act, I think is a little bit wrong, but that's all right. So, all right. Go ahead with number two.

>> BRUCE: All right. Number two. BLM should prioritize designated habitat for removal of excess animals. BLM shall use the degree of range degradation as a criterion for

prioritization of removal of excess animals. Consideration should be given to those range lands that can be restored and maintained in a healthy status. So, BLM's response to that is that, again, gather priorities are based on the following criteria, compliance with court orders, public safety, protection of private property, protection of species, which includes greater sage grouse, initiation of research, and to achieve appropriate management levels in HMA. Those are the criteria. And the response to that is that in FY2018, BLM has removed over 11,000 animals, in which about 5,000 of those animals were in sage grouse habitat, specifically moved to the gathering wildlife funds to gather horses in those areas.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: I can assume that you agreed with that recommendation?

>> BRUCE: Yes, we do. And we're at prioritization. It's also been in there, but this is the first year where the wildlife program has contributed funds to do specifically for gathers in those habitats.

>> Is this a routine operation to determine whether or not the trigger has happened with regard to emergency removals? Or is this something that has to -- the bureau is waiting for a wake-up call, so to speak, from constituents or from somebody, another agency?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I'm not sure what you --

>> I'm wondering, is that something on the radar by HMA that you're actually monitoring it on your own? Or are you waiting for a wake-up call from somebody around that is actually seeing it?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I think, typically these are ones where we're making the call. These are our planned gathers. These are what we put on our regular schedule. And again, it doesn't preclude us from using wild horse and burro funds when available to include beyond, if we get sage grouse money in the future to use wild horse and burro funds, but our wild horse and burro funds to prioritize gathers in additional habitats as well. Does that answer your question?

>> JIM FRENCH: Yes, it does.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Number three, okay?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: BLM shall develop partnerships to conduct analysis of socio-economic and environmental effects on communities with reduced AUMs on HMAs due to range degradation. Further analysis shall be conducted regarding the effects from all HMAs. The response, then response is that the BLM is not prepared to fund this without outside help. Our purpose is to fund the work that is a priority. Although this is a priority, but again, we are limited with funding. The BLM recognizes that uses of public land such as recreation, including private -- energy development, permitted livestock grazing and the presence of wildlife herds contribute to the viability of western communities and the national economy.

>> I had a quick request on that, the decision-making process within the bureau, whether it be wild horse and burro, whether it be other decisions that come down the pipe such as land plan amendments. Generally involve decisions which will have an impact on local governments. Wild Horse and Burro it's not the part of the state or the county or the city that's responsible for that. It's interior. And I think that's where this recommendation came from, ultimately. And I would say that at least to cite the master plans from those communities in states that actually -- that actually are being -- they are being subjected to those decisions has to be part of the decision-making process. You can't make that decision absent that crucial piece of analysis.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Right.

>> JIM FRENCH: And I believe there's been a court case that cited that in inform Nevada that required the interior to go back and look at that. I make that statement for the record is that it's not really optional. It's something the interior needs to do.

>> I know any site-specific project, we do a socio-economic analysis as well.

>> When it talks about effects on resources that many rural western communities depend upon, this is not just the tail end of a statement. There's a lot of our western communities do not have the tax base that you have in eastern states. It's a completely different sort of economic arrangement. So, in Nevada, for instance, where we're depending on who you talk to, we're 85% to 90% public land, there's no tax base. There's no school sections. There's no state sections to generate funding and whatnot. So, this is -- it's not just this little statement at the end of a sentence. It's extremely important, because the only tax base that we have are in many of the rural areas that is ranch-based income. And we just don't -- it's -- and many people do not understand that. We don't have private land that can be taxed. So, it all has to come off of the public lands. So, it's a very, very -- I know as a county commissioner, I know you are sympathetic to that concept. So, I just wanted to kind of clarify that for yourself being sort of from the eastern part of the world.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Well, I'm a westerner.

>> JIM FRENCH: I have a question. At home, we have the -- we have the forest service and the park service owns 80% of Newton county, Arkansas. What you're talking about is true. They pay a stipend.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: But if you look at what the payment of tax is, it's not I was just back in DC about this. But our lowest tax base for private property that we tax at is a \$1.35 an acre. The government pays 17 cents an acre.

>> JIM FRENCH: I know it's not much, but I wanted to be sure it was the same thing. Ginger?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: This cuts both ways. The little town of Maybell, Colorado, they're a wild horse watching economy. I would point out that a little town in Wyoming as well, their main driver is looking at wild horses. So, it works both ways, I should think.

>> I firmly believe that the federal government, there needs to be a robust review of the master plan that actually outlines what they're depending on. With whether it be wild horse watching or livestock grazing.

>> I would like to add, these smaller communities in the west are solely dependent on that are surrounded by strictly public land it affects everything. It's people's livelihoods at stake. If the range isn't maintained and taken care of, the caring capacity is decreased, and they're out. They're not able to take part in their western heritage. Their livelihood, the traditions that they have, that's supposed to be protected as well. And it's often a bypass statement like Dr. Perryman talked about. And ginger, what you talked about, a lot of people are guides and participate with wildlife and stuff. It affects all aspects of that. So, I think we need to really be aware of this situation and not overlook it. It's part of what makes up the west.

[Silence on the line...]

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Let me start over. BLM shall encourage racks to develop and submit for consideration ideas for herd management and range rehabilitation. Our response is that racks have a keen interest in wild horse and burro management. The BLM will prepare and transmit a letter to the racks representing areas where wild horse and burros are present and ask for their insight into herd and land management, including opportunities with state, local, and national organizations. We are, as a division chief, I'm going to commit ourselves to preparing that letter and having some discussion on this at the next meeting.

>> JIM FRENCH: Our meeting in Elko was the first meeting I had a racks attend. It was very positive, and I mentioned for this meeting having the local rack attend. Was that ever addressed or thought about or looked into?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Yes, very much so, especially to get the Utah RAC here. But their charter expired. The RAC chairperson appointment expired, and they were without one, and we were scrambling. We were looking at other states as well to have a RAC chairperson come in to build that relationship with you guys as well. But we'll -- Wild Horse and Burro program will initiate that. 37RACs now. It doesn't need to go to all of them, but we'll determine how many have horse herds and burro herds on their RACS and send them letters and get some feedback and I'd be happy to some board members review that letter as well.

>> JIM FRENCH: Well, thank you. That was the first time we had done anything like that, and it was a very positive

bridge-building event. Anybody else have any comments? Okay. You can go on to number five.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: BLM shall advertise and conduct more frequent adoption events at off range corrals to allow more horses and burros to reach sale eligible status. In calendar year 2018, the BLM according to our website held a total of 96 adoption events. Of these events, 39 were held or will be held in BLM off-range corrals. For example, BLM's Paul's valley in Oklahoma holds monthly adoptions on the second Tuesday of every month. They have begun internet adoptions. Adoption events across the country allows more people an opportunity to adopt animals without having to travel to BLM facilities which are primarily located in the western United States.

>> JIM FRENCH: This was one of my recommendations right here. And I know that Illinois is a different type of facility as Paul valley. But in Illinois, I can go there any day of the week and adopt a horse.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: We have formal adoption events --

>> JIM FRENCH: But in Paul's valley, you can only go the second Tuesday of the month. That is what this was addressed to. If some cannot go. I understand it's a stress, and Pat at Paul Valley is a friend of mine, and I'm not picking on him. If I happen to be going to Oklahoma City with a horse trailer, and I think dang, I can adopt a mustang, and it's only about 40 miles down from Oklahoma City. But it's the first Tuesday of the month, I'm blowed up. I mean, and you know what I'm saying. So, that's what this is about. I understand scheduling and personnel. But we need to work a little bit better, especially because there's only two off-range corrals from Oklahoma. It's Oklahoma and Paul's Valley. There's no other. Those things, I mean, we need to be able to work more with the public to make these horses available when we have them. Does that make sense?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Oh yeah. Definitely.

>> JIM FRENCH: Ginger? Again, on the second Tuesday of every month, they herd in horses into the smaller corrals. Ewing, they're already in a small corral. It's a little bit different set-up, and I'm not saying that we should be able to go to Paul's Valley every day and it do. But once a week or something like that would be -- anything that will get these horses more available would help.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: All right.

>> JIM FRENCH: Ginger?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: They were used as an adoption event facility, a number of mares that were brought in from Nevada. I showed horses to some of the people who came through there. This accounted for 161 horses were adopted in Montana during a few month period. I don't know if any of the other herds that have facilities like that, but this is a permanent facility at the base of the priors, and people were coming from Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, because it's a lot closer than Palomino

valley.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I caught some of the discussion with the work group with placement care, and I know there was discussion about that and discussion about increasing the adoptions and making them more available. We're hoping that the online corral -- and we had roll-out issues with that. But I think that's a start to at least allow anybody to go and pick up a horse at an event. We are trying to really strategize on how to streamline adoptions and get more animals in care.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: There were a lot of very plain horses there. But they were really nice horses. And I just don't know on the facilities end of that whether there are other opportunities like that.

>> JIM FRENCH: I really want to give BLM a pat on the back. One of the previous recommendations we made was to make the off-range corrals available. And a lot of the ones that was closed, the one that first comes to mind is Litchfield. It was closed, and it has been opened and there has been adoptions there. And there's a lot of these corrals that are now being used, and it's due to the board recommending, and the BLM agreeing to and implementing that. It's a positive thing and I think it helps with the number of adoptions that we had. And I think that number is only going to go up as more people realize the benefits. Gus, he talked about that. It's cool that we're taking mustangs and doing a show with quarter horses and beating them. That's cool! That is cool. Because, you know, that's -- well, mustangs are where the quarter horse got their start. The steel dust horse, he was a mustang, and that was the start of the American Quarter Horse. Jim, I will let you take over.

>> JIM FRENCH: The number one request that I have received since being on this board aside from hate mail has been making adoptions more accessible. And I can only imagine with the change in protocol, that we're going to see an increase in interest in this. If we have people running guys like me down wanting to know how do I contact the bureau relative to the wild horse program or adoptions outside of the prison program for breaking horses, there's got -- it indicates to me there's a heck of a lot of interest on this that is untapped at this point. I just think that based on the policy shifts, we're going to have to ramp up the --

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: And we're looking at all the ways to do that.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: How have the online adoptions gone?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Essentially we post animals online, and people can bid on them and then when they get a -- I think they're open for a certain time period. Take over!

[Laughter]

>> Oh yes.

>> Introduce yourself.

>> Hi. I am Hollé Waddell. I presented a couple of different times to the board. We have a new system in which you can adopt a horse online. We identify different pick-up locations so you can register, get approved application for purchasing or adopting an animal. Once a pick-up location is identified, a little down the line, a couple of months of logistical coordination that happens, but they normally can pick up the animal at a store front, off-range event, or a corral.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: It has been successful?

>> HOLLÉ WADDELL: Yes. It has really improved. The previous system was really archaic and outdated, so we gave it a face look. Crystal Johnson did a great job working with developers and reformatting and recoding and all of the technical things that needed to happen. There were bugs and fixes, but there was policy issued as well as a how-to guide for the field, and a helpful guide for purchasers online. It has been an interactive -- people can still contact the eastern states, because they are who manage the online corral system. So, I'd say that it has increased the number of events that we've had online. Previously we had maybe three a year. And we're really trying to ramp up to have a monthly online corral event.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Aren't you using more and more volunteers to help take photos?

>> HOLLÉ WADDELL: Yes. We have.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: And this is what the previous board has worked close with Holle on this. It has been really good.

>> HOLLÉ WADDELL: A long way to go, but we have volunteers taking videos and photos. It just has a better ability to create a catalog for the animals, and then the animals maintain some of the facilities. It's more user-friendly for BLM staff and personnel to upload photos or videos of animals that didn't get adopted, and use those animals again in a future event. There's a search feature, so if you're looking for a black horse, you can filter just for that. So, it's, you know, kind of like if you're shopping online, it's the same thing. It's a very similar concept, and it's much more user-friendly than the previous system.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Very much so. You've done a good job. And to address Dan, your thing, we'll try to take up the slack elsewhere. But this is good discussion, and this is a board meeting, and I don't want to shortcut anything when we're getting progress. Okay? I apologize for that, but we'll try to get back, even if we don't have to have a break, we will get back. Okay. Go ahead. I'm a tough one.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: We're not using this -- part of this recommendation was to get animals to reach sale-eligible status. And you haven't heard us say that. Mostly it is to, again, to get animals into good homes. We're not trying to do new things to get animals into that sale authority. I mean, if

an animal, we're thinking, we're posting good animals that are adoptable, and that are going to get into good homes and get through our adoption program. Whether they're untrained or trained. But most of them online are untrained.

>> HOLLÉ WADDELL: Most of them are untrained. That is correct. One of the things that I would add, and I talked yesterday during the working group is that we've developed additional policy regarding animal selection requirements. So that if an animal, to say we want to put the best animals forward on the online corral system and present those for adoption. And if you come to a facility, an off-range corral and adopt an animal that, you know, maybe has a couple of extra Nicks or maybe the mane has been cut down by someone else, maybe it wasn't the prettiest horse, but it is still available for adoption or purchase. So, we did develop policies to help create some guidelines of practices that people in the field were already doing available to the public, so they can see that we make the best effort to put the best animals forward in the events.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Are all the horses at short-term holding facilities available for adoption or not? Something that you said, you said we're not trying to make it so that they're eligible for sale. Why not make it so they're eligible for sale authority? I don't see why that's a bad thing?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Steven, if I may answer, they didn't say it was bad. They said the intent was not to speed horses through that, but to give everybody an opportunity to adopt a horse. They are not saying it's a bad thing, but it's another tool in the box.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: We need to have all the horses available so if somebody wants to adopt them, they are --

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: They are.

>> HOLLÉ WADDELL: That was part of the sales policy that was revised this fiscal year. It does provide guidance to off range corrals to hold monthly facility adoptions and events so that it's created as an event and the animals that are participating would be offered once, twice, and three times, and they become sale eligible. If the animal is not sale eligible, it can still be adopted.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Even after three times?

>> HOLLÉ WADDELL: Yes. Even after being presented and offered three times. That's correct.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Ben, you have a question? Just go ahead and stay there.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: We've got two more and the Grand Junction, which are seven for that. Number six, I know a lot of people have been hearing this in the news. BLM shall facilitate invitation to attend state trials if they might occur if allowed by protocols governing the trial. The response is a research project is currently being proposed for a gather in Oregon,

which is ongoing at this time, and this fall. BLM plans to contract to spay 100 mares. It is BLM's intention to be transparent and allow public viewing of these procedures. While at the same time we need to be prudent and consider the nature of the research and the protection of the veterinarians and the health of the animals. There are no special provisions in the Warm Springs HMA environmental assessment. The board members are certainly allowed and encouraged to join the public viewing, and there is going to be public viewing at this, if it does happen.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: I thought there was a lawsuit was filed, and the intent of it was that there was not going to be no public viewing?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: That is when CSU was involved. One of the criteria that Colorado State University had is they would not allow viewing -- or they would allow viewing but no videography. When CSU pulled out, we revised to basically say that we have a process outlined that says the public can watch and do videography and do photography as well. It's in a small room, and they're going to funnel people through.

We are working on those recommendations as priority work includes -- increasing the number of trained animals offered for adoption, increasing animal availability to adopters through more store fronts with more emphasis on the eastern part of the U.S., research more effective contraceptive measures and more.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: You have done an outstanding job on that, too.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Don't pat me on the back. I had nothing to do with it.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: I was reappointed to the board a year ago.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: It's people like her.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Then they shut down all the board activities that was going. And your crew continued on with these recommendations and implemented a lot of them, and it's going on with it. I'm thankful for that. That's rewarding that they went ahead and implemented -- even though we wasn't there to help them and, you know, give them -- that's not what we meant. But they did it. And I'm appreciative of that. Any other board members have any comments? Okay. Go ahead and move on.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: We'll move to Grand Junction. There were seven. The Wild Horse and Burro had their meeting in Washington and presented their most recent recommendations. It was scheduled early in the year, but we know it happened. Obviously we didn't have a meeting in March, but I'll paraphrase our response that we consider the board's input on where future meeting locations. I think at the end of this meeting, we'll discuss that a little bit at the end. BLM will then work with the advisory board members, our senior BLM leadership, stakeholders, and public, while still being cost

effective. Costs are obviously important, and Washington dc is a very expensive place. We know what happened in the spring. We didn't have a meeting for various reasons. I think we'll discuss more locations. But Washington dc, and I think some of the discussion we had about getting congress, you know, there is some rationale to have a meeting in Washington, but we will make that call at some point. Okay?

All right. Number two was the phase-out long-term holding over the next three years and apply that budget to on-range management and adoptions. BLM BLM's was that it would allow sale or unitize the animals currently in holding. Refer to our response that basically we cannot do those actions at this point due to appropriations language, and our priorities of placing animals into private care.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: But if you had an advocacy group step up to the plate and say, "We would take them".

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: They will take them and ensure that they will provide good homes for 36,000 animals, we would gladly take it.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Okay. Okay.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: There are groups working right now, and I think we will talk more about this tomorrow, too, to actually not come to the table empty-handed. We're not going to provide homes for 35,000 horses either, but to provide some of the support that is going to be necessary to figure out what to do with that. And including perhaps housing some ratio of those horses. So, that is not off the table.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Right. And we've had several offers like that as well. There's been three or four, I think in the last couple of years.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Mary, would you like to make a comment like what we talked about at lunch?

>> LARRY: Certainly. We've got to start thinking about things differently than we have in the past. I have a paper that should be published in the next couple of weeks. But one of the aspects that we thought would be good to explore is this idea of shared participation by -- shared participation of care for a very large number of animals, and it could be done congress would have to get involved with it. But I think it would have to be done through tax credits and accelerated tax write-off amounts. For instance, if a benefactor wanted to provide an entity who has taken charge of these horses, if they wanted to provide them with \$5 million worth of donations, they should not only get \$5 million worth of tax write-off, they should get maybe 1.25 or 1.5, pick a number, some kind of accelerated amount that would create some kind of economic incentive for taking on this responsibility. And it moves the animals. You can put whatever kind of stipulations you want to put on that care, but it would transfer that ownership from and that care responsibility from the federal roles on to the private

sector. And I think there's some ways -- there could be numerous ways to do that. But I think we have to start thinking along those lines, and it also provides an opportunity for some of the vocal horse advocacy folks to actually play a participatory role in the actual care and maintenance of the animals.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: That would be wonderful.

>> BARRY PERRYMAN: I think it's in production now. We'll get it passed around. It should be something that could spur conversation for the next several weeks.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Number three, create adoption mechanisms -- to include international adoptions and/or sales. We continue to seek innovative and creative ways to increase private care placement through adoptions and sales. We are in the process of an adoption center program. You'll hear more about that this afternoon. We have received authority. We can transfer animals to other federal, state, and local governments. And then at this point, there is really no direct -- there is no authority at this time to directly transfer wild horse and burros to other private non-government entities, nor outside of the country. We have made sales that have eventually made their way out of the country, but these were specific things that were made to, for example, a similar thing like mustang heritage foundation in Germany. But, we're exploring ways with that.

>> BARRY PERRYMAN: Good. Good.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: There were some animals sold, and the purchasers did complete the required paper work, the sales application, and they were outside of BLM, and we were no longer involved. We did receive an update, and they worked very well with the mustang care foundation in order to have a successful event.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Yes. It was very successful. Jim?

>> JIM FRENCH: Thank you. I want to get clarification on some of this wording. 2018-5052. No authority existed to directly transfer wild horses or burros to private non-government entities. That policy flies in the face of just exactly what Dr. Perryman was just talking about. We were talking about the possibility of putting a foundation together, organizing a foundation so that people who want to donate \$20 or want to donate, people in the private sector who don't necessarily want to own a horse or a mustang could donate into a foundation that would support horses in long-term holding to alleviate the problem that we just described earlier this morning with the budget of the interior. And I in reading this, this policy flies in the face of that solution in the tool box. And we've got -- I bring that up right now, because I want to clarify that. I know there's conversation about a foundation being formed before. I'm told now that that idea has pretty much died. I just think it's a great idea. We have people who don't have a million dollars that would like to donate into a

foundation and actually provide funding for put it on the ground to benefit mustangs that are in captivity.

>> HOLLÉ WADDELL: So the first point is I have not heard that the BLM foundation died. So, I'm not sure about that. I defer, probably, to leadership to respond to that part of it, if you're talking about the BLM foundation. Is that what you're referring to? Okay.

>> The IM and the foundation are two different things. The IM specifically addresses the transfer to federal, state, and local government. That's what that policy focuses on. That's separate from any work to develop a BLM foundation. Congress did give that authority, and there's still work being done to understand how the agent will move forward with that. I haven't been briefed on anything else in the area. And I will say that the authority to accept donations does exist, so the foundation is just a way to facilitate something that the BLM already is able to do.

>> HOLLÉ WADDELL: That's correct. And to get deeper, there's departmental policy that creates the authority to accept and solicit donations, and it's very clear about who is authorized to do that. It's clear about that. So, there's BLM policy that's being developed, and it's not been complete and completely approved yet, and it is separate from the transfer IEM. So, if there are non-governmental entities that are interested in acquiring animals, they can still do that. There's no law against it. They can adopt or purchase those animals. And in fact, we have a memorandum of understanding right now with an organization, Equi-center that has been very successful. They have purchased animals and doing great training work and looking at doing an open house later this fall. I would encourage organizations, if you're interested in acquiring the animals, then they can totally do that through adoptions and sales.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: To try to clarify a little bit, I think if we elevate this to 30,000 feet, and we actually look at some of the conversations we had in Grand Junction versus today, one of the things that I mentioned in Grand Junction is we had a room full of people and energy in that room that want to do something positive for the mustang program. And I can't think of a better way of doing that and empowering people who have that interest to follow through with that, other than creating a foundation independent of the protocols on the ground right now and allow for entities that have and are looking through a tax benefit incentive or through just the goodness of their heart, wanting to donate into a foundation. I firmly believe that's the solution to the whole question about euthanasia. I really do.

>> HOLLÉ WADDELL: Jim, yesterday, during our working group, we had some good discussion, and this was actually brought up. There are lots of foundations that have resources to support foundations. I encourage that they work together. BLM cannot do it all. I cannot create every program that is going to

place all of the animals. If I did, I should totally get a really high rating on my evaluation.

[Laughter]

But in all of my efforts, I recognize that we have, you know, over 40,000 animals that are in off-range corrals and off-range pastures. So, I would encourage those organizations to coordinate amongst themselves, absolutely, 100%. Contact us, and we can move through adoptions and sales of those items. But we have gone down the tax incentive road, and it does create -- of course we have to engage other departments. It's not just something our agency and the department of interior could resolve, but those are conversations we could have at the table. Absolutely.

>> JIM FRENCH: I think we're scratching the surface of a solution here, and I believe, you know, that it's kind of sad that here we are in 2018, and we're just now starting to talk about this to this degree, because I really believe that that energy is here, and that there are a lot of foundations out there on the ground right now or corporations that would like to donate large amounts of money to support -- if they can get the tax write-off or credits to do so. I believe it would be a great opportunity for them to buy into a piece of this management right now. And I just -- I bring this out and I'm going to re-emphasize it one more time, because I think we still need to sit down and circle up and determine how do we duplicate some of the efforts that are going on in the private sector right now for other foundations and other things that are trying to be done in the private sector? There's a lot of models out there on the ground that I think we should try to take a look at on that. I'll leave it with that.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Okay. Daniel, if I may make a recommendation. I don't want to stifle any positive discussion by the board, and we're doing very well. I know we're over. If I could, we've got 30 minutes extra at the end of the day. What I would like to do is let Mr. Shepherd give his talk after the break. We'll finish up with this, and then Ms. Hope can do her thing, and then we'll break, and we'll let Mr. Shepherd do it then, and then we'll take up with Holle, if that's okay with you. We will have a I don't want to stifle positive conversations or limit any questions from the board. At this point, this ain't anybody preaching, so I'm not going to say amen and shut them down. Bruce?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: We're not going anywhere.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Thus says the boss.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Whether it's donations or just having people put these animals into private care, and you know, I think that's -- again, that is one of our priorities. That was our off-range vision to get as many animals into private care as possible. Whatever mechanism is, and if these things that, you

know, tax breaks, tax incentives, if that's going to work, great. All right. Moving to number four. Increase wild horse and borrow funding for reversible fertility control by \$3 million in FY19. And we are now in FY19. Fiscal year 19. BLM is partnering with several research institutions to support research into additional fertility control methods. Some methods show promise but have not been tested on horses on the range. BLM hopes to expand where applicable reversible fertility control such as vaccines and others that have shown some promise. Again, if it can be effectively and efficiently administered with the goal to reduce removals and achieve and maintain AML. Reversible fertility control reversible fertility control does have limitations.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Number five?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Okay. No questions. Okay. All right. BLM will immediately, within the next three years follow Wild Horse and Burro act, the on-range population is 82,000, and we have finite off-range holding space for moving large numbers of animals over consecutive years is currently not feasible unless we get additional space. Unless the BLM receives -- through adoption, sales, and transfers, or increases future BLM budgets. This recommendation cannot be achieved and cannot be achieved in this time frame. In April 2018, you will hear later that BLM submitted a report to congress titled management options for a sustainable Wild Horse and Burro program. This had four options to move the program forward towards achieving and maintaining across the program. These rely heavily on achieving AML quickly, which includes partnership with stakeholders in the public.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: I know we will probably talk about it later, but who picks out of the options?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: The report was to congress.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: So congress has got to pick one?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: They can pick one or a blend of them. We submitted with the intention -- we were directed under the 17 to submit that report. We have done that, and now we are waiting. As you've heard mentioned earlier today, we cannot lobby congress. I think everybody has seen that report here in the room, and know what's in it.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: My mamma taught me if I could not say anything good, not to say anything. So, we're going on to number six.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Maintain AML for fertility control. After AML is achieved, and when we say that, we're talking at a program-wide level. In any one particular HMA temporary fertility control can be effectively administered to reduce future removals and maintain AML. Within most complexes well above their AML, it will take many years using only fertility control to reach AML. Permanent and temporary fertility control will not allow those to reach AML at this

moment.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: After reading this, and when I saw that, I think what they were referring to was HMA like tiger, and like Oregon, there's a big demand for horses. The Pryor Mountains where those horses get adopted really quick, I think that's what they were referring to. Something like that.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I didn't read the response.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Am I right, Ginger? Is that what that was about?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: I'm not absolutely sure, but what I am sure of is that it will take the application of fertility control, whether you're at AML or not, combined with those techniques.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Okay. Any other comments? Okay. On to number seven.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: All right. Adjust AML where appropriate. I know we've already had some discussions on this. After AML is achieved in any particular HMA or HMA complex, BLM with assess the need to adjust AML, following in-depth analysis of range land monitoring and data collected over three to five years in accordance with our procedures outlined in 4700 in our handbook. As part of a long-term management and land use planning. The goal of any adjustment is to have sufficient water and forage at the minimum feasible level to maintain their free-roaming behavior.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Comments? Questions? Go ahead, Jim.

>> JIM FRENCH: I remember their recommendation well. I think the intent was to modify the 4700 manual having to do with adjusting AML following a catastrophic event. A three to five-year analyses following a major fire event or coming out of a drought cycle or something along that line, which has dramatically impacted the HMA habitat needs to be done sooner than later, and in many cases, it's not a five-year -- we don't have that luxury of five years. And I think the idea behind this is there's got to be a trigger within the context of the BLM's manual that allows for adjustment at AML based on conditions on the ground.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Browse, there's probably several listed, and I don't know how many we have online watching this, and I'm sure there might be some people here. But would you briefly describe how AML is set?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I'm going to let Alan do that.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: That's good. Okay. I can do that. Okay. Alan?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: And your EPAP will be...

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: That's a question I'm asked time after time after time. And we've talked about it a little bit today. So, Mr. Shepherd, if you would just --

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: I'm Alan shepherd, the on-range branch of the Wild Horse and Burro in Washington. We're going to go

into an area and we're going to have a series of years of collected monitoring data on forage utilization, animal distribution, animal use distribution, water availability, whether impacting private ground. We're going to look at all factors. So, all of those are taken into account, and we're going to figure out what our capacities for use is in those areas. And then you're going to also be looking at in regards to your livestock use, we're going to be working with our departments of wildlife agencies to see what their target elk numbers and deer numbers and all of those things to look at to see what that capacity is for an AML or a multiple use decision in an area. And establish it through that. Jim talked about earlier that the initial steps that were taken in the late 70s and early 80s to establish the preliminary AMLs, done with county commissioners and grazing boards and folks like that. We took it steps further to then look at those numbers and then use resource monitoring data to look at carrying capacities of those pieces of ground. And each state did it differently. Nevada did multiple use decisions where we looked at livestock, wild horses, wildlife, multiple uses.

Some states were specific to horses. By using resource monitoring data is the key to look at what that production is on an annual basis. And you want three or five -- multiple years, you know? One year is not going to set it. You don't want to set it on a high year, then your AML is too high. You don't want a drought year, or it's way low. You want to have an average, and you want to take into account that bad year anyway. You want to have an AML that is supportable, should you have that bad event.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Right.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: That's the basic process. Like I said, it's not a one-year answer. It's going to take a couple years to put together the right amount of information. The field is collecting this data every other year.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: And each HMA would probably have a different basis of information -- thank you, lord.

[Laughter]

Prayers work. What can I say?

[Laughter]

Highway did you do that, Dan? Oh, goodness. I mean, so how long does it take to adjust an AML? I think that's what this was all about. In those areas where there's a fire that sweeps through. We've had lots of fires. Almost 500,000 acres here in this state, and horses can't handle that, but the AML is still the same. Is that what this is directed to?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: And I think the way I would answer Jim's thought is we're not going to adjust the AML immediately with that scenario. We're just going to look at adjusting that population level to help benefit the restoration. And then look

at the monitoring data down the line to see did that restoration enhance the area and it's benefitting the horses? Or did it just, you know, burn the soil clean that it's not going to be beneficial to re-establish some of the things? And we go to the land of cheat grass in a lot of our country where the AML isn't supported anymore. So, I think the key thing would be a BLM response to manage animals in specific cases to a response of a major drought or major fire instead of adjusting the AML immediately. That comes later with trying to do -- have them with the right data.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: That makes sense.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: That makes a lot of sense. Does the policy currently call for the initiation of analysis to start looking at data coming out of a --?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: We have gotten to the AML range, and we can start looking to see is AML appropriate? In 85% or 90% of our HMAs, we never achieved AML, so how do we know it's right? That's the key. I have been doing this stuff for 29 years, and I have only reached AML twice in one HMA, and that was because of a fire or a drought. I have never achieved it due to AML gathers, to achieve AML as a management tool, just because we have never had the capabilities to be there. I think that's the big thing. We have to be able to get there and stay there for a little bit and see what happens on the ground, you know? The problem is, in a lot of our countries, especially the great basin and our Mohave country and things like that, where it takes five and ten and 15, and maybe 50 years to see any major response to some of this stuff. We just have to hope that we see a response and we get favorable moisture and things like that and we keep that number there, so we can see how the vegetation responds.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Thank you.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: That's it.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: That's it for you, Bruce. You can come back up here and sit now. You can sit with the big boys.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: We will now hear from Ms. Hope Woodward, and she will talk about what the forest service is doing with their wildlife services. I appreciate you being patient it's a good meeting. We're asking lots of questions and finding out lots of information. So, buckle your seat belt, because -- it's your turn to drive.

>> All right. Thank you very much for the opportunity to present here to you, and thank you for Utah state for hosting this I want to note that this presentation is a little bit different than what was on the website. We are about a tenth of the size, however, we are authorized similarly as the BLM under the wild roaming Wild Horse and Burro act as amended. The issues we face, and the opportunities are similar to that of the BLM, and that we also do partner with the BLM and actually have 24 of our territories -- they are referred to as territories as

opposed to herd management or herd areas. We actually partner with the BLM on 24 of those, primarily in Nevada where we share boundaries. We have approximately 8700 wild horses and wild burros on the active territories that are found in 19 national forests in eight western states on 2.1 million acres.

I am pausing, because 19 seems like a number of national forests, but I think that number is likely correct. And of those 24, 27 are wild horse territories and four are wild burro territories, and three are actually combined, and those are in the spring mountains areas outside of Las Vegas.

Our staffing is a bit smaller than the BLM, and we have the staff in region three. The Washington office has a program manager, myself. And also in region three, we have dedicated specialists on the Carson national forest, there's a wild horse specialist and a facility manager and also a horse technician seasonal, and we were also able to bring on Carson assisted funding to bring on four wild horse interns. Some of which are continuing on. So, there's not a separate tab here as Carson pointed out. Here present with us today, we are fortunate. But the region three as a dedicated wild horse and burro coordinator. Dr. Francisco is a veterinarian and Ph. Primarily, we're funded to support the costs related to the animals, horses and burros, primarily horses removed off of forestlands prior to FY14. There are approximately 700 animals in BLM long-term holding pastures, and that's where we receive our budgeted for funding. We received the same FY18 as we did in FY17. Fortunately, the costs were somewhat reduced overall. We're actually billed after the end of the calendar year, and so we did have a little bit of extra funding beyond 550,000 that we could use for other program support out to the regions and forests.

And we're looking at for FY19, additional funds, primarily to be covering not only those horses in the BLM long term, but also animals that were removed, and an emergency gather, which I'll refer to later in the Cold Creek area, wild horse territory. And then also the animals that are to be removed, the helicopter round-up on the Modoc national forest that will be in short-term care for adoption and sales at the BLM facilities. In terms of our management capacity and planning, how the forest service has approached management, without decisions, we're limited in management other than for emergency gathers off private, tribal, state lands, or for public safety or safety of the animals. Currently we have seven of the 34 territories have decisions, three are joint managed, and we have four that are working on wild horse management plans.

In terms of the management that we have been doing, particularly on those that do have the management plans, and this includes the prior mountain herd, which the forest service, 10% of that herd is on the forest service in Montana. So, in

terms of on-range fertility control, we have two territories doing that. That includes the priors and Jicarilla. At least for this fiscal year. In other years we have had fertility control on both Herita mesa and Jicarilla. Both are in northern New Mexico. The Jicarilla and the Herita mesa go to the Bloomfield facility in the Carson national forest. And Modoc has recently come on with a new short-term facility on Modoc national forest and with capacity, initial phase one, of about 300 to 500 horses.

In terms of round-ups and removal of animals, which includes helicopter as well as bait trapping, there is ongoing bait trap removal in the Carson forest. This year, the Jicarilla, the forest service land. That is a jointly managed area with the BLM. And activities have been conducted on the prior service portion, and not on the mesa portion, which is the BLM. So, the gathers would be off the Jicarilla, the planned Modoc gathers, and the emergency gathers on cold creek territory, cold creek area. In terms of gentling and training, we have been doing that on the Carson, some on the Jicarilla, and also the Modoc national forest. And adoptions and sales, those have been done on the same three forests, and also some on the Prior Mountains. I don't have figures this year on the prior mountains in terms of the we have appropriate management levels for 2000 for horses and 296 for burros. Overall, we're almost four times over AML, or 400%. We do have some territories with higher percent over AML. And we also do have some territories that are actually under AML, some very small territories in Nevada.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Hope, are you going to talk more about the devil's garden?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: Yes. There are more in later context, and I will discuss certain aspects of that as well.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Okay.

>> HOPE WOODWARD: A note in terms of management planning, there's a few territories that have done management planning, and there's others that yet need to do management planning, and that's also discussed in another slide. So, there's need for review for about 25 territories, the AML review. As was noted earlier in the 70s and 80s, there was initial review. And then some of those territories haven't had any review or analysis regarding decisions in this.

So the areas that I'll be going into in the next few slides have to do with where we are in the status of our plans and fertility control related to management as well as well as litigation. So, I noted that we have 34 active territories and seven with NEPA decisions. Those are in New Mexico, Hundo Torape is one. And another in the cherry creek area. And also this year, Hickasun completed a management plan out of the Austin range district in Nevada. The Modoc national forest also has a signed management plan with the priors, and San Bernardino

territory. And we have five territories working on management plans. The Heber has completed the collaborative group process, and now they're going to be beginning the EPA process in mid-November, and they expect to go out for scoping for initial work and proposed action. The North Hills, we've moved along with assistance of the BLM. They have taken the lead on that EA, and likely for the BLM, they have a management decision in this first quarter, and then likely the Dixie will sign a decision the next -- the second quarter. So, the population surveys are generally done with the BLM, especially where we have joint managed areas. But we have surveys for populations that are done more informally. We have horseback surveys, and some population is derived from the permu-T observations. The Jicarilla is the primary territory with the only -- only area that we have done fertility control, the forest service led this year. We plan to expand that, the fertility control with PZP. Carson is bringing in the science center, and they will put on PZP training for about ten people, including staff from Oregon. The Ocicho did conduct a pilot study to see how that might be affected for those horses, and they are deciding to move through with training people and working to get something that perhaps maybe hadn't been brought out here before, the EPA licensing. And that varies. States require certification or licensing. So, although we are treating vertebrates, for Oregon, for example, you're looking at rodents. Some states are more stringent to get that licensure. Some are easier to get that.

In terms of the gathers, in reference to Fred's question, today began the round up via helicopter on the Devil's Garden, and there's a planned removal for 1,000 horses. I'm wondering whether it might be more appropriate to be question/answer or break out on a separate -- after going through the slides first, and then returning to that.

In terms of removal by bait trapping, we removed one horse off the Big Summit territory, due to the horse having become overly habituated, being fed by the public, and that was an unfortunate occurrence that there is need for greater education for the public. Some signs are put up there. And unfortunate to have one of our partners who is working towards adopting that animal. As I noted, we had an emergency gather related to low body condition, lack of forge off of Cold Creek. This was in April and May, and 148 horses were removed through bait trapping and with assistance, at least in terms of the contracting with the BLM. However, this was a forest service bait-trap gather removal of those animals. And they are available for adoption. The first ones became available for adoption out of the Ridge Crest facility in south eastern California on August 1. And probably two weeks ago, I think 16 of those had been adopted out for training. So, those are some very gentle, easily approachable animals. And we're looking to have success in finding good homes for those animals. And the

Ridge Crest facility has been helpful in taking on that role when we didn't have a place for those animals to go to offer them for adoption. In terms of the Jicarilla, this year they removed 48 horses from bait-trapping method. In terms of the gentling and training program, with Devil's Garden, animals removed through several partners, were able to adopt out a number of horses and get those gentled. That was actually more of last fiscal year. But that still is an active program, and they're working on developing other partners and other gentling programs. The Jicarilla, in addition to the Jicarilla Mustang Heritage alliance, which is one of the partners with the Carson, the Carson has also been doing some in-house, so to speak, gentling with some of the interns that came on, two of them have horse experience or training experience. And the one I mentioned on the Big Summit. And sales, 37 animals were sold off the Jicarilla.

We're getting near the end of the presentation. I noted with the Jicarilla mustang heritage alliance, they are working with the Carson as well as the sky mountain wild horse sanctuary, who have assisted doing work with PZP as well as with surveys and setting out cameras. I noted we were able to bring on a number of interns. The Washington program has several partners, two of which are the college trees program, and we were able to bring on six interns on the Carson for, and also two here in Oregon. Those partners were on. We funded a Modoc to assist with the wild horse program. Okay. All right. So, just the other inner agency agreements that we have other than those working with the BLM are national agreement to refund the BLM for care of the horses we have an agreement that expires this calendar year. They were helpful in working with the Salt River horse collaborative in Arizona outside of phoenix on the Tonto national forest, and they have also been working with a contractor now to form a collaborative to look into solutions working with the state of Arizona for those horses. These were not protected under the wild and free roaming horse and burros act. However, tracking those animals as well as unauthorized animals that are not protected under the act also comes under the purview of the wild horse and burro program in forest service, in collaboration working with our units, the forest service local units. We're recognizing just overall on this idea, on the agreements that we need to develop into more partnerships. We need to engage how to engage those partnerships and formalize and develop new partners. And the idea of having open and honest communications, respectful communications, and that all information gets out on the table. People are able to really express what their side boards are, what their needs, we are using the Udall foundation for that. In terms of informal agreements where we don't have an MLU, the -- has been a partner assisting with the pike summit herd, particularly with the annual ground surveys. And also they

have been assisting, too, with emergency issues such as the one I mentioned earlier about the animal that needed to be removed. And then the Modoc placement committee on the Modoc national forest has been continuing to work to help place animals and look for alternative solutions to long-term management.

We currently have one ongoing litigation that is ongoing from last year, which is actually FY18. And those plaintiffs are noted here. That is currently ongoing, and there is no ruling on that case. Oh! And I didn't show these slides here. I apologize. I was imagining that you were seeing that. I apologize thinking that you were maybe seeing all of that.

This last slide, we move on to the question issues, and given that I don't have the slides specifically on the Modoc national forest gather off the devil's garden plateau wild horse territory, I want to note a few points about that. I will pause here just to get my thoughts in order. So, this round up and removal of horses via helicopter contract which began today, this falls under the authority under the act in terms of maintaining a thriving and preserving and maintaining and achieving a thriving natural ecological balance in terms of our relationship on our wild horse and burro territories. There are an estimated 4,000 for a territory with an AML that was set in 2013 of 402 horses...

And it is seen that without removing some of those horses and removing towards AML, that there could be significant damage. There already has been damage to the eco-system, and also to the horses themselves. The Modoc national forest plans to make as many of those removed horses as possible available for adoption to good homes. And I have specifics on how that will be done. However, it's unlikely that there will be enough adopters provide homes for all of the gathered horses. And given the population on the Modoc national forest is expected to increase by 20% a year, it's seen that it may be destructive to actually return those horses not adopted to the territory. Destructive in terms of the habitat, of the territory. So, these horses, some of these horses will be made available for sale. We recognize this is the least preferred option in terms of limited sale, as well as unlimited sale authority that the forest service does have authority to use under the act.

And so that's why we're working hard, both the actions of the forest service, as well as partnering with the BLM to prioritize adoption of the gathered horses. And there is additional information on the devil's garden plateau wild horse territory web page, as well as links for application for limited sales application for the Modoc, as well as an application for adoption for the Modoc, and links to the BLM website to apply for adoptions of those animals that will be going to the BLM facility. Approximately 700 will be going, I believe, to the

Litchfield facility, north of Susanville, and 300 animals will be going to the new Devil facility on the Modoc national forest.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Okay. Now in the past, in 2015, the forest service kind of terminated their cooperative agreement with the bureau of land management. They quit sending them horses and started operating on their own. Are you saying that's coming back since you're sending them to the BLM holding facilities?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: Yes and no. The forest service is not managing to put in long-term holding. So that's not changing. I would say no, we are not revising that. We are using our existing memo of understanding with the BLM and our national agreement. And so the animals that will be removed off of the Modoc national forest that are under ten years old will be -- will be -- I'm pausing, just because I've believing that they're going to the Litchfield facility, and they will be offered for adoption there, and they will go on to the agreement to have those animals there for a short-term facility and no go into long-term.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: So what happens if them 700 head don't get adopted? How long is Litchfield going to hold on to the 700 head?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: My understanding is they will hold on to the 700 head for a year, and those are discussions that we haven't finalized. So, I don't feel that I can speak outside of what the Murdoch's plans are right now.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Okay.

>> HOPE WOODWARD: They may very well be that I could get back to you, maybe I can dial them up and get back to you by tomorrow, perhaps.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: I understand that. Now the 300 head that you've got, and you know, I'm aware of a lot of stuff between the BLM and the forest service, and being on this board as long as I have and being an active participant in a lot of this. Honestly, my e-mails are burning up with some of the information that is coming up. I don't know how much of it is true, and how much of it is not, how much of it is half-truths and how much of it is out and out lies. If there's something you can't answer, just say that. But, the advocacy groups are going crazy that you're going to send 300 horses to slaughter. And that's some of the comments that I'm getting. And I know that's not exactly correct, but I do know that you're going to offer those horses for sale in the same manner that BLM does SE horses. Is that right?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: That's correct. The Modoc national forest has determined a process recording to sales as well as adoptions. We recognize the sale without limitation is controversial, so we have a progression of potential options to move horses out of government ownership. The priorities are

adoptions and sales with limits under the current BLM guidance criteria, and also sales without limits, addressed by the act as amended as well as California state law.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: How can the forest service have sales without limits if they are acting under the same as BLM, and BLM can't?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: We are not required to not sell horses -- let me say this appropriately or correctly. Although we can sell horses without limitations, there's nothing in the act that says that we cannot offer them with limitations.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: That makes sense.

>> JIM FRENCH: Did I hear you say it's also under the provisions of the California state law?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: There is language related to the penal code for the Virginia state penal code.

>> JIM FRENCH: So there's a California state law that says you can't export or sell a horse in California for slaughter, right?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: There is actually -- it's probably best to actually look at the language itself rather than to interpret the California penal code section 598C and 598D.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Do you have it there?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: It's unlawful for any person to buy or accept a horse with the intent of killing the horse if that person knows or should have known that any part of that horse will be used for human consumption. And under 598D, it's unlawful under that law to offer sale for sale horse meat for human consumption.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: For human consumption. That's interesting.

>> May I ask a quick question? For my own information, doesn't federal law supersede state law?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: There is a question for that that our counsel has discussed and BLM forest service. And we do have some thoughts related to mentioning the California penal code provisions on our forms. These forms are not approved by the office of management and business. These are forms that we've produced in the interim while we're working through getting OMB-approved forms forest-wide.

So, you may look at the interpretations of that. The office of supremacy of federal law over state law. The Modoc national forest has felt that it was important to include those on the form. If there is a need to remove or discuss, our counsel is aware of that.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: I assume that litigation is going to answer that question for us. At this point, has there been any lawsuits filed that you are aware of?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: I could check my Skype here. I'm not aware that any litigation has been filed.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: You just explained it very good,

under the BLM regulations, congress has stipulations in the appropriations bill, but the same stipulations are not in USDA's budget bill, which is why you can do what you're doing is basically what you're saying.

>> HOPE WOODWARD: That's correct. We do have that authority. We have the authority to use that. And we also have the discretion to not use that authority.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: But I want to clarify the fact that you're going to do every effort that you can to be sure that these horses go to good homes. That's the first and foremost priority of everything, correct?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: Yes. The direction from the Washington office as well as what the Modoc has stated is that the first priority is to find good homes for these animals, either through adoption or sale with limitation.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Okay. But -- okay. That makes sense. Any other board members? Ginger?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: I think it's unfortunate that someone who cares so deeply is in this situation. I know that the board's hope that these horses can find homes. Thank you.

>> I know you mentioned this, but how many are they planning to actually remove?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: They're planning to remove up to 1,000 horses, so 1,000 horses. And that action starts today, and will continue until 1,000 horses are removed.

>> There's about 3,000 or 3500 over AML. Is the long-term plan to get back to AML?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: So the long-term plan is to get to AML. And this gather removal round-up is actually part of a four-year plan to get to AML.

>> So if everything goes as planned, within four years, they'll be back to AML?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: That's correct.

>> One question I have, and this stems from our conversation with Paul and Celeste yesterday in our break-out meeting. From what I understood, don't they have draft blood in them?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: Yes. And they are generally recognized as being horses that are easy to train. And they're also the larger size, approaching 16 as ginger mentioned, but 15, possibly up to 16 hands. And that's also expected that the younger horses who may have been raised and given better feed and forge could attain larger size. Some of the horses removed in 2016 were not as large size as we had expected. But, there's a number of photos on the website, actually, a little bit of time on Facebook, and Googling Modoc, you'll see a number of the horses that have been adopted out over the years, and discussion about the horses.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I just remember Holle mentioning one of the big frustrations is that a lot of the wild horses were

not big enough. Maybe some outreach can go out. That's a good thought.

>> HOPE WOODWARD: That's a good recommendation, Steve, and hopefully if the Modoc is not listening in, I will pass that on. I know we worked with Steve Leonard out of Canon City and border control. But certainly, those are options, and actually opportunities that we'd like to have for the horses.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: I have one more question, and then we'll hit. Are these horses branded on the neck like a BLM horse? Or how are they identified?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: The Modoc national forest plans to use microchipping, using the same process or readers that the BLM would use.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Okay.

>> HOPE WOODWARD: And they also will have identification neck tags.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. What we're going to do, since we have taken -- we have taken Alan's time with everything, we're going to let him have as much time as he wants, but we're going to take a short five to seven-minute break. I want everybody back in here at 20 after 3:00. Alan, you'll have as much time as you need, because we don't want to hear Holle talk, and you can have as much time as you want.

[Laughter]

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: If everybody will please take their seats, we'll start back up. Thank you. If the rest of the board members will please come back to the podium... we're going to start docking your pay. I want you to understand that the agenda is an outline or a guide. The purpose of a board meeting is to learn as much information and fact-find as much as we can, and that's what we're going to do as a board. I apologize to those that don't get on time. Alan, I really do apologize for that. Our job is to ask as many questions as we can, obtain as much information as we can, and that's exactly what we're going to do. At this time, I turn it over to Mr. Alan Shepard, who is the operating manager and a friend of mine.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: I'm the on-range branch manager. Holle will get mad if I take her title.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: She stays mad at me all the time.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: I want to give a quick overview of our report to congress that we were requested to make a -- or develop a year ago. I'm going to run through a couple of quick things that we took into account in presenting the program to congress. We had over 82,000 animals at the time that we were writing the document, which is roughly three times the appropriate management level. We looked at the current populations were threatening the western range lands, impacting the ecological functions that we were dealing with, and in

limiting forage and water availability to all users. One of the big things we're seeing because of these numbers is emergency gathers based on water and forage availability are becoming more common, and we have to do them to save impacted and in peril animals.

One of the big keys that we deal with is we can't gather enough animals and treat enough animals to reduce the herd sizes through fertility control alone. They are not 100% effective. I think it is a valuable tool and will be a valuable tool when we're at AML, and can use it as a management tool at that time to keep us there. But at the current rate, it will not solve our problem. Low adoptions and sales have definitely resulted in the volume of horses we've got in holding at this point in time. So, we have to deal with that issue. And where we're spending 60% of appropriated funds for holding of animals and care for them, we definitely need to placing those animals, in order to make that funding available for other uses for proper management on the ground.

So the report to congress, in our appropriations language, in our 2007 appropriations language, congress requested a report from the BLM containing options for humanely achieving appropriate management level. They didn't request how many options, what they should look like, where they -- what they needed to be at what level. They wanted -- they gave us a time line of when they wanted that document, and we strive to achieve it. The program put together a group team of managers and specialists geared towards developing that document. We think we put together a pretty extensive and experienced team to look at all aspects of the program. And we went forward with that.

Over the course of a year and a few months, we finalized that report in April of 2018. In developing our report, we went into it with several management assumptions that we wanted to use to gear us as we developed the different options. And the holding expenses that we create by holding so many animals that we have. So, we can free up the funding that our allocations are for on-the-ground management. We had the assumption that long-term holding space including would be available if we're going to achieve these options. And we continued to ask for authority to transfer or to get authority to transfer animals to nonprofits. Other federal agencies, state and local governments. A couple more assumptions that we used in developing our goals were we identified a set of categorical exclusions within the framework of national environmental policy act, organization NEPA.

We assumed for any treatments that we would need to do on the animals themselves, we would have experienced veterinarians available into the level that we needed. Depending on what we were doing, we would need a lot of them with specialized abilities.

And then we also looked at any other legislative options or changes that could be considered to help us achieve some of these management options in our goal of achieving AML across the country and on all of our HMAs.

We'll just dive into the options. Option number one, our goal is to achieve AML using all existing authorities within the act. Over a ten-year period, under this option, we would need to remove roughly 156,000 animals over a ten-year period to achieve AML. Y'all. We would treat with fertility control, primarily sterilization and vaccines of 38,000 mares over that time period. We would hope to achieve 40 plus thousand adoptions over that time period. We would, under sales without restriction, we would need to sell roughly 110,000 wild horses and burros and roughly 24,000 animals would need to be unitized due to -- it would account for roughly 200 million more than what we are currently spending in that time period, so roughly a billion dollars. Using this option, we would achieve AML in roughly eight years.

Option number two was to achieve AML using our current existing authorities. So, no sale without limitation and no euthanasia by substantially increasing program funding. We would need to remove, under this ten-year alternative, 151,000 wild horses and burros. We would need to treat over 52,000 mares with fertility control. 2,000 sales within current restrictions during that time period. Off-range population would increase, so our holding population would increase to 110,000 animals, roughly. The cost would exceed our annual budget by 1.1 million, or a billion with a "B" dollars, so we would be close to \$2 billion for the program over ten years.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Now Alan, is that over the ten-year period? Or 1.1 per year?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: It would be our base funding that we get now, each year annually for ten years plus 1.1 billion over the ten years.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: So you would divide that by ten?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: You could do it that way. You're definitely in the 150 million plus annually until we hit AML.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: And then your slide on option one would have increased the budget by about \$20 million a year?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: Correct.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: It's going to average \$20 million a year?

>> What would be the ramifications -- so this is 0 to 10 years, but in the aftermath, what is the budget going to look like with option one versus option two?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: Once we have achieved AML, that curve, the spending ups and downs will level out, and we will actually decrease our budget. If we achieve AML, we have no holding under that option. We would actually decrease it and still be able to have a manageable program, because we would have it under

control, and we would be achieving -- we would be placing animals hopefully as quickly as we need to remove them and things like that.

>> With option two as well?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: With all the options that we will talk about. They will eventually all level out once we achieve AML. We have to achieve AML in order to get the budget to stabilize and/or decrease.

Okay. Option number three. Again, using the existing authorities to help place the animals as quickly as possible. The removal rate would be roughly 129,000 animals over the ten-year period. We would be treating 26,000 mares in that time period. 84,000 adoptions would need to occur in that -- over that time period using the financial incentive program that we're developing, hoping to basically double our approach of what we're doing currently. During that, we would be selling roughly 2,000 animals, which is about what we sell in a given year to 200 to 300 a year. And our off-range population would still be increasing to some level. By year ten, we would still have roughly 70,000 animals in holding. This is our quickest one, and we could do that within six years, but we will be removing a lot of animals, and we have to expect to place a lot of animals during that time period. 86 thousand animals would be expected to be placed during that time period. It's the most expensive -- this is where the big dollars come in. We would need an additional \$1.4 billion above our cumulative appropriations in order to achieve this.

Our last option is using existing authorities creating -- using the adoption incentive program, and increasing permanent sterilization. This would remove roughly 36,600 animals. We would treat 103,000 mares with fertility control, focusing on sterilization over a 10-year period of time. 40,000 adoptions would need to occur through the incentive program, similar to option number three. And sales would be roughly 2,000 animals as well. Our off-range population would be decreased to roughly 37,000 animals during that time period. This one would require roughly 320 million additional allocation of funding over the time period in order to achieve appropriate management level in 12 years. This is the only one that took us outside of the ten-year time frame that we were targeting. Even with doing a large number of sterilizations and placements and removals, it's still, based on the modeling that we did, still would require at least 12 years to achieve AML using this approach.

>> It's hard to compare between things without the background information. But when we look at things like spaying is incredibly contentious to begin with, but looking at feasibility, if you look at option four, over 10,000 mares a year that you would have to spay, that means you're gathering, you know, 40% of mares that are of a treatable age in any gather, so you're gathering 60% more, and BLM has

parameters. They can't gather more than, you know, you've said anywhere between 15 to 18,000 a year, just because of logistics. And that fluctuates, obviously. So, I have trouble reading through these. And they are sort of magical numbers. I don't know that they're attainable, and that is the analysis of what's feasible.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: The big thing is we have to assume that we're going to have the contract crews to gather the animals. So, that would likely mean we're going to have to double or triple what we have currently in order to have that type of work being done. Because we're going to have to gather serious volumes of animals. We're going to have to touch a lot of animals in the course of a year. That's some of the assumptions that we are going to have to have the funding for in order to gather that number of animal. And in order to do that volume of sterilizations, we're going to have those special, having big cadre of qualified vets that can do the work we need to have done. And the sterilizations are going to be, you know, we're going to have all kinds of gelding as well as spaying and fertility control still happening. But, the big thing is that we have got to control that mare population, that growth rate under that option. And that's the most feasible method of controlling for any assurance that we're going to control that growth rate by using sterilization. But we're going to have to rely on a lot of specialized labor work force.

>> And I want to couch that by saying you do have to make a lot of assumptions when you model any of this, because you start up here, and then you have to --

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: Right.

>> And figure out what you can do.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: Right. With all of these options, and these are the four principle options. We looked at all kinds of different things, but these were the most practical to get us within a set of parameters. Our goal was ten years. We set that as our goal to see. And in talking to management and requesters, ten years seemed to be the time frame we wanted to live within. And so we have to look at that work that way. So, that's why some of these numbers are just massive in scale. Are they doable? I can't guarantee that. But, you know, we have to formulate options that congress can absorb and mull it over and give us a direction, you know? Tell us what they want. You know? How do they want us to take this program? Do they want us to reach it in ten years? Or do they tell us 20 years from now? Or whenever? There's a lot of activity that has to occur.

>> BARRY PERRYMAN: One question I have, if any of these are taken up and we get down to AML, what do you foresee as a path way moving forward once we achieve AML so we're not revisiting the same problem down the road ten years thereafter, ten years, whatever. I think of us back in about 2007, we were pretty close to AML on range.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: My personal opinion is if we hit AML, and we maintain a suitable funding level that keeps us on the path to achieving and maintaining AML, I think we can keep it there as long as we maintain our tools. And we need to use all of our tools in order to stay there. We can't slack off and take a time-out and sit back a couple of years, because we know what happens with two or three years of inactivity. We see what happens. We have experienced it multiple times, because we're multiple times over AML. I think the main thing is maintaining funding at the level we need to do the work we need to do population is going to be a goal to achieve and maintain AML, particularly to maintain it. And I think at that point we can get into the discussions that we've had already about looking at the monitoring and restoration projects and verifying AMLs and doing that type of work. But like we talked earlier, we have to achieve it first. We have to get to that number, and then we have to maintain it and see what, how our eco-system responds once we're there.

>> FRED WOEHLE, JR.: Thank you. Alan, I think you have done a good job here trying to encapsulate the scale of the problem, which is something that I have been beating the bushes about for a long time now. The other scale of this plot is very hard to get our heads around. We can't service the debt because we're paying the interest, and we're about to get to the point where we can't make the interest payments. That's the reality of the situation. I believe there is a non-lethal way out of this. But we have to understand the scale of the problem. Anyway that you go about this, there's going to be 100 to 150,000 horses that are going to have to be dealt with in some way to get to AML. If we started today, okay? That's 150,000. How many cups of coffee is that if you have one each day? You know? Just think of it like that. It's an incredible amount. And so, all that to say this. This is my swag, and it may be some other folks' swag. There may be more horses, certainly as many horses on reservation lands than there is in the whole federal system right now. And of course, horses don't observe the sovereign boundary of reservations. They move back and forth, even in the best of situations. They crawl through fences. They crawl over them. Fences aren't maintained on both sides. And so, my concern has been, if we were to get to AML, there's going to be a vacuum filled, at least in those areas around the Res. Those horses are going to come off the res, and they're going to be on public lands, and we may be right back where we were. So, the question is this: What is BLM and what is forest service doing? Is Hope still here? What is BLM and forest service doing to coordinate, for lack of a better term, with each of these -- each tribe is sovereign, and they have different governmental organizations and so on and so forth. What is being done to coordinate with them to sort of at least be ready for what could happen if this were to go down? Or if they wanted to participate in this

overall endeavor that we have to try and get a handle on this debt curve that's bloody out of control right now.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: Well, I think a major piece of it, you know, I can't speak for the tribal governments and how they're going to manage their land and horses. I see our role as opening lines of communications with those folks further. Of knowing that we've seen it in many places where you create a vacuum every time you remove animals. You pull them, and establish some level of equilibrium within the area. But, you know, it's going to be -- the lines of communication of trying to figure out, you know, this is what we've done, where can we help? Or at least, you know, give them experience, you know? We work closely with the forest service, so I think we will be okay. We can work through those, because as we achieve AML, I hope our partnerships and co-management of some of these areas are bringing forest service with us. But the tribal ground and state horses and things like that will always be something that we have to consider them drawing in, especially if our habitat starts improving. Forage starts creating and the brown horse comes and visits and brings all of his buddies with him across the tribal fence.

>> BARRY PERRYMAN: And now you're talking about health issues as well. I think it would be good if BLM actually had an action plan for going to the various tribal governments and saying, Look, our problem is your problem and your problem is our problem, and we probably need to see what we can do to combine all of our resources and ideas and see if we can't, you know, come to some kind of a hopefully non-lethal solution to this.

But back to the scale, just for everybody's benefit, we're talking about 125,000 horses BLM going in. And we have to figure something else out. Double that. That's probably what the real number is. It's probably closer to that than what we're just dealing with here. That's the scale of the problem that we're facing here. It's -- out of control doesn't describe the situation.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Tom?

>> TOM LENZ: When do you expect an answer from congress?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: I can't answer that.

[Laughter]

I wanted it the next day, but that didn't happen. We will wait until they give us the direction they would like us to follow.

>> TOM LENZ: And what expertise do they have?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: I'm hoping they have staffers that are looking through it and reading through the report that we gave them, and at some point will ask us to sit down and clarify it. I have talked to the appropriations staff when we released it on both houses, and they asked a lot of good questions, but

it was definitely just cursory-type questions. But I think that will come down to the individual, you know, congressmen and their staffer read through the document and formulate their own process of where they want to take it from there.

>> If we figure there's 80, 90,000 horses out there and half of them are mares and almost all of them are pregnant, we know we can't spay them the first 120 to 140 days, because the fetus maintains pregnancy. And we haven't had a research project done to determine how far into pregnancy we can spay them -- you may be able to do it throughout pregnancy. We may not. I don't know yet. So, that number, 10,000 a year, may not be feasible.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: Like I said, these are, I guess, our best guess to achieve that time frame of looking at that ten-year period of time, that, you know, we know coming out of it that that's our best hope, you know? In reality, is it really going to take us 15 or 20 years using that approach? But the big thing is the numbers we generated and thought through were based on that ten-year target. And that's what makes you look at it and swallow really hard and close your eyes and beg and things like that. But it's a lot of work. And a lot of animals to deal with. You know? And a lot of expertise.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: I appreciate that, but we have more discussion that we need to do. This is a very important topic for us, and so, let me have just a little bit more time, okay? I saw her. Bruce has a question.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I don't have a question, but I know, getting to your question, Tom, about -- and Alan is right. If we will get a response. I have received a few phone calls. Some folks are reading it, and this is good. These guys took a lot of effort to get that done.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: I think it's a good effort. But I assume if they asked for it, they would respond to it. Maybe it's not a valid assumption.

[Laughter]

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: It wasn't one of the assumptions we went into it with.

>> I have been in this for ten years, when I adopted my first mustang. And in that ten years, I've heard a lot of talk, but pretty much what's happened is status quo. People wish they had double the budget. They wish they had more tools in the tool box. But, nothing has changed in ten years. And the concern that I have is right now, it's beyond the control of the status quo, like the ship has sailed. We can't catch up to it. It's gone. And I don't know if we can out-spend it. I don't know if we can catch up, to be really honest.

So, the concern that I have is I think that it's more of a triage kind of situation. A lot of the HMAs are too far gone to be saved, to be honest. So, that begs the question, how big is the problem going to get, and how can you begin doing

trriage to save what you can? And Gus today mentioned that there may be over 800 horses outside of HMAs, and -- 800 horses outside of HMAs in Utah alone. In Nevada, that number could be in the tens of thousands outside of the HMAs, and probably thousands outside of the HAS.

So, we're looking at 31 million acres just inside of the HMAs, and if we continue down the status quo, we might have tens of thousands of horses on 40 million acres or 50 million acres or 60 million acres, and it's just going to get bigger and bigger and bigger, and more and more out of control. And I wonder, is there anything that we can do to cap it at 31 million acres and have our triage and sacrifice it so that it doesn't become 40 or 50 or 60 million acres over the next few decades? Is there anything with fencing or with priorities or anybody talking about containing it at 30 million acres?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: I think the main thing is one of our priorities that we will be -- I hope that we're definitely looking at is under a normal situation, which we currently aren't at, but under a normal situation, we would be targeting the HMA areas and HA areas around our existing established HMAs. If we can go in and target those, we can keep that expansion, which was already expanding. If we can control that, and then start making in-roads into it. That's some of our first steps, and that will be priority work, and work that each individual state, when they recommend their HMAs for treatment for management, they should be looking at those type of things of, where our issues are at, can we solve it in this gather? Or is it two gathers or whatever? They definitely all of our states need to be looking at how do we control those expansion animals plus the HA animals where we're not managing them long-term as we're working with the long-term management areas within the HMAs?

>> BEN MASTERS: Is there any budget for fencing to try to help with that expansion?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: At this point in time, we spend very little on that type of work.

>> BEN MASTERS: If money was allocated for fencing, would it be beneficial?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: You're dealing with grazing allotment and wildlife habitats and things like that. You could be placing a fence in a migration corridor for big game animals, for example, in Wyoming. That's a big issue right now with the secretary managing those critical migration corridors for big game. We could be boxing in animals, you know? I can't say that it's a definite thing, but we have to look at those type of things to see if there's a way to control movement away from where we want to do management. The wildlife staff and everybody to look at some of that management very collaboratively and come up with the best mechanism, especially if we get told you're going to do this within this period of time.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Celeste?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: My understanding of these options, and I could be wrong is congress was a little bit grumpy and said you have 30 days. That's not enough time to truly analyze members of this scope. And Paul and I are fond of saying we do a lot of back of the envelope calculations. But then after you've done those, you have to get down into the weeds and into the nitty gritty. I'm hopeful that congress understands that in the presentation of these four options, that these are very basic starting points, because otherwise, these are not good options.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: We made it very clear when we talked to folks about it that this is the national AML. It's not HMA by HMA by HMA. In any scenario we run, you're going to have HMAs that are low AML, mid AML, and high AML, and twice AML. And you're going to have -- your average, the goal, the average is going to be the national AML. And then we can start looking at that other stuff. But, it's going to come down to once we really get -- if we implement whatever direction we go, that's when the more finite pencil pushing gets going with, you know, HMAs by HMA or complexes or states. And then how it melds into that national number.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Ginger?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: You can go ahead. I hadn't planned on saying this at all, but I think that it's time that we looked at the whole program in a very different way. And I think that the HMA concepts haven't been successful in a lot of places because there are so many conflicts. In 1998 or whenever Pat became the director of the BLM, he came to Colorado, and he met with me. And he had a concept of wild horse commons. You wouldn't have all of these little herds all over the place, but you would, within an area in each state in which they are designated, you would have a common area where you have wild horses, and it would be managed primarily for the wildlife. And they would not have livestock grazing. Because a lot of the conflicts come from the multiple-use concept. And this is something that I have rejected immediately when the director said that, because it would require opening up the Wild Horse and Burro act and looking at management of wild horses in a completely different way that wasn't one that comported with the law. But, I'm just throwing this out here, because I'm very willing to sit down with BLM or anybody that would want to discuss a really truly different way of looking at wild horses, where they could be truly viable populations of animals, not 20 in one HMA and 153 in another, and 24 in another. They're just not viable. And when you really are striving to get to AML, which is the number that is probably reflected what it was when the act was passed, when they were fast disappearing, I don't think that's realistic. I don't think it's genetically realistic. And so I just throw it out there that I would love to

embrace discussions on ways which the animals could be managed in large herds in a couple of places that don't interfere with other activities and they would be primarily for wildlife. I say primarily for wildlife, because we know that, and Gus as mentioned this, we know where predators can be protected, but there are even natural management tools that are possible, augmented with humane PZP. I'm not saying we wouldn't try to maintain in numbers in that way. I just throw it out there, Alan, because you've been around for a long time, and we've been through so many struggles together. And I mean, how many animals -- what would be the method of killing the animals that you're talking about?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: We would use whatever the approved method would be. You know? That would be the consultation with our vet advisors and things like that to be the appropriate, most humane way practical. Most likely it would be animals that we've already removed from the range, and/or certain adoptability or salability or whatever. You would definitely have to look into that criteria. But it would be the most humane method.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: That would probably be a gunshot. That would be the most humane method of dealing with this. They didn't even know what hit them. But I mean, this is a pretty emotional issue.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: We're going hear from Jim and Hope, because we're running out of time. Daniel is giving me a really mean look, and I don't want him mad at me. Jim, go ahead and talk, and Ms. Hope, you'll have a chance to talk, and then we'll move on to the next item on the agenda. If you want to have a seat up here, you can. You don't need to stand there.

>> JIM FRENCH: I was going to confine my comment to one issue, but now I have more after listening to Ginger. Relative to re-writing how the Wild Horse and Burro act is administered would not only crack open the act itself, but also NEPA and -- so getting that accomplished through congress is going to be -- not going be easy by comparison to what we have in front of us. I just wanted to say that. The other side of it, from -- did we provide specific program proposals to affect the 40,000 adoptions to congress to get that increased public awareness or public activity or public acceptance in the removal of horses from their responsibility? We had a sliding scale in terms of the number of adoptions, and I wonder if housed within this, if there is any indication as to how we will go about marketing to that degree.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: For the three or four main approaches is, for the most part, we had to assume our adoption level was going to be static for most cases, except where we had the incentive, and the goal of the incentive was to double, basically, that status. So, if we adopted more in a year, we may not have to sell as many, or we may not have to do as many

sterilizations or that type of work. I think one of the main things we discussed is if we're successful with placement, that will affect a lot of the components of each option of what we can do and can't do.

So we all know we need to do a better job of placement of animals, whether if it's marketing or, you know, just getting the word out better or however, getting new markets. And Holle has talked more about that and will talk more about it. But I think the way we have to approach these scenarios or these options is the fact that we have to look at some of those things as a very static thing, because we can't see the future. And so we looked at it as that 4,000 number for adoptions, for example, per year for ten years is about what we're averaging over the last period of time. So, we stayed at that level with the options were we boosted the incentive was to hope to magnify that either one or twofold.

>> JIM FRENCH: I get that. Thank you.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I would like to respond to Dr. Perryman, and I would like to present Dr. Francisco, who is our region three Arizona New Mexico wild horse and burro as well as feral, unauthorized, and special status coordinator who has been working with tribes. She's been looking at this issue, so I would like to present Dr. Francisco to answer that question.

>> Many of the tribes have come to me and asked me the same question. So, when I took this position in January 2017, one of the first things that I looked at, because of something that I have been working on in my own Pueblo in New Mexico, because we have about 7,000 on our 700,000-acre reservation. We have about 7,000 feral horses. And so, having the relations that I've had as a veterinarian for 28 years with tribes and with native people, when I came to the forest service, I brought that relationship. And so we started working with New Mexico State University, Dr. Sam Smalage put on an all voices summit in March of this year where we invited the tribes. So, we want to really engage the tribes in New Mexico and Arizona. Because what we've found out is that, you know, obviously where we have national forests, we are adjacent to tribal lands. And many of those horses don't know that they're on forest service land, and they don't know that they're on reservation land. We get what other people don't want. So, somebody says I can't feed the horse anymore, so they bring it to the reservation and let the Indians, because the Indians all love horses. We are finding that on all tribal lands that we have an abundance of unwanted horses that now belong to the tribes, and they become BLM or forest service. So, we have a relationship, and we are working very hard. In August, we sponsored a one-day summit and had the USDA there and all the different tribal governments from New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Colorado, California, the south western region. And some of the tribes talked about some pretty hard decisions that they have to make. But nobody wants to see what

happened on the Navajo nation happen again, where you have 191 horses die in a mud pit. It wasn't something that was pleasant for anybody to see, and so those are things that we are working with and relationships that I am working to strengthen and hoping that we can definitely, because we know that these are -- these are tough decisions that have to be made. And tribes want to make the right decision. This was our country. No offense to any of you, but this was my country before it was any of yours. So, I definitely want to make my country strong, and that's why I served in the Air Force. So, I am a veteran. I have a deep, deep love for this country and the animals, which is why I became a veterinarian. So the tribes come, and we are working it out. So, the forest service is forward-thinking in knowing that part of the partnerships that we have to forge are those with the tribes. The tribes are not very trusting of the U.S. government. I know that surprises a lot of people. But the tribes are not very supportive of the U.S. government. So, if I can as a government employee, and as a tribal person, build those relationships so that we can do what is right for the horses in the most humane matter, that is what we are doing and what the forest service wants to do.

>> Can I ask where tribes are sovereign nations, what are some of the tribes doing that we could glean some ideas that they have come up with for their excess number of wild horses?

>> DR. FRANCISCO: There was a horse hunt proposed, to hunt 60 horses on a remote location, but they faced a lot of outward opposition to that. Other tribes have thought about the same thing. One question that we get asked all the time, and I say we, meaning government officials. It was asked multiple times in our meeting in Colorado in August, why can't we slaughter horses? And we just, you know, we have to explain that. We did have people there from the food safety inspection service that explained to the tribes the history of what happened. And so the tribes were better educated on why that stopped and why it was not permissible currently. But those are some of the things.

Other tribes, I will just be honest with you, are probably doing things that people don't want to talk about. That's all I know.

>> Thank you very much. Appreciate it. I appreciate your input. Paul, you got to be an auctioneer, because we have Mr. Paul right behind you.

>> HOPE WOODWARD: I should have come up a long time ago and put the pressure on Alan. I warned Dan that he was long-winded.

[Laughter]

>> FRED WOEHLE, JR.: It's Dan's fault.

>> HOPE WOODWARD: It's Alan's fault.

[Laughter]

I'll be brief. It has been introduced several times throughout this meeting today, and that's the adoption incentive program. One of the things that I think Alan hit on was that it was a part -- it was identified as a part of the report that was submitted to congress, the management options for sustainable program. I'll say that that's the title. And that was submitted back in April, and he already went through all of that. So, I'll just go over the goals of the adoption incentive program. The overall goal is to increase the number of animals that are placed into private care through adoption. And the board members that have been here before and others that are watching, you recall me mentioning an adoption incentive program that was a pilot that was in New Mexico that they did for a number of years, and basically, the incentive they were offering was \$500 one time, and what they found is it did not increase the number of animals placed in private care, it just changed the type of animals. We are hoping this was a thousand-dollar total opportunity for adopters to receive two payments, one of \$500 at the time of adoption date, and \$500 at the time of title date. We like to encourage new individuals and organizations that are not currently purchasing to come out. We want to reach a different market. We want to encourage new individuals as well as reengage the prior adopters that may have been there before to consider adopting additional animals. It was time for him to come get another. If we have adopters that are coming to adopt animals every 25 years, then we can change that, for sure. Every animal that leaves the -- it is freeing up space for Alan to remove more animals, and a cost savings to us as well. The \$1,000 incentive is less than we would pay for the cost of an animal to stay in off-range corrals. Michael will be able to provide that information to you at the next board meeting, I'm guessing. Those cost savings will contribute to improving rangeland health. So, the adoption incentive, this is a draft policy that has been developed that is in the process of being approved. They will be able to choose if they wanted to participate and understand that they would be expected to of course adhere to the prohibited acts in terms of adoption, which is already a requirement as an adopter. And then they would be required to complete a separate form in addition to the adoption application. If they are participating, they would complete an adoption incentive agreement that has several different questions, and I identified the expectation that we would have of this adopter. And they would also be providing financial institution information for the direct deposit of the \$500 initial fee. The initial fee of \$500 incentive payment will be paid 60 days within the adoption date. It would be an electronic deposit, which is why we require the financial information, and the second payment would be eligible once the adopter completed all of their title application information, compliance

inspections, and all of those things would be required for submitting for the second \$500 incentive payment.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Holle, is there any training requirements with this as far as --

>> HOPE WOODWARD: Next slide.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: No, no, I'm talking about to get the money.

>> HOPE WOODWARD: Training? No.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: So they don't have to touch the horse or anything?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: Nope. Just adopting. This is to encourage new adopters and re-engage the old ones. So, the only requirement is that they would, of course adhere to appropriate acts in terms of adoption, and also the terms that are identified on the incentive agreement.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: And can you briefly discuss those? Or has that been done?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: It's being developed, but it's in draft, so I would rather not until it's finalized. The incentive program would work for all animals, all untrained wild horses and burros would be eligible, regardless of age, sex, color. And whether or not they are trained, doesn't matter the number of times that the animal has been offered, because it's an adoption. So, all animals whenever this program is launched sometime this fall would be eligible for this particular program.

An applicant can choose to adopt and not purchase the animal. The sale eligible animals that participate in the adoption incentive program. As I stated earlier, if an animal was sale eligible, it can still be adopted. If there's an animal being offered and says hey, you can purchase this animal, and they say I want to participate in the adoption incentive program, they would be able to do so. The adoption fees would be -- could be competitive or non-competitive. We have had kind of gone back and changed the format on a number of events. So, it just depends on the event. That would be identified in all of the advertising, as it is now. And again, trained animals are not eligible for this particular incentive. This is an extra thought. The reality is that the off-range holding numbers may not increase dramatically, however, we are wanting to implement this particular adoption program in an effort to assist BLM in regaining balanced populations and rangelands. That's really the goal. So, I know that this is not going to place 36,000 animals into private care, but it is one of the next tools, next steps, one of the components of getting that done. So, many new things that have been coming out of off-range, I talked earlier that we have increased the number of online corral events. We've increased the number of adoptions or sale events that take place at the off-range corrals. That has changed, and we have encouraged the facility managers to host more than one in a one

big drum bone. It's going to have a lot of different ingredients in order for us to move and increase the number of animals placed into private care.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Questions?

>> JIM FRENCH: I have a question, and I'm going to think outside of the box. I wonder how we arrived at the 500,000 number. The first time I heard this incentive program proposed was at a national association of counties meeting in Washington dc, and Neil Kornze presented that at the time, and he mentioned \$10,000 for that incentive. \$10,000 is obviously a lot of money, but when you are talking \$48,000 for the life of the horse, there is still \$38,000 going back to the treasury, in my math. I come back to that first question, is how did we arrive at \$1,000?

>> HOPE WOODWARD: Just to comment on the \$10,000 in the previous proposal, there have been several discussions about incentive payments, and that was \$10,000 for ten years, so it still averaged to \$1,000 per year. That one had challenges about committing appropriation dollars in future years when we weren't really sure what the funding would look like for the program. But the thousand dollars in this particular scenario did take into account that based on FY16 and FY17 numbers, we averaged the cost of an animal in off-range corral for one year to be \$1,825, and that's based on a \$5 per head per day amount at corrals. So, Michael did some average, and he's an amazing person in spreadsheets and his projections and things like that, and felt like that was his recommendation, was the \$1,000 was a reasonable number. We went forward to request that maybe we do 1,000 initiative and \$500 later or 500 initiative and 1,000 later. But it was said, let's offer \$1,000, which is a fair amount, more than we're offering adopters now. And we can see where it goes.

>> JIM FRENCH: Thanks. I appreciate that. Going back to your comment you made about the guy who, \$25 years before he come back for an additional adoption, and we need to fix that. How about a sliding scale? How about, you know, kind of the thousands for the first one and three thousand for the second? A sliding scale? So if you -- give the incentive for somebody to take two or three of them off the books at one time to have that ability and that desire to do that. I don't understand how that would be a bad thing for the program. And it would certainly give the incentive for that fella who's looking for an additional -- has the room for and looking for an additional mustang for his family to maybe pick up three or two.

>> HOPE WOODWARD: That's a good comment, and a good thought. We did think about a sliding scale, and increasing, but I won't even go through the challenges in trying to explain, you know, the budget people. They're just like pulling their hair out about oh my God, are we going the use those funds? Are you

sure it's authorized? So lots of discussion about this. Everybody was a team player, and okay, how do we get to yes in this particular scenario? So I think there's potential to do more, Jim, 100%. But I think we start manageable and small first, and see how well it goes.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: This was a recommendation made by the board back in 2015, and part of that was tip trainers for mustang heritage get \$1. If I'm a tip trainer and you come and adopt a horse for \$125, mustang heritage pays me \$1,000. BLM pays more than that because they're managing the program. But that was the amount that we had set back then. And so, that's when that was. You have 30 seconds.

>> BEN MASTERS: I think there's a lot of demand for mustangs, because they are really good horses and they get a lot of pride out of owning a mustang. And I think that for the majority of the public who want one, they -- a lot of people can't train them themselves, because they don't have that skill set. And usually after about three months or so of work, you can get these wild horses in a pretty good place as far as being able to pass it on to another individual. And while we were sitting here thinking about it, if that number was raised from \$1,000 to \$2500, that is enough money to pay a horse trainer for three to four, maybe even five months' worth of horse training, and it would be a very attractive incentive to a lot of people that I know to pick out their own mustang and take it to their trainer of choice, and then to have it trained for a long enough period of time where the chances are that horse would reach a level of training where it could have a really good relationship with that buyer. The \$1,000 incentive, I don't know if that's enough time or enough money to pay for a trainer to get that horse to the point of where it could be used by the general public. That was just a comment that I thought was worth making. I really don't have a question. It was more of just a comment.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Okay.

>> HOPE WOODWARD: And there's no requirement to train the animals that are adopted ever. That's not a BLM requirement. That's the choice to that adopter. And the purpose of this adoption incentive, I know you mentioned \$1,000 from the 2015 recommendation, but this was really kind of a more of an analysis of what makes sense for this program, and what can we really afford? Our potential budgets and other challenges that we have within it? So I think if, and I would encourage again, this would be the third time I've said it in this group, but there are lots of organizations that are interested, and they should totally develop some training programs so they can assist adopters or be mentors or assist people in some kind of way, create a Facebook and reach out and be available to them. I think that's wonderful and people should completely do that. And the host of people that you have heard a couple people say there

are lots of people who want these horses? I encourage them to come and get them. Go to the adoption events or online corral events, and encourage them to adopt and sale. For BLM to have to dress it up for any expectation is a high thing. I promise I will wrap up in just a second. Many of the things we talk about are changes and are not the norm that we have been doing within BLM. So, let's see if this one works, and then we can make adjustments once it's successful.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Good deal. Thank you, Holle. As Paul comes up to present his program, in is -- Barry has an important meeting tomorrow, so he won't be here tomorrow, so I would like to give him a few minutes to make a statement.

>> BARRY PERRYMAN: I just wanted to say -- I was going to say something else, but I'm going to say this. I can't be here tomorrow, and so the board will have to make some decisions. We may try to get on the phone call. But service being what it is in this neck of the woods, out in the boonies, it may be problematic. I wanted to say, first of all, with the passage of the Wild Horse and Burro Act, the original authorization, we had the ability, we had the potential to show the world how to manage horses and burros in a thriving or to a thriving ecological balance in a multi-use environment. We had that ability to do that. We had the opportunity to do that. Instead, we're sitting here however many years later talking about a national disgrace. The horse nation -- the horse nation. They have their own stories. They have their own songs. And we have let this thing get so out of balance that our disgrace has become their disgrace. And so, I try not to get too emotional, but, as the board moves forward in their deliberations and their work groups tomorrow, I encourage the board to really think about the public thrust, the public interest, and that interest has to include the resource base. If you don't have the resource base, you don't have anything. That's where it all begins and ends at. You've got to have the habitat and the resource base. If we don't have the resource base, then we don't have any options for the future. The resource base is not managed appropriately. There's no options for the future. At least they're very, very limited. We talked about that a couple of times today. So, I encourage you in your deliberations going forward to really consider that aspect of this whole management scenario that we're dealing with. And with that, that's enough. Thank you for your indulgence.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Thank you, Barry. All right. Paul that's a tough act to follow, but you've got it.

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: It is, but I feel like yesterday, I already got to do an audition to that act. In one of the working groups, we already talked, really, about the research that has to do with population growth suppression. I think that it is the research that probably is of the greatest interest to the

board. But there are research topics that we support, including genetics. Survey methods, which are becoming a larger issue with safety concerns. Population modeling and demography. Let me echo people for thanking you for all of the efforts to advise the program. Yesterday you asked me to talk, and maybe I can review super quickly what we know about the fertility control measures that we know already work. I sensed yesterday that there might have been some discussion that board members would have liked to have about the research projects.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: I think you did a good job yesterday during the working group of a brief overview and then let the board ask questions.

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: Okay. Thank you. We know that PZP works well in both horses and burros. PZP pellets work for about a year, and they may lead to two or three more years of marginally more improved effects after a PZP booster dose, but it doesn't cause great effects for the first year or two. And there may be some variation in batch quality for the pellets. We know that the vaccine doesn't have great effects after the first dose, but after a booster dose, the second overall dose, it can lead to four years of overall pretty good 80% percent contraception, at least. That is at least four years. Could be longer. Gelding, sterilizing stallions, and we're learning more about behavior effects, but at first blush, the effects seem pretty minimal. I mentioned that gelded stallions held their harems similar to fertile stallions.

We know that spaying mares via colpotomy leads to permanent and immediate sterilization and reduced growth rates. And spayed mares continued to be in bands with other horses. They did not go off by themselves and become solitary. The study that we're wanting to do will provide more detail about the effects of colpotomy -- spaying. So, I'm taking a different approach to everybody else.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Does any of the board have questions? The board recognizes Steven Yardley.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As far as that Oregon study, how far out are they on that? Or what all has been done on that thus far?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: It is ongoing right now.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: And when will that take place? Or anticipated to?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: The research aspect to that project is under litigation, but our schedule would be for it to begin -- like I said yesterday, I've got to preface anything about the Warm Springs, the full disclosure about the true details is in the environmental assessment. Don't take my word for truth about this, but my understanding is that that could begin in late October with radio collaring. Then spaying to follow. That's assuming --

>> BARRY PERRYMAN: Could you confirm what I heard? About

the effectiveness in the field and so on and so forth with approximate Spay Vac?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: So there was an initial study that found that Spay Vac was promising as a vaccine. It's a PZP vaccine, instead of being oil-based or in capsules or in pellets, the PZP is surrounded by liposomes, and would lead to a long-lasting immune response. The initial trial, Alan, maybe you can confirm for me, was that Carson City? Yeah. A couple of years of good response after one year of Spay Vac. USGS followed up with a second dose at Paul's valley in Oklahoma, also in captivity. And there I think they had one reasonably good year after the dose, but then the second year was not so good. There is one of the investors or a person who works in the company who now makes Spay Vac. We have been in contact. The second trial was not promising. There could have been a number of variables that led to that promising outcome. We don't know which of those variables it was. Could it have been the location of the injection site? The quality of the batch? A number of things. But the bottom line is second trial was a real big disappointment. And so, you know, I would guess that BLM could be open to looking at further studies of Spay Vac if the company demonstrates that it works again.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Alan, I heard that in some of the recent PZP use that the vaccine was not as viable as it has been in the past, that there was a quality issue?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: Are you talking liquid PZP?

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: What I was told is --

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: You're probably alluding to earlier results that I can't share, because they're held in confidence from one of the researchers. But we do have preliminary results from one of the studies that indicated that a comparison of PZP produced in 2016 was less -- had a lower effectiveness than PZP produced in 2018 at the University of Toledo. When I was alluding to variation in batch quality for PZP for the PZP22, that was the basis for that. The antibody titer response wasn't what we were hoping it would have been in some data that we've seen.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Go ahead, Ginger.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: The NAS report recommended, you know, certain types of infertility treatments, and they did not recommend an ovariectomy. They said it may be followed by prolonged bleeding or infection, and makes it inadvisable for field application. Has something changed that we would amend that decision with the NAS, do you think?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: I would want to re-read what that report said. I don't think that the word recommendation is there. They were listed as the three most promising methods, but the report did not say that other methods were not promising. Yes, additional information has been shared since 2013, and it was made public in the first Oregon environmental

assessment in 2016, that was the 2015 panel convened to assess a number of different spaying methods, their risks, their costs, other concerns or things that BLM should be aware of when choosing a method. That 2015 report concluded that colpotomy was one of the most promising of the spay methods available for a use by BLM. I also think that it's an important misnomer that I need to point out here is that the proposed work at Warm Springs for horses that would be coming from Warm Springs, as clarified in the EA, would not be conducted in the field. No one at BLM has considered using gelding or spaying in an HMA. These animals would be removed from the HMA, transported to the corral, which you have visited, and the facility there is set up with padded squeeze chutes for appropriate restraint of an animal, of animals, that is suitable for this type of surgery. So, it shouldn't be interpreted as a method that's being considered for use in the field.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: At that meeting it was presented in that way, because I remember Steven asked about using it in in the field.

>> FRED WOEHLE, JR.: We have Dr. Tom Lynch who had the review of everything, and I think he would like to address this issue.

>> TOM LENZ: You have to appreciate that the corral is the field. When they say the surgery can be done in the field, it doesn't mean it's done out where they caught the horses. It's not done in a clinic, right?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: I stand corrected. Thank you for the clarification. So, a corral is considered in the field.

>> FRED WOEHLE, JR.: That's the way that I understood it. It could be done in a corral, but it doesn't have to be done in a sterile environment, which is difficult to achieve, especially on a large number of horses coming off of the range.

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: One reason that the ovariectomy is preferred is because there is a smaller incision for healing.

>> TOM LENZ: I think we reviewed 20 or 30 proposals and ended up recommending either nine or 11. It was in 2014. So, I don't remember the four of them were surgical procedures. One was ablation of the oviduct papulation in the uterus, with a laser, you would scar that, so the fertilized egg couldn't pass to the uterus, and so they would be sterile. The other was a forward-looking scope, putting a ligature around the oviduct to cut off the blood supply to the ovary. The reality was that some of the ovaries caused adhesions in the abdomen or dropped to the floor, and maintained the production of hormones, so the mares continued to cycle. The other was a laser and cutting the oviduct and tube. That one could not be done in the field because of equipment. You would have to have a laser guided endoscope, so that is tens of thousands of dollars that would not work well in the field. Spay Vac is most promising for this type of procedure for these type of horses in this type of

environment.

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: Thank you very much about the reminder about the review of the proposals. The report that Mrs. Katherine mentions by the national academy of sciences. You could look at that as additional information that came in afterwards. One of the recommendations was actually that spaying via colpotomy may not best be considered a research project, because it was already demonstrated for use in management, and that maybe one should consider it as a pilot project. So, that's a semantic argument, but the main thing that I wanted to point out was that the national academy of science review panel concluded that spaying via colpotomy was suitable for use in management.

>> TOM LENZ: And the surgery itself is not the experiment. It's the stage of the pregnancy and how the horses interact and stuff like that, correct? This is not a brand-new surgery that we dreamed up. This is an old surgery. As a matter of fact, I've got two mares that were done six years ago.

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: It's a well-established procedure.

>> TOM LENZ: But it was to determine what stage of pregnancy you could perform the procedure on?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: I'm getting to the point where I would want to pass the comments to an expert.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Anybody else?

>> I would like to comment that Dr. Julie was on board before Dr. Lenz, and she was in favor of this. She thought this was a very promising procedure for population control and something that the board should really push for and the BLM should push for. But it showed a lot of promise, so I know that was one of the biggest things that she hoped to see happen was this go into full effect.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: I was asked this twice this week. Can you explain the formulation of PZP? How is it derived? Where does it come from?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: Sure. Pig ovaries are macerated or cut up, and the tissue that's surrounded developing eggs, basically, is removed under a microscope, harvested, if you will, and then purified through filters. And then --

>> I don't want to put words in the chairman's mouth, but I think what he was wanting to know is how many piglets had to be sacrificed for each dose of PZP?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: I don't know.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: The people that were talking to me about this were kind of curious that the sacrifice of one animal was okay. And to, you know, to do stuff like this.

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: I mentioned yesterday that Purdue university is looking into the development of a recombinant ZT protein, which would be harvested from microbes, where the microbes are grown in vats. They spit out the protein, the protein is purified, and you know exactly what the concentration

is and what the source is. So, there's something appealing about that in many ways. But it has to be demonstrated that it is biologically active. So, we know that has been demonstrated in studies in south Africa and India, but if we put it in wild horses, we want to know that it works and what concentrations and all of the protocols.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: This is my fifth year on the board, and we are always in strong support in all birth control methods, not just one. One is not all we need, but all of them. I support the use of PZP in the areas where it can work. But it's not an answer for everything. Anybody else have a question?

>> JIM FRENCH: I'm curious, currently what is the cost of a dose of PZP?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: A dose of liquid PZP is about \$28, that is to say the cost of purchasing that dose is \$28. The cost of PZP2 pellet vaccine is \$580, and the other is about \$50. That doesn't mean it's \$30 to give a mare a dose of PZP, because you have to have that mare in hand. To get the mare in hand, you have to capture her, and to capture a mare, you typically have to capture -- if you look at the age structure and so on, probably at least a stallion and .4 or .5 foals on average. So, if you're talking about \$1,000 to capture each animal, it's a \$30PZP dose, and then \$3,000 to catch the animals. There has been discussions about which HMAs are suitable for darting. And you have to know what that mare is and what her history is. You use a different regimen if it's a primer or booster dose. If you give two primer doses, it leads to horrible abscessing.

>> What would the cost potentially for an ovariectomy via colpotomy?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: I'm going to make wide margins and say 300 to \$600.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: We've got about three minutes.

>> Mr. Chairman, is PZP22 now dartable?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: We have been told that it is dartable. We're not confident -- we're a little hesitant to dart it, because we would like to see a further demonstration about how often all of those pellets get injected and to the right musculature and so on. So, we're hesitant to rely on darting for PZP22.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Anybody else?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: There's always other research that we support.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: You went over a lot of that yesterday in our working group.

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: There's research about genetic viability and, you know, we do ongoing monitoring to make sure that each herd --

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: I'd like to hear about that, but you've got about three minutes.

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: 30 seconds, we have an ongoing cooperation with Texas A & M University. Our handbook calls for roughly every ten years, we try to sample a number of animals from herds when they're gathered. We send off the samples, and we get information about heterozygosity. The population right now is four times what it was, or, you know, in 1971. Genetic viability is not really a big concern for most populations, and moreover, each herd really shouldn't be considered an isolated population, as Mr. French pointed out that there's a lot of movement between herds, and we can facilitate movement as management agency to make sure that each herd is viable.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Is there a minimum number in a herd to be genetically viable?

>> PAUL GRIFFIN: If you had an endangered species like a toad living in one pond, then yes. Different people will give you different numbers whether it's 50 or 500 or 5,000. But horses are not an endangered species. They number in the millions around the planet. They come from breeds that are pretty well known. Most come from breeds that have recently come about, and they're not isolated. If there are isolated herds, geographically, there's nothing in the act that says that they need maintained by themselves. BLM has a purview to move animals between herds.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Are we gone? Are we through?

>> Public comment period tomorrow, you need to sign up at the back of the room...

[Spoken off microphone].

We never checked with Sue.

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: She was supposed to have called in. I didn't want to call her, because she was supposed to have called in.

>> That's okay.

>> SUE: I'm here! I've been here all day!

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Yes, Lord!

[Laughter]

>> SUE: Did you need something?

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: You didn't ask any questions.

>> SUE: Well, everybody was doing a good job asking questions, and there was only a couple of times that I had burning questions, and decided it was time to move on.

[Laughter]

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Well, you're missed.

>> SUE: It has been nice to listen. Sounds like you're having a really good discussion on everything, which is so helpful.

>> Can you ask her if she has been hearing everything okay?

>> FRED WOHL, JR.: Have you been hearing everything

okay?

>> SUE McDONNELL: I have heard your voice really well, but some of the others, it would be nice if they were closer to the microphones, because sometimes it fades in and out. The presenter's microphone has been pretty good. I could hear everybody.

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: You could hear Steven, right?

>> SUE McDONNELL: Exactly. Steve is one that I could always hear.

[Laughter]

>> FRED WOEHL, JR.: Well that's good. That's good. All right. Well, the meeting will reconvene in the morning at 8:00 a.m. As of right now the meeting is adjourned.

[Adjourned at 5: 00MDT]

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WILD HORSE AND BURRO ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH
OCTOBER 11, 2018
8:00 A.M.

* * *

REALTIME CAPTIONING AND/OR CART (COMMUNICATIONS ACCESS REALTIME TRANSLATION) ARE PROVIDED IN ORDER TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION ACCESSIBILITY AND MAY NOT BE A TOTALLY VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

* * *

>> FRED WOEHL: Good morning.
Good morning.
We will start.
Everybody take their seats, please.
Ms. Kristin has a shock gun up here.
She's shocking me already because we are five minutes late already.
So we are going to get started.
I thank everybody for coming today.
We had a very interesting meeting yesterday.
We learned April awful lot about an awful lot of stuff.
We had great interaction with the board and great interaction with the presenters and it was a remarkable day, I thought.
And today is going to be just as good.
So without any further ado, I'm going to turn it over to my friend Mr. Bruce, who is going to introduce the speakers this morning.
>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Well, thank you again, everyone this morning.
Today we will start the morning off with a panel discussion, and on talking about healthy horses and healthy rangelands and it's a follow-up from, I think, a lot of the discussion we had yesterday.
So I feel very honored that -- Fred, do you want to go over the rules of the room first again?
>> FRED WOEHL: Is this anybody here who was not here yesterday to hear the rules of the room?

I think if you don't mind, I think before we have public comment period, I will have you do it at that point.

Is that okay?

All right.

Thank you.

>> One quick thing, we do have Dr. Barry Perryman and I assume Don will be on the phone.

We want to remember that they will both be participating.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes, correct.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Thank you.

Well, again, I'm really excited about this panel.

I think this is going to be one of the best parts of this meeting.

I think it's already been a great meeting so far, and I feel really honored that we got the four people that we got to come today.

Some came from pretty far away, and some are fairly local.

But -- and we'll provide that conduit and context of the complex management of public lands and a multiple use environment.

So I will introduce the folks all and then they have kind of drawn numbers and -- and they are going to go in that.

So the order that I introduce them is the order that they are going to present.

So first of all, I would like to introduce Nancy Perry.

Nancy works for the American society for the prevention of cruelty of animals.

She is their vice president for government relations, overseeing legislative and regulatory policy at the local, state, and federal levels.

She has over 20 years leading national policy.

Nancy has degrees from Wellesley, UC Northridge and Lewis and Clark College in beautiful Portland, Oregon.

Being an Oregonian, I had to say that.

The next presenter is Alan Bass.

He's the rangeland management specialist, serving as the range program lead for the BLM Utah State office.

He's been in this position since 2015 and a native son of Utah.

He has degrees from Weber State and Utah State University.

Our third speaker is Redge Johnson.

He's currently the county liaison for the governor's public lands coordinating office.

Redge has assisted in all 29 Utah counties for 28 natural resources identified by the Utah legislature.

Redge and his team have taken the county plans and drafted a state Resource Management Plan based on the desired outcomes of those 29 county plans and the state agency mandates, and this man was formally adopted in 2018 Redge has been tasked with the grazing management team.

He enjoys spending times in Utah's abundant outdoor resources and with his wife and two daughters.

And then lastly is Dr. Steven Petersen, he's a professor of rangeland landscape ecology at Brigham Young university.

He's been in that position for 12 years.

He's been working on free roaming horse research for over 13 years.

He was on the committee and an author of National Academy of Sciences report that was published in 2013.

He entered his Ph.D., again, another Oregon connection, his Ph.D. from Oregon State University in rangeland resources in 2004 under the direction of Dr. Tamsen Stringen.

We look forward to a good discussion.

And you each have no longer than ten minutes.

So Dan, keep them on track, okay?

All right.

Thank you.

>> NANCY PERRY: Can you give me one minute?

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, I need to warn you all.

He does have a cattle prod and he used it on me a lot yesterday.

So just be aware.

>> NANCY PERRY: Yeah, I think I'm live.

Can you hear me?

Great.

Thank you.

Oh, wait.

How is that?

Okay.

Great.

Fantastic.

Well thank you so much for this wonderful honor of being here before the advisory board and having this amazing opportunity over the last few days of so much really good conversation with so many people who are truly interested in working through this challenge with wild horses and burros and it's really a delight for me and it's been very energizing.

So as you heard, I'm Nancy Perry.

I'm with the ASPCA.

My organization is first animal welfare organization to be formed on the continent.

We are pretty old.

We have been at it for a long time.

Our focus has not been specifically on wild horses until fairly recently.

And some of the reason for that is we felt that the opportunities with respect there for making a genuine difference.

We were worried that it was just too great a challenge, and in the last couple of years, we have started to see real opportunity and that is why we have started to engage on this issue.

And that's why I titled this "Opportunities and Obligations."

Because I thought it was important to show where we thought we saw ways forward and some of the potential obstacles to moving forward.

So that's where I will focus my comments.

One of the first things that we determined a few years ago when we started having

these conversations about wild horses, and they involved going out to Nevada and meeting with stakeholders and sitting down with folks who had dramatically different views on this topic, was that if we focused on where we didn't agree, those conversations fell apart rapidly.

If we focused on where we agreed, we found we had a lot more common ground than we even knew walking in the door.

And that was what led to the really fruitful conversations for us.

The common goals we see on this slide don't represent everyone's core value, every one of those boxes may not be where our mission falls most specifically.

Obviously, humane treatment is our wheelhouse at the ASPCA, but we do care about ecosystem health.

We care about the rangeland, being able to support the lives of millions of other animals, and we certainly know that any plan forward that's going to result in long-term success for wild horses and burros will have to be fiscally responsible.

We appreciate that.

And most importantly, we really appreciate the way that this conversation in the last year has shifted to be thinking in terms of genuinely long-term solutions.

I think it's been hard to get there.

We all want this to be something that can be resolved quickly.

But we all know if we are looking hard at this problem, that it requires a long-term commitment, and working in Washington, D.C., I know that that is not always a given, and it's actually a pretty big challenge that we all face together.

Getting any administration to commit to something that lives beyond them is difficult, and Congress doesn't think that way either.

So we'll talk about that a little bit.

We do think after sitting down for a few years that there is a way forward.

It led us to sit down with other humane organizations, national welfare groups, as well as those stakeholders in Nevada and Utah, those states obviously representing very large chunks of the larger population of wild horses.

That led us to put a proposal on paper.

The minute you write a proposal and put it on paper, it starts to change and so we have called it a draft proposal, and it's continued to be a draft, but we did finally force ourselves to submit it to the secretary last October, so a year ago, again as a draft.

We had some very robust, productive conversations with the BLM, working from the very top.

We had several conversations where the Secretary was in the room and we had conversations with the folks that work with the numbers and crunch them and understand the dynamics on the range in a very detailed way.

And that's been incredibly helpful in terms of figuring out some of the logistics of putting forward any kind of proposal.

Those conversations continue.

We have not come to any final commitment or agreement around it, but our proposal genuinely focuses on how to move forward, what the logistics should look like, and a nonlethal approach to managing wild horses.

That's obviously very key for us, but we think it's key for success, for any proposal.

Obviously, this is a time-sensitive situation.

So we are hoping that moving forward we can move from the discussion phase to the implementation phase as quickly as possible to avoid more years of foal crops that add to our inability to address this challenge.

Our proposal is basically -- the details are not necessarily the important part, it's the overall theme.

And, again, nothing is all that new under the sun here, but I think what we are proposing is the synergistic effect of committing to four different prongs ever management together.

So first and foremost, we are willing to argue for robust gathers, roundups and gathers.

That's something that's been difficult for the humane community to support, but at this point in timing, it feels like the way to get out ahead and start to work on prevention.

In order to be effective in that -- in that prong of the plan, we need to prioritize where the rangeland has been degraded, where wildlife is impacted where there's T&E species.

Focusing on a regional approach, instead of an HMA-based approach feels important. As we all know and talking about the last few days, those herds are large herds and not just HMA-based.

Coupled with that is the need to be very committed to fertility control.

More than ever historically the agency has ever been able to be.

This is a big stretch and we realize it's a big stretch.

We believe that treating at least 80% of the horses on the range is going to be critical to realize the benefits of prevention in this plan.

And as far as the particulars, we can certainly go into them.

We believe that we have an effective tool with PZP, if it's properly applied.

I realize there are all kinds of arguments around that.

I appreciate that.

I have think there are other innovative technologies that we have heard about in the last 24 hours in this room, that are really exciting and there's a lot of prospects that will come online waiting for those prospects to be perfect doesn't feel feasible.

I think we should start with what the -- the tools that we have at our disposal now and bring new things online as they are appropriate.

We have a real interest in making sure all of those tools that are brought online are humane and effective, but we are very interested in being pragmatic too about whatever fertility control methods are applied.

Obviously if you are going to gather and remove, you will have to relocate those horses coming off the range.

And one area that we think there's some potential streamlining benefits is in the long-term holding area.

There have been a lot of be interested parties in helping with this problem, but given around the uncertainty if the agency would move forward with any lethal population control, that's been a bit of an obstacle to bringing some of those potential partnerships forward.

We believe that if we can commit to a nonlethal synergistic, multi-pronged approach,

we can see long-term cost effective pasturing, maybe lifetime so we are not transporting horses and incurring more costs that would result from some public/private arrangements.

And so that's obviously an area we still have a lot to explore on, but I think there's real potential here for saving money and allocating resources towards the on-the-range work that has to happen.

Then finally, perhaps the most fun prong of the management plan is talking about adoptions.

Everyone would like to talk about adoptions.

I have been really encouraged to hear about some of the innovative ideas that are really taking hold now around the adoption program.

We at the ASPCA are huge proponents of adoption, in many different realms and we are pretty good at marketing and we have offered the administration -- our opportunities to lean in.

We have done work around the horse community that shows there's a lot more homes out there than previously believed.

Edge Research did a study with us a year and a half ago.

That 2.3 million have the resources now to take in the horses and desire to.

It's about finding them, and marketing, obviously that the agency is leaning in on.

That's very exciting.

I think we can add to that, if we get the energy of the humane community behind a proposal.

So those are the guts of what we are proposing.

The underlying themes here are urgency.

Obviously prevention, getting out on the range and having a commitment to the rangeland work.

It's easy to talk about adoptions and finding a way out through adopting, but we absolutely cannot solve these problems through the adoption angle.

So I think that prevention on the range work is going to be critical.

Streamlining is something we already talked about.

That's an important element of state cost savings and then finally, this marketing work that's already underway is really important and I think there's a lot to be done there.

The holistic aspect of managing wild horses is going to be critical.

It's so easy to think well, the next new thing is going to be our saving grace.

And I think, you know, we have got to really be committed to and -- and determined to implement all elements of this plan together or else we are not going to realize the benefits that could be realized.

How much a minute?

Okay.

Okay.

So some of the challenges are building trust and making sure we can bring the right partners along on this plan.

The new sales policy, though, it doesn't relate to rangeland work directly, could create a back door to selling horses to slaughter.

I am assured that's not the intent of it, but the problem is many of the provisions that

were stripped out in the IM, with put in place in response to the incident in 2014, when 1700 mustangs did go to slaughter.

So having those provisions and making sure we are not sending too many horses too quickly, having a time limit, having some ability to report concerns, having a database that helps identify problematic buyers, all of those things are really critical and I think we need to go back and look at that IM and make some adjustments around it.

And I think what it does is it jeopardizes the support for moving forward if we don't have clear understanding that those horses aren't going to move out the back end.

Roundup protocols, we should revisit, because every time there is an incident on the range, there's certainly going to be problems with roundups.

It's unavoidable but having those comprehensive animal welfare protocols reviewed and having training for contractors would help avoid some of those programs and it's critical for building trust.

Finally, the political realities that I look at when I work on this issue and have been lobbying around it for 15 years, we cannot do nothing, but we cannot kill is a management option.

We can euthanized.

But killing healthy horses to control the population will not be supported in Washington or among Americans.

And then any sales for slaughter explicitly or any schemes that result in that, are going to erode trust in the agency.

And we have an opportunity right now to build trust.

So I think we have great opportunities.

I think working together and collectively, and really emphasizing where we have commonality is going to be the way that we are going to get where we need to get and I'm glad that we are in this for the long haul.

So thank you so much for all of your generosity and work on this.

>> FRED WOEHL: Thank you very much.

Does any of the board have any questions or comments?

Ben?

Now, I want to point something out, we are going to have to be brief.

And so if I call your hand, don't get mad at me.

>> BEN MASTERS: The private partnership approach to taking care of the horses that would be gathered, you know, if we decided to try to do roundups and fertility control in eight years, that's going to mean probably gathering 100,000 horses off the range. You are looking at somewhere in the ballpark between 100 to \$150 million annually to feed and house those animals.

Where would that money come from and how would we as the Board or the BLM have some sort of certainty in knowing that that -- when \$150 million expense is going to last for the next 15 to 25 years for the rest of that horse's lifetime?

>> NANCY PERRY: That is an important question and definitely one that's asked by a lot of folks.

We won't have certainty about anything that we do.

But we have to have a strong enough plan that we can look at where that money should be spent, how we can make savings.

We have been working with the biologist and an economist to model out options for gathering this many this year and how many years it would take of gathering.

All the gathering be need to be robust.

I don't think it means a lifetime sanctuary for all the horses that come off the range.

I think we can make savings if we are not moving horses to long-term holding and moving them again and again in that process.

There's cost savings to not having to do that.

So having long-term, stable contracts is a savings that we will make.

That's not enough.

We have to also build up our adoptions so that we are not putting every horse out there.

Some of them are not going to go through the adoption program, but I bet we can do a lot more with adoptions.

I don't think it's the only answer, though.

I think it's combination of those things that we'll save.

And then obviously if we really are on the range, employing preventative measures, we will realize the benefits there too.

So it's sort of that -- it's not one thing.

It's all of these things together that will make the savings that we need.

I also think one more thing.

I think there's a lot of interest and energy in a solution that involves unlikely bed fellows in Washington.

And so finding opposing parties that will agree to something will unleash some more funding.

Because I think they are tired of this issue too, and they would like to be done with, it but they just don't want to be responsible for something bad happening to the horses.

So I think if we have a positive solution, we will some positive benefits and even private funders might lean in with us.

>> BEN MASTERS: Can you give us an example of an entity that could commit \$20 million annually for the next 15 years?

>> NANCY PERRY: We have not gotten far enough to identify specific corporate entities that would be in that position.

I know that there are some entities like the American Mustang Foundation is one of the potential long-term holders.

They already have some facilities online.

There are others that will come forward if we are able to strike a deal.

But no, I don't -- I think we are a little premature to have examples of those corporate entities.

I think there's an appetite out, there though.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: You talked about the four different areas, and then on one of your next slides, I saw one of the things you would like to see happen is to minimize helicopter gathers.

How do you propose to accomplish all of this work and treat 80% of horses on the range while at the same time minimizing helicopter gathers?

>> NANCY PERRY: Yeah, well, I think the helicopter gathers are always going to be

necessary in certain geographies and we appreciate that.

I think finding the areas where they are not necessary and always employing other methods, will help avoid some of the incidents that erode trust in the agency's management.

I'm not suggesting that we don't do helicopter gathers.

I have think there's very little opportunity for eliminating them all together, given the geographies the horses live on.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: What is your big opposition or concern with helicopter gathers?

>> NANCY PERRY: Oh, I think most of the incidents that happened in recent days, months, years, that gain a lot of attention for dens who are watching this issue are incidents that typically happen due to the stress of helicopter gathers, and frankly, some inappropriate behavior on the contractor's part.

And there are animal welfare guidelines that just are not always followed perfectly. I have think there's no perfect scenario, but I think we can do better than we have always done.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Steven, that's enough.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I would just like to finish one comment.

I would like you just to recognize that all the things you recommended are going to require a greatly increased amount of helicopter gathers versus the current.

>> NANCY PERRY: I think you are right about that.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Okay.

Jim?

>> JAMES FRENCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Nancy, I applaud what you are trying to do.

An awful lot of the comments and the strategy you spelled out this morning is -- was actually discussed this morning prior to this.

And I applaud that.

One of the things that -- and we are talking about the adoption side it.

I think we all embrace the fact that we all would love to see -- as opposed to long-term holding, we would like to see an increase in adoptions.

I have been an advocate for international adoptions since I have been on this board and I know that a lost arguments against it I have heard them -- many of them already. However, I think -- I think we lose sight of what the overall goal is on our side, if we -- if we eliminate that because -- due to some bad actors on the other end.

My question to you is: Would your organization have an interest in brokering through websites and whatnot, brokering international adoptions to make sure that the other end of the -- the receiving end of the adoptions is appropriate?

You know, in other words if we had bad actors, I think your term on the other end of it, and, you know, their intent is -- is we can determine it as less than beneficial for the horses.

Would -- what we're looking for is an organization to broker those adoptions that would make sure that the overall impact would be -- on to the horses would be beneficial.

Because we have a -- there's a huge demand, especially in western Europe for horses.

>> NANCY PERRY: That's very interesting.

I'm not very diverse on what the interest is, and that's a good conversation to have.

I will just say the ASPCA is a domestically focused organization.

So we don't have any real connections externally in the -- you know, outside of the US.

Our mission is American focused.

So we would not be in a good position to offer much support there.

I will say that I just have a lot more faith in our ability to track and understand where those horses go.

I'm sure you have heard this before.

I feel a lot more comfortable keeping them in this country, because then we -- I believe we have laws in place that would help us if we did see problems.

That doesn't mean there wouldn't be potential for someone good taking horses and giving them good jobs in another country.

It's much more difficult to ensure their safety, the further away they go and how far outside the reach of our law they would be.

So I just have hesitations around it.

High pressure I also would note that, you know, we are working towards a country where we don't have horse slaughter and there are a lot of countries that do.

And that's a quick -- a quick slide down for horses in other countries.

So all of those things would give me pause, but it's a conversation that we should keep having, I think.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Thank you.

>> Nancy thank you for coming in.

You bring tremendous resources and expertise.

I notices that several times during your presentation you stated y'all were opposed to nonlethal solutions.

>> NANCY PERRY: Mm-hmm.

>> It's my understanding that ASPCA supports euthanization of dogs and cats that are not adoptable.

>> NANCY PERRY: At the same time, we have been actively engaging with the shelter community in this country to really encourage them to move towards higher and higher what we call live release rates to get to the point where euthanasia is not employed for space purposes.

Meaning, it's not employed as a population control technique for dogs and cats.

And by being a bit of a gadfly on that, we have seen live release rates go way up in our shelter community in this country.

So I think it's important for our voice to be in favor of pushing everyone away from utilizing euthanasia lightly or conveniently.

And one of my concerns is it's been a challenge for the agency to get comfortable with and feel confident about on-the-range management and prevention on the range.

It just hasn't been the strong suit so far for the BLM.

And my worry would be not only would I not feel good about -- I feel like we have a real -- we have created this scenario.

And I feel we have an obligation to every one of those horses to try to avoid them paying the price ultimately for it.

So that would be a concern but I also worry that it would become too easy. And I think if we have an escape hatch of euthanasia, I'm not sure it would ever go away, just the way politics work.

You know, when you start down a road, it's hard to undo it.

And so I would hate to see us go down that road if we have any other option in the entire world to exercise.

>> FRED WOEHL: Ginger.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Hi, Nancy.

Thank you for being here it's great to see.

Does your proposal presuppose that you would be going to the AML of 26,710 horses which many organizations believe is unrealistically low to sustain certain small populations?

>> NANCY PERRY: Yes, there's so much concern and anxiety about AML, whether it's the right number, how to think about AML.

I think we start after the AML conversation with how we engage, not to say there aren't good, important dialogue around whether or not the AML number is the right number.

We get that, you know, there's -- it's a calculation.

And it may need adjustment.

Our interest is in recognizing that right now the agency has set that as AML and their job is to work towards it.

So as we enter this conversation, we are sort of post AML in saying, all right, well, that's AML, we are not in a position right now to challenge that.

So instead, we are working towards it, but I think everyone I have talked to from every level of the agency has acknowledged that that precise number may not be the critical piece here.

Getting close to it.

Getting more in the range of AML is what is important.

So I'm not saying that getting to AML isn't important, but I think if we got to 35,000, I think we would be having a very different conversation right now.

I feel like some of that anxiety would allay, if we didn't have 82,000 or whatever we have on the range right now.

So that's kind of where -- we are not very focused on it.

And we are not really trying to argue about it.

Does that make sense, Ginger?

I don't want to -- I don't want to avoid your question.

I just -- I don't know that we're that focused on AML.

>> FRED WOEHL: Thank you, Nancy.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yes thanks, Nancy.

>> FRED WOEHL: I really appreciate your -- your program that you did.

I enjoyed our drink and coffee this morning.

But I just have one question for you, and then based on your slide that you had about you are not in favor of BLM being able to adopt out 25 horses.

>> NANCY PERRY: Right.

>> FRED WOEHL: Due to an incident that happened in 2014.

>> NANCY PERRY: Right.

>> FRED WOEHL: And it wasn't a broad incident.

It happened with one person and all of that.

Based on that approach to that, we don't need to issue a driver's license to anybody because there are accidents that happen and people get killed and that's bad.

Do you know what I'm saying?

And that -- that really bothers me because the -- this program of getting up to 25 horses can help out an awful lot.

And it's automatically assuming that they are going to go -- go and take them to slaughter because of an isolated incident that really shouldn't have happened and I agree with that.

>> NANCY PERRY: Yeah.

>> FRED WOEHL: Were lots of mistakes made.

I agree with you that we need to come together and I agree with a lot of what you did, but that stuck in my crawl just a little bit.

>> NANCY PERRY: Yes, I was rushing a bit.

It would be great to have a longer conversation about this, but here's some framing for that.

We support the idea of the right adopters or buyers getting larger numbers of horses. We have seen that happening even before this sales IM came into place.

So I think when that policy came in, I don't think it precludes large-scale adoptions or sales.

But I think that the -- the sales IM is raising concerns because I think really those protections are pretty minimal.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, now, now prior to this, if I wanted to adopt out four horses, that was my limit for 12 months, until -- 12 months, until they got titles.

>> NANCY PERRY: Oh, right.

>> FRED WOEHL: And now I can do more than that.

So if I have a training stable, where I specialize in mustangs, I can go get me 25 horses and I can train these and I can let other people have the benefit of owning a mustang.

I mean that was the intent.

I guess I'm kind of -- it kind of bothers me because I'm always a positive-looking thing. I never try to look at negative.

>> NANCY PERRY: Right.

>> FRED WOEHL: This glass is almost full, it's not almost empty, do you know what I'm saying?

And one isolated case.

It was wrong.

It was terribly wrong.

It was terribly wrong!

And I agree.

But having that approach, where we are going to restrict on one isolated case, I don't think that's right.

>> NANCY PERRY: From what I understand, even before it went into place, this new policy, it was --

>> FRED WOHL: But it had to go up to Washington, D.C., and get them sign on. It nobody on a local level or state level could do it.

So if I'm a cowboy, I don't want to visit with Washington, D.C.

They don't know which end of the horse gets up.

>> NANCY PERRY: Some of them do.

I hear you.

I don't think we are that far apart on this.

>> FRED WOHL: Okay.

All right.

Well, you and I can talk about this later, if you will, but we got to get on.

That's just -- I really appreciate the time and the effort that you spend and it's -- it's exciting to me having served on this board for five years and seeing where we were five years ago, where we -- you and I wouldn't even talk to each other.

I mean, I didn't know you then but since you are ASPCA and I was a cowboy, we wouldn't talk to where this morning we drank coffee and had a good time.

>> NANCY PERRY: Yeah, thank you.

>> FRED WOHL: That's benefits.

>> NANCY PERRY: It's a great thing here.

The Mustang Heritage Foundation has a lot more capacity if we can all find the funding for them.

So they are a good example of a large --

>> FRED WOHL: And part of the reason is that right there.

>> NANCY PERRY: I think we are sitting really close on this.

>> FRED WOHL: All right.

Good deal.

Thank you very much.

Bruce, do you want to go on with the -- okay.

Alan, I promise.

You will probably get asked many questions.

>> ALAN BASS: Mr. Chairman, be careful what you promise.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the board.

For good or bad, I'm not going to talk about horses.

We will talk about livestock.

Whether that helps your meeting or not.

As you all eloquently noted, because I'm the BLM lead in Utah, I do not have to worry about horses in the state of Utah or dealing with them.

I have Gus and that's very comforting from a range parameter to do so.

So as I go about this presentation, again, those would be some interaction or intertwining of horses or livestock.

I will pretty much stick to how the agency deals with livestock grazing on public lands, but think about how horses are managed, maybe with or without the same kind of regulations or direction.

So I will go over -- I thought would be good to have an historical context and we will go about where we are today and the administration, some relevant acts that guide and direct us in that administration.

And, of course, we will talk about the myriad of regulations that we have in order to administer grazing on public lands.

So as we know, grazing is long in the tooth.

It's been around for a very long time, along with the horses.

They go back long before regulation and a lot of things were in place.

We know after the Civil War, there was a big push to go west.

The next little box comes up, "go west, young man."

All the post-Civil War, they went out and you can see in the picture, a group of livestock gathering crew.

They picked up strays or whatever else.

They went out and they got to the forage first and they made their livelihood.

And many, many, many folks did this, young and old and in between, because it was a very low cost to start up an operation and there was plenty of free forage and unregulated at that point in time.

Over the next several decades, this is occurring more and more and more and it began to be somewhat controversial.

It began to have interactions, the adage of the sheep and the cowmen did not get along.

Basically, the regulatory mechanism of the day was a long rope and a six shooter and that created a lot of hostility.

Then as you progressed towards the early 1920s and '30s, or even the 1900s, you had settlement occurring.

Those coming west that were not so much interested in livestock grazing but homesteading.

Ranchers also homesteaded and that started to create this interaction we still have today of some cry for regulation.

Even the industry itself went to their Congressmen and said we need to do something that needs to be some sort of management of who goes where and when and how we can get along on this public range.

And so we have the Taylor Grazing Act.

This was signed on one of the days that the dust bowl settled on Washington, D.C.

They put pen to paper and to arrest the deterioration and at degradation of the United States out west.

Some of the parts I highlighted, Sections of the Taylor Grazing Act, the grazing districts were created.

Concept of a ten-year grazing permit was instituted.

This concept of landowners adjacent to these grazing districts who either owned water rights or were in the business of livestock held the first priority, or preference, but the superiority of position in order to get that grazing privilege on public land authorized those issuing permits for cooperative agreements.

Arrangements to do range improvements and that's a really big deal today, that many of our range improvement.

You heard that water is a major limiting factor.

They are put in and maintained by permittees many of those from which their private water rights are developed from.

And so the -- at that time, the grazing service began this effort to adjudicate and in the 1930s and '40s we went through a process of the who, when and where and how much to graze.

So there was a real effort to kind of control or manage, if you will, the grazing on public lands.

The -- where the allotment concept, when the season of use, the permittee and how much was done.

You notice there on the third bullet point, the concept of this where and when was based almost entirely on the traditional and customary practice.

So they basically asked the rancher permittee, where have they been grazing and they gave them a permit for that.

We then later learned in the '50s and '60s that was not quite so sustainable as people came from the east to the west and they are used to dealing with AUMs, annual unit months, and the amount.

It's how many acres letter AUM.

So in the '50s and '60s, the Bureau went through a secondary adjudication process to fine tune and further address the traditional and customary practices because that's kind of what got us into the problem first place.

During that same time, we have a myriad of other acts that come into play, that grazing was trying to deal with and address and we are expected to manage livestock grazing and compliance with all of these things and some of the ones that we will focus on today, that stand out is the law of Free Roaming Horse and Burro Act and I will talk about other acts and it also talks about horses in that act.

So to go back to the Taylor Grazing Act, you see that the purpose of that was to stop injury to prevent soil deterioration and to provide for their orderly use, improvement and development.

That's critical part for me.

I think orderly use is a key point and, again, thinking about management of horses, how do we do orderly use?

And it's also to stabilize the livestock industry.

There's nothing to impede that but to help manage so that that can be sustainable.

It also talks about, in section three of the Taylor Grazing Act that it should be adequately safeguarded and the issuance of a permit pursuant to the provisions of the act should not create right, Title or interest or stake to the land.

It's an opportunity to use the public land and the Bureau recognizes that it's a longstanding and important aspects of public lands.

Then we get to the BLM's organic debt and I apologize, this violates all kinds of PowerPoint rules.

I understand Dr. Petersen.

You can read it.

I got in red the parts that I think are important.

That the purpose of multiple use is to utilize in the combination that will best meet the present and the future needs of the American people and that's going to be debated as long as after we leave today, forever when you start talking about people's values.

Again, the comment was made yesterday that the horses is a passionate program, I

believe livestock grazing can be equally as passionate and controversial at times. The next part as well, provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments I think that's key for the bureau under the multiple use and the sustainable management guidelines. We need to have that sufficient guidelines for periodic adjustments whatever that might be.

And the end result and the beginning of that management concept, we need to be able to have that latitude to adjust and revisit and review and move forward with new concepts to address what I believe is the -- you know, was the mission of the Bureau is ultimately land health management.

That's the one goal.

That's one common ground we agree on.

I think that's one thing through management we can focus on with all the resources. And then last, harmonious and coordinated management without permanent impairment of the productivity of that land.

And so we are trying to do all of these things, provide food and fiber and soil health and economic stability.

So thanks to Tammy Howell, this is a picture of the Onaqui herd.

I believe you visited that yesterday.

In the Public Range Improvement Act, it talks about still a concern about the public lands being an unsatisfactory condition and then this act, we highlight the range improvement funds and 8100 fund and the Bureau's option that comes from grazing receipts where we want that money to go back out on the ground on the range improvements and's where we partner with the grazing improvement program, with the water shed restoration initiative, WRI to put water on the ground and wildlife benefit from that and horses went fit from that.

They took time to amend the '71 act and how the act is doing a good job from protecting horses from being captured or branded.

It looks a little better on your computer screen when you are closer.

But it says certain amendments are necessary and then it goes on to say because the horses exceed the carrying capacity of the range, pose a threat to their own happen at that time, fish, recreation, water, soil, conservation and other rangeland values.

I think that to me highlights the need for management.

I think if you read the Wild Horse and Burro Act, it occurs over 20 times.

That's the focus we need to have is the multifaceted management.

Today the livestock grazing program.

We issue grazing permits and we monitoring the permits for the terms and conditions in order to meet land health, fundamentals.

Rangeland health concerns and we work with our local partners through consultation.

We bill for that use set out through the Taylor Grazing Act and we transmit those around from permittee to permittee.

Just where we are today, there's roughly under 18,000 permits or leases.

There's 12.3 million livestock AUMs.

In 2017, there were 18% of those AUMs and 3.5 million AUMs in nonuse.

There's a myriad of reasons why that could be.

That could be from emergency sterilization, if we do a seeding, we want to arrest that

from livestock.

We ask that they come off for a period of time.

It could be from personal business uses, perhaps permittee wants to sell a few head and go to Hawai'i for a month.

Certainly one of those aspects, as we heard yesterday and as you watched those bull hog work on that tree, until we restore the vegetation, there's not the AUM.

Because something has gone in and used that forage prior to that, when and where livestock use and there's not anything there.

That ranges from the use of wildlife and wild horses that those permittees are also taking on use for those reasons.

This is just a graph to explain it.

I wanted to highlight on your right, you are looking at the screen and you can see the 1953 is the first date on the bottom.

It goes to 2017.

That decline is from that second era of that adjudication when we realized, you know, giving the permits based on what they were historically doing were not working.

And so it's -- this is a graphical representation of the numbers you saw in the previous slide there, 12 million AUMs and 8.8 being used.

And now I will go through the regulations.

These mind numbing.

I would encourage you if you look those up on the code of federal regulation, make sure you find 2005 regulations.

We even have judges use the wrong regulations.

If you want to read them, please use the 2005 version.

So the 4100, the 43CFR is what governs the grazing administration for the BLM, and there's a lot more in the regulations.

I will go through this pretty quickly.

It talks about us using multiple use and sustainable use with applicable lands and maintain and maintain rangeland.

I think that's critical.

Our fundamentals of rangeland health don't ask us to go for pre-European settlement or a potential natural community.

We need to manage these under the multiple use guidelines for functioning ecosystems.

That's in a sense, if you will, I don't like the word "sacrifice" it generates a lot of negative connotations but it's the give and take for a little bit, for everything that can be on that landscape.

And maybe not everything is everywhere on the landscape and that's about multiple use, but grazing, we take that into consideration.

There' regulations about increasing permitted use or decreasing permitted use for drought, fire or natural causes.

Again, the conditions for range improvement.

We have may require or ask the permittee to put in range improvements.

We may partner them, or provide other range management.

We have conditions for qualified applicants and these terms and conditions that will

continue on to the next slide, talk about a variety of components that we think are important for us to be able to meet those fundamentals of rangeland health and that can be a rotation system, that can be an expectation of a rider, salting locations and a myriad of things, the interested public and the rangeland is still important and necessary for that management of the livestock.

Again, continuing modified terms and conditions.

I threw one in here.

It was interesting.

There are prohibited acts and one of those if livestock are in excess of the numbers authorized.

Not to bring up old wounds but I have seen what would happen if we were 1800% over permitted use on public lands.

It gets pretty hairy.

We do all of this through a proposed and final decision process where the public is involved.

We don't take hardly any actions with this without issuing decisions and allowing the public participation of that and then again the caveat for all of this, 41.80 regulation, it came from the 1995, in the 4100 reg.

I hope that's not me, it's promote healthy rangelands and acceleration regulations and the management of the grazing and the western livestock.

So thank you for your time.

Maybe one day we will be talking about these.

>> FRED WOEHL: I'm from back east and if I want to drill 20 wells, I can drill 20 wells. These water rights is important to the horses, to cattle to anything.

Would you mind briefly explaining water rights and how they impact the range.

>> ALAN BASS: I would encourage Redge to answer that.

So my official response, to water rights are governed by state of Utah.

That would be my official response.

>> FRED WOEHL: All right.

>> ALAN BASS: But, yes, they are very important.

Water rights arise.

The agency holds many water rights and permittees hold many of those water rights and for a myriad of those interactions we are able to work together but for the joint purpose of improvement of public lands.

They need water on the ground to have better health of their animals.

And to consume forage and so our goal is to distribute that water across that allotment, to do just, that and many times, at the end of those, design system, wiring systems, the permittees are willing to add, you know, 50 feet of pipeline into an open tank or a trough or guzzlers per small game and big game.

There's many times when they will leave their systems charged after they leave their when and where on the allotments.

Wild horses raise their dander a little bit.

They are more than happy to allow that.

Water rights have a beneficial use.

We have to make sure that that is being used.

We have common allotments and there will be 8 or 10 permittees on that allotment and only one or two have the water rights and that's why it's increasingly important for everybody to get along with that so that that water stays for all of those permittees to be able to use that in a shared management kind of perspective.

I hope that answers your --

>> FRED WOEHL: Thank you.

Anybody?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Could you just touch briefly on the social economical benefits of the public grazing to the state of Utah.

>> ALAN BASS: Where is Director Keith?

I don't have numbers in front of me.

Again, I think Redge could probably put some numbers -- sorry to pass the buck to him.

But I know there was an initiative out West, Grass Creek, northwest Utah, to an -- they provided several hundred dollars to look at the ability to keep these small ranching communities in play.

And how they are going to be sustained throughout the generation, and what the agency's interaction was, if you canceled the grazing or if you terminated that for the hundreds of thousands of acres and designated the uses.

They made that area for other uses under the Bureau's mission.

So I can't give you numbers but I think if many of these small rural towns if livestock grazing was to be removed, we would have more neighbors on loss front, for sure.

You might be able to answer that.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: And what would be some of the ramifications, I guess to removing -- if you were to remove the public grazing from the lands and what have been some of the benefits of having -- I know you touched on water rights.

What have been some of the other benefits of having permittees on those public ranges?

>> ALAN BASS: Well, let's start with the positives.

I think grazing the way that we are using it now could be used for a lot of different purposes.

Not only into the livestock industry or put pounds on the hoof which is the rancher's ultimate goals.

We have targeted grazing.

We are using fuel breaks or fuel load removal.

We are doing a concept of outcome-based grazing authorizations where we are trying to work with the permittee to give them as much flexibility as possible.

So when we have identified resource objectives that we like to see out there, possibly for safeguards and possibly for other species and just the land health itself, that they are able to step back a little bit from the rigid when and where and how and whys to a more flexible approach to say, we need to go here and here and here and here in that type of rotation fits here because that's where the water is or that's where we got the rain or that's where the sage-grouse are not going to be here right now and went adjust our management system and go there.

And we know that resource will move and it will be something else.

So they are able to kind of maintain some land health by having a quote/unquote disturbance, a disturbance, that's in the negative connotation.

A lot of people think multiple use because there's a use.

There's also a negative impact.

Stop mowing your lawn and see what happens.

You will be spraying a lot of chemicals to control your weeds.

I think land disturbance helps.

So having the horses out there, and the ranchers are there and they understand what's going on.

They can give an historical context to the landscape.

They can provide feedback to the agency about what they have seen in the past.

They are usually the ones who give ideas on how to fight fires because it goes through their country.

And there's a knowledge base, because the agency with the limited staff can't get on the ground like we like to.

We may only get out, you know, once or twice a month to an allotment, where they are there every day.

The concept, if we remove that we are going to get back to a perfect condition or pristine condition, I think is a false impression.

Grazing has been occurring on this landscape forever, and, again, the goal is to manage that.

To make that work within the context of social values, the bureau' mission of multiple use and that includes all species that graze out there.

>> FRED WOHL: Thank you.

Sue and Barry, if you are on the phone, if you have a question, ask it now.

If not, mute your phone.

You are creating a disturbance.

Well, Barry is pretty good at --

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: I'm on the phone.

>> FRED WOHL: Do you have a question?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Not this moment in time.

>> FRED WOHL: Well, put your phone on mute there's a little button on your phone that says mute, m-u-t-e.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: I will give it a try.

>> FRED WOHL: Okay.

Well, this is one of the best parts that we had, and this give and take has really been good and I'm looking at the -- (Background noise)

And the read of the board meeting is board input.

If you don't mind, I would like this to go on because this has been really, really good and besides that, my good friend Jim has a question wants to ask.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm going to state for the record also that the -- from a water rights issue, you know, you were talking -- you were speaking to that here a few minutes ago and speaking not for Utah, but for Nevada right now, one the things that was observed with the increase and the -- the increase in distribution of horses on to livestock allotments,

was not just the competition between horses and livestock.

In some case it's was the springs that were beat out and quit flowing.

And in many cases, though, it was a lot of those projects that were funded by 8100 funds, having to do with pipelines and troughs and drinkers and all of those kind of things.

Just by the nature of how horses gather around those locations, and mill around on them, whatnot, they damage them often to the point where they quit working.

And I know that was something that was not only for livestock standpoint.

It was from the wildlife perspective and the wildlife guzzlers, it was a big deal and it created a lot of damage.

I only say that because that's something to keep in mind as we are moving forward with sharing those spaces.

But I wanted to state for the record for my friend Dr. Perryman also is that from 30,000 feet, there's a paradigm shift going on right now with regard to the Taylor Grazing Act and what -- and what we took as gospel from the 1935 or '34 sustained yield model that was actually spelled out within that.

And orderly use, so to speak.

And because there has been -- when you factor in the changes in water distribution, the time of the year when water comes now, we are in the middle of -- I think most states that don't even have water rights or water drought issues in terms of inches of water produced, we are all seeing drought or snow droughts.

We are seeing a lack of snow, snow pack, which dramatically changes how water is delivered during the season.

And it is -- what that has done, though, is changed and shifted the response to the ecosystem on the lands.

Not only for -- with regard to how we run livestock operations but how that impacts things like other uses on the land, wildlife and whatnot.

I guess with that change in that synergistic impact to the ecosystem, in your view, Alan, what is the shift in management protocol from the livestock industry regarding that?

I know we all -- nobody -- the country I'm at right now is operating livestock the same way they did 20 years ago.

It's all changed dramatically and I'm just wondering if you can give us a little overview of that historical aspect of it.

>> ALAN BASS: Yes, if I'm tracking your question right and I think we saw yesterday or identified one of the concerns with that change in how water comes and when it comes and in what form it comes, is the hauling of the water and the shift that that's created for horses and concentrating them in certain areas.

I know we have a lot of offices that have the same conversation with permittees who haul water.

They may be filling up existing troughs and so they are sort of still grazing and managing their operation on that allotment with that historical way that they have been running that rotation.

So, you know, I think that's probably something that they think about.

I don't know how well -- or if the agency is dealing with that through the grazing

administration, because it -- it's the so unpredictable and changing it so often is how do we decide where do we put water developments or where do we take them? There's -- you know, and I could only speak -- you folks from different areas of the country, probably have different interactions and Nevada is doing different things to address this.

In Utah, there's been proposals to consolidate allotments and make, you know, 29 operations into one.

And run bigger herds quicker through rotations and we are addressing, you know. There's an example of two of those water rights.

There's big water rights who are supporting that effort and developing the storage tanks where we can control that flow and they are putting the troughs on floats.

So now you can strategically or surgically distribute that water where you want that and not just have a free flow or filling up that pond where you have the potential for west Nile or whatever else may come.

As far as the grazing rights and the distribution, I'm not sure.

Sometimes it's a challenge for us to get out that far ahead because we are trying to renew the permits that are in front of us.

I do think through the Taylor Grazing and the outcome-based grazing, there's a conversation occurring with that, where with do we want to see our resource objectives where do we want to be in 10 years or 15 years and what is that going to take and water distribution is pinnacle to that conversation.

But the forecasts where we might have it coming or not, it's a challenge.

>> JAMES FRENCH: One little follow-up.

In addition to the water side of that, obviously, with we had vegetated challenges and we have wildfire incidents that have gone from 54 averages and 7 year averages because of the flashy fields on the ground and that's all shifting the paradigm as well in terms of that.

I'm just wondering, you know, the competition now, between users on the ground is becoming much more critical.

I think that's one of the reasons that we are here with the wild horse side of it, because that competition starting to equate into ecosystem degradation and I just -- I know -- I know in Nevada, I know that's a big deal for the livestock operators and you know a lot of the changes you just described with regard to the permits and whatnot, have been voluntary and have been proposed to the -- to the agency over and above, you know, what came down from Washington, D.C.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Thank you, Jim.

Just so Daniel doesn't have a stroke, we will go ahead and finish this and however long it takes and we will gain back on the lunch.

I may not let everybody have an hour and 15 minutes.

And I promise by the closing time -- just like yesterday, you were stressing out.

We will get through in time, and we will do that again.

But things like this is really educational for us on the board.

And the interaction that we are having, I think, has been a -- well, that big word.

Beneficial, is that the word I'm trying to think of?

It's very beneficial.

So anyway, who is up next, Bruce?

All right.

>> REDGE JOHNSON: Good morning.

It's a pleasure to be here with you.

I would like to thank Bureau of Land Management for the opportunity to present to you today on behalf of the governor, Governor Gary Herbert and boss Kathleen Clark, we would like to welcome you to Utah.

And giving us an opportunity to discuss some of the issues that we have.

I was asked to cover multiple use and how Utah needs that on our public lands.

So I talked a little bit about healthy rangelands for healthy ecosystems, herds and economies.

That's a big part of the Utah economy, 57% of our state is public lands.

So we have very little private land to work with.

So every decision that's made by a federal agency has significant impacts on our economy.

And our ecosystem and our local communities.

So we appreciate the opportunity to come here and discuss some of the desires of the state of Utah and how we move forward on this.

I think everybody can appreciate that we all love horses.

I worked on this issue for a long time and whether I'm talking with the ranching community or with the advocacy groups, I have never yet run into someone who did not love horses.

And the question is how do we manage them and how do we get to this balance that we can all live in?

And I would like to give you a little background on myself.

These are actually our horses when I was growing up.

Probably one of the few people in my generation that grew up or spent a large part of my childhood without running water, electricity or telephone.

What I did have was about 80 foals every year that I got to train.

So that's kind of my background and that's probably why the governor's asked me to take this on was that background.

I'm not sure it was a blessing.

It gives me some background in how to deal with horses also.

All 80 mares that we ran, ran on open range year round.

So much different than most people back east, on how they train their horses, how they raise their horses.

I would say that a good portion of our mares were just as wild as some of the wild horses that you see out on the range.

Some probably more so if you were at the Onaqui and could approach them and get up to where you could approach them.

Some of our mares weren't quite that tame.

So it gives me appreciation for what -- what some of the challenges are.

I would also say that we were very specific on when we put our herds into a pasture, how much we let them utilize a pasture and the number of horses that we put in a pasture.

And we are very careful about following those principles.
And the reason for that is if we didn't, you wouldn't see the grasses that you see underneath the horses.
What you would see is see bare dirt.
And it's critical to deal with those three principles when you deal with livestock, but especially horses.
They don't have a cloven hoof, but a solid hoof.
They are one of the only animal out there that has that hoof.
They can dig through snow.
Which was great which is why we could leave ours at a high elevation during the winter and they can dig through the dirt and dig up the roots and take out a whole plant and I will get to that in a minute.
It's critical that we look at how we will manage the horses.
As I said, we support the wild horses.
The state of Utah wants to make it clear that we support wild horses and it's part of the economy.
It's part of our culture.
It's just something that we enjoy.
We know people fly into Salt Lake and go out to the Onaqui herd for that.
We don't want to disturb that, but this is the picture that we would like to see of the wild horses.
Healthy herds on healthy rangelands and we have got some work to do to get there.
Unfortunately, too often what we are seeing in certain areas are pictures like this and that's what we want to get away.
With on the left, you see that's a forage issue and on the right, that's probably a forage issue but also a water issue.
We have two different things.
I would like to discuss those and how we properly manage horses for both good rangeland conditions and water conditions.
So there's some talk yesterday about the challenges of BLM and multiple use.
I don't envy them because it is a big challenge but their mission is to have productivity of the public lands for future generations.
As Alan was saying, that's a discussion that will probably be continued perpetuity on exactly what that means.
They have sustained yield and that's energy development, timber harvesting, recreation, also ensuring the natural, cultural and historical resources are maintained for present and future use.
There was a lot of discussion about, you know, these horses have been here for a long time.
There's also other cultural uses out there but a lot of these rural communities depend on, and that was logging and grazing and mining.
That's the pioneers that came here, they didn't have anything when they got here.
So when they got here, they had to figure out how do we get the timber for building our houses?
How do we get the ore?

I grew up in Cedar City and that's where a lot of the iron ore came from. They had to figure out how to get the ore out of the ground and that's part of historical multiple use and what we talk about and why that's so important.

We can't have a single use area or a single use on the landscape because our economy being 67% public lands, that's -- that's kind of a death knell for a lot of these rural communities and we have to keep that in mind.

The state supports the multiple use mandate of the BLM.

And if we don't have healthy rangelands, then we have impacts to the species.

The picture on the left is the sage-grouse.

And if we have unhealthy rangelands, then we have impacts to the T & E species or any rangeland or any species.

And we are not able to do projects like we have on the right.

We have a lot of renewable resources in areas that we have wild horses but we aren't able to move forward with projects if there's not enough area for the T & E species to survive.

We have to have that balance there.

And that's why it's critical that we have these healthy rangelands across the landscape, with the wind and solar, a lot of times you can have grazing and stuff underneath that, but with mitigation and stuff, that has to occur for the sage-grouse, if we don't have enough healthy landscapes, it starts to impede progress into these other renewable resources.

So as I said, multiple use is critical for the state of Utah.

Wild horses and burros are absolutely part of that.

But we also have wildlife that we need to maintain, not just the threatened and endangered species.

We have all the other species out there.

It's not just big game, small animals, rabbits, squirrels, et cetera, crickets, insects and everything else.

It's the whole gamut that we need to look at and wildlife.

It's not just the big game, the stuff that's pretty to look at or the threatened endangered.

Are there enough bugs on the ground, there are enough mosquitoes?

I know that's not what everybody thinks about, but recreation is also huge.

We have the mighty five here in the state of Utah.

We are very supportive of our recreation industry, and believe it or not, we have a lot of people that go out to the west desert.

There's a lot of rock hounds out there and they like to see the wild horses.

They also -- believe it or not, they like to see the grazing that occurs out there and the cowboys moving their animals around.

It's critical for us.

We live in a very dry state and the state does own the water, and we allow the right to for people to use that water.

It's put to beneficial use.

So we'll probably get into that a little more later.

Grazing is also a critical impact for local communities, and we also view that in the

state of Utah as a cultural and heritage thing that we would like to protect.

It's a -- it's a very big part of rural communities as Alan was saying.

Some of these areas like Wayne County, 97% public lands.

And the vast majority of their income comes from grazing.

If they don't have grazing, they don't have the year-round stores and the year-round gas stations that also support recreation during the summertime when they do have some recreation.

So grazing is that year-round income that allows some of these rural communities to survive and then the added benefit are when they get some people traveling through for recreation or things like that.

But timber, grazing and mining, a lot of the year-round jobs that allow them to survive. Thanks.

Renewable energy is also a big part, especially in the west desert.

We have wind, solar and geothermal are all in that west desert area.

And there is not conflicts specifically, with wild horses and burros but like I said if we don't have healthy rangelands then we get into some of that conflict because we don't have the opportunity to generate some of that.

Wild free roaming horse -- wild Free Roaming Horse and Burro Act, I won't go through this, because I think the Board knows this by heart.

We looking for the thriving ecological balance on public lands.

So I want to go through these slides really quick.

26 years of change.

This is an HMA down in southern Utah.

There was a re-seeding it was very healthy and 2003, only half of it was there and this is 2016, and we don't see any grasses there.

These are pictures where there are wild horses.

The same thing on the Blonde Wash and it goes back to the discussion of how the horses can separate.

This is probably -- if there's anything from my slide, this one and the other slide, and that's the use of the forage.

You have 50% use, you are pretty good as far as keeping your -- your soil intact.

When you get down to 90% use, that's when you start seeing serious impacts, not only to the vegetation, but also impacts your water because you start getting a lot of erosion.

You don't have water retention and another thing that a lot of people don't think about with grazing, is if you keep healthy areas out there, then you also have carbon sequestration.

When you get to 90% use, you don't get carbon sequestration any more.

So something to keep in mind.

The ill pacts to water in the west.

As I said, water is key in these desert communities and what we are seeing is some significant impacts to the water sources, and it was mentioned earlier, once you start trampling down -- and horses do compact the earth harder than a cloven hoof animal.

A cloven hoof animal almost tills the earth when they walk, but the solid hoof actually compacts it.

You can see this the no livestock grazing in this area for 30 years.
You can see how solid the soils is compacted and that creates not only desertification.
Area but you see springs will actually quit running because the soil gets so compacted.
This is the other slide I would like you to take to heart.
And this is how wild horses monopolize water sources.
So you see the green is used by the horses.
And the blue is native wildlife.
I stole this slide from somebody else on the panel.
So I thank them tore that.
But it shows the impact that wild horses can have and in this area, we were not looking
at cattle, but I can tell you also from being out on these ranges, that if there are wild
horses on these water sources, they will also keep the cattle off.
So it's another impact to the grazing, but mostly looking at the wildlife issue on that.
How to achieve AML, some thoughts that we.
Have I know this is very aggressive, but with what's going on on the range, water
impacts and forage impacts, threatened and endangered species, we are facing
critical challenges and we would like to see AML achieved within three years but
certainly within five to ten years.
That's critical or else we will never get ahead of this, especially the ecological damage.
We have a lot of restoration and remediation to do on the range and we can't even
start doing that until we get down to AML and we talked a little about what the state of
Utah is doing with watershed restoration yesterday and we are happy to pitch in on
that effort but until we get to AML it's pointless to go out and do those projects.
Like we said earlier, we have done the seeding projects.
If you are over AML, the seedings just go away.
They are unsuccessful.
We would like to see all available fertility control options on the table.
Different HMAs will require different solutions.
Some will require permanent sterilization and some we can do the darting but we have
to look at them HMA by HMA and see what works in those areas.
If you have areas that are really vast, really rugged, you are going to have to probably
look at a permanent sterilization solution as part of getting to AML.
Remove young adoptable animals.
This comes from my background.
The younger the animal it is, the easier they are to imprint with and the easier they are
to train.
We need to concentrate on bringing off those animals that are trainable and adoptable.
I think it was Protect the Harvest did a futurity and the top sale was \$70,000.
There are ways to help finance some of this stuff, but we need to get those
young -- and they started with very young animals.
Also, though, we need to retain an adequate number of high quality young animals for
herd viability and diversity.
We always kept three or four of our best fillies and those were our replacement fillies
and that's how we kept them genetically viable and then we brought in a new stud
every few years.

We always had 80 head and we had good genetic viability by keeping the -- we also brought in other mares.

There's a way to do that by just bringing in new genetics.

And also I would highly recommend that we look at implementing proven grazing principles in the Wild Horse and Burro Program.

Do we shut off water and try to get them to move to a new area?

But with the wild horses if we don't think about how to move them, and how to get next in new pastures and do some kind of rotation with them, we will always end up with these impacts, localized impacts.

As we deal with the grazing community, we have plans and then we plan on when they will be in the pasture.

I would suggest that that's one of the ways to do this the last couple of days.

I saw that wild horse and burros are the living spirit of the West, I couldn't agree with that more.

They are.

That's one side of the coin.

The other side of that coin are the actual pioneers who brought the horses there.

We hear a lot of discussion of removing the grazing in order to allow more horses to be out there.

Those families, Mr. Yardley's family that have been out here for generations, those are the pioneers that brought these horses to the range.

So I hope we can get away from saying it needs to be one or the other.

There's enough room that they can both survive.

We need to work as partners on that instead of being in conflict with each other all the time.

I appreciate Nancy and the work she's doing to Friday that to fruition.

Dr. Steed was talking about tradeoffs.

We have to have multiple use and how do we get healthy herds on healthy rangelands while also still allowing renewable energy, grazing and the other things that are critical for the state of Utah to continue while we also enjoy the wild horses on range.

So look forward to working with you all, and I'm open to questions.

Thank you.

>> FRED WOHL: Thank you very much, Redge.

Jim, do you have a question?

>> JAMES FRENCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Real quick question, Redge, from the -- you mentioned we all understand from the governor's office and I'm wondering if there's conversations within that -- that circle that in the process of achieving the recommendations, the five that you just presented to us, is there an appetite on the part of the state and local governments to partner with the federal government to achieve those recommendations?

>> REDGE JOHNSON: So yes, two years ago, the legislature put \$500,000 to doing rangeland projects and \$250,000 went in this year and part of that was for rangelands and another part of that was for some water projects and then actually doing some gathers.

Now we are not -- we have not done anything on the adoption side or fertility side.

But I think you would find a willing partner, in we can come up with some of these solutions to be partners with you on that.

You know we are great partners on the water restoration and rangeland restoration, yes, I think would be partners.

>> JAMES FRENCH: I think the subject matter experts alone and the ability to provide the specific management direction that is necessary for your piece of country in here is crucial in this whole thing and I think -- I would just like to state for the record, I think that part of the solution of this thing is going to be not only public and private partnerships that was presented by Nancy but also state and local partnerships right alongside of it.

>> REDGE JOHNSON: Thank you.

I would agree with that and state and county Resource Management Plans we refer to that as local ecological knowledge.

And, you know, these people have been on the range for 150 years.

They know how to manage these areas.

And if you see -- I would say, in the 40 years that I can remember, and I have been on the range since I was 10, working with my family, and buying cattle all across the we have, I have seen a marked improvement in many areas in the forage because of the management practices that we use now.

You know, we are not there in the '20s and '30s, but we are learning a lot and implementing those better management practices and I think we can bring that to the table on this issue.

>> FRED WOEHL: Ben, you have a question?

>> BEN MASTERS: I do.

Judging from the historical record of success of the wild horse and burro program, I think that the possibility of the program getting significantly more sun sustainable is very, very real.

And currently, in Utah, it's three times over AML, and there is approximately 800 to 1,000 horses outside of the herd management areas.

If populations double every four years, you are looking at 2,000 horses outside of HMAs and four years, 4,000 outside of HMAs in the next eight years.

The BLM's budget is strapped.

I wouldn't plan on them being able to contain it.

Does the state of Utah have a plan on what to do with potential exponentially growing horse herds outside?

Herd management areas?

>> REDGE JOHNSON: So right now our hands are tied with the same regulations that Congress has put on the Wild Horse and Burro Act.

It's interesting under the act, they are supposed to work with the local wildlife division, and we would like to see more cooperation there.

But to date, we -- I guess, one, that's why I'm here, talking about trying to find solutions.

We recognize this is an exponentially growing problem.

If we don't get ahead of it, that's why our timeline is three years.

You will see a lot of five and ten-year timelines.

I don't think we can let it go that far, Ben.

We have to get on this right away and there is a significant impact to our private landowners.

You know, as I said, some of these counties are in single digit private landownership. And they are still seeing impacts from wild horses.

That's -- that's not fair to them and we also have a lot of state institutional trust lands out on the rangelands.

Those are funds that go to our school children and they are affected by wild horse and burros.

So we have impact and we can't survive the exponential growth in the wild horses and be economically viable in some of these rural counties.

So we will do everything we can and, you know, we have been back to Washington, D.C., to try to indicate people on the impacts that we see in rural Utah, but we need a solution from Congress to allow us to -- to address this.

>> BEN MASTERS: On those state lands, if there is a horse on state lands and it's not inside of an HMA, or an HA, whose horse is that?

>> REDGE JOHNSON: It is to my knowledge, still a BLM horse.

We can call and let them know that they are there and they are supposed to be there within three days to remove it, but one of the issues, these are rangelands.

And so when the operator has the rangeland out there, is on the mountain taking care of his cattle during the summer months or harvesting the alfalfa, and he may not be out for a couple of weeks and they have eaten all the feed, but he didn't know that they were there for three or four or five weeks until he goes back out to check on something.

So there are some significant impacts there.

They are still wild horses and they are still protected under the Wild Horse and Burro Act.

The only thing we can do is let them know that they are there.

And Gus is really good trying to get the horses off of the private lands but it's the notification part where these are wide open rangelands.

If you have been down to western Utah, southwestern Utah, you know how big it is and how open it is.

Those horses have a lot of places to hide and they come out at night to feed and so there's an issue.

>> BEN MASTERS: So you are stating that a horse, an unclaimed horse that's on state land that's not inside an HMA or HA, belongs to BLM?

>> REDGE JOHNSON: Are you talking about unclaimed horses or horses that are branded?

We have two things --

>> BEN MASTERS: A feral horse.

That's 40 miles away from the nearest HMA.

>> REDGE JOHNSON: So if it's a branded, marked BLM horse, it's under Gus' supervision.

If it's a feral horse where somebody -- a private individual took a horse out and just let it out, and it's not a BLM wild horse, then the sheriff can go out there immediately pick

it up and they have to hold it for a few days and they can take it to a market and sell it. Does that answer your question?

>> BEN MASTERS: The horses that are in HMAs are not branded.

So if a horse on an HMA and left ten miles without a brand, I don't understand why that horse is a wild horse and is the BLM's.

>> REDGE JOHNSON: So that's a good question and I will have to leave that one to Gus or somebody else on how that one is handled because we -- we can't harass the wild horses.

>> FRED WOEHL: But I think what he's asking, how do you know that it's a wild horse?

How do you know that it's not a horse off the -- the neighbor's ranch?

>> REDGE JOHNSON: Yeah.

>> FRED WOEHL: So what Ben is asking about these horses that are off the range, that they are completely away from it, what is the state of -- the state of Utah going to do about it?

I almost called y'all Idaho.

>> REDGE JOHNSON: That's fine.

We get along great with our partners to the north.

>> BEN MASTERS: Would that be better to defer to Gus?

>> REDGE JOHNSON: It is.

I will leave that one to Gus.

I can tell you most of our ranchers are very nervous about disturbing the wild horses and so they won't do something like that, but Gus, why don't you handle that one.

>> GUS WARR: Sorry, Redge, I want to see you squirm a little bit.

In the horse expand we they move outside of the herd area, even if they are 10 miles away, those animals are still unbranded, unclaimed and they fall under the Wild Horse and Burro Act.

It's not anywhere near an HMA.

We go and investigate it.

We try to determine good it's a feral horse that's been turned loose.

Sometimes we see one with a halter mark or the classic is we look down and see a shoe on it.

That's obviously not a wild horse but a horse that's unbranded, unclaimed, on public lands falls into the Wild Horse and Burro Act.

>> FRED WOEHL: Is there a brand law in Utah?

>> Yes, definitely, we work really closely with the state of Utah and the brand inspectors and they help us veg these questions if there's any questions.

We can determine are they wild horses or private feral horses.

>> FRED WOEHL: Dr. Petersen, don't panic, you will get your full time.

You will be grilled just as much as these folks are.

>> BEN MASTERS: So that statement that a horse that's unclaimed on public lands is a wild horse, that is a big statement.

Where is that at?

Where is that written at in the act?

Yeah, because that fascinates me that -- that a horse that's unclaimed that could be

200 miles away from the nearest HMA under that definition would be considered a wild horse.

(Off microphone comment)

>> GUS WARR: Mr. Chairman, in the state of Nevada, you know, everybody knows where the Virginia range is.

That's where the Wild Horse and Burro Act originated with Wild Horse Annie, she was talking about the Virginia range at the time.

And much of the Virginia range is state land.

And the Bureau of Land Management, there's a significant herd of horses on the Virginia range.

There always has been, at least in recent history.

And the Bureau of Land Management relinquished -- the question was asked them, are those your horses?

Are those somebody else's horses?

The same question you just asked the Bureau of Land Management, no way.

And we had -- we got an opinion from the attorney general just recently, the Department of Justice that those horses belong, in fact, to the state of Nevada and the management is -- is going to have to originate in the state of Nevada, and they are going to take responsibility for those horses.

That's why the controversial discussion about the sale without restriction on the Virginia range, the population came up.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Are they held within the confines of the act on those horses.

>> What was that again?

Are they held within the confines of the act of what they can --

>> Not at all.

They are completely independent of that.

>> I have a comment.

I want to commend you on one thing that you said.

That's where said that they retain an adequate number of high quality young horses.

I have been on a couple of gatherings where they return part of the animals they gather to the range and I'm not critical of the folks that were in charge because they were range or grass manners.

They have horse people, but they were returning horses -- and I understand this from an adoption perspectives, Palominos, and buckskins but a lot of them were club footed or bench needed or had straight stifles and those are significant defects that would always lead to early lameness or certain wild horses early death.

And so I'm not sure what the solution is.

I'm sure we could put to go an educational booklet for the people that run the gatherings to help them identify those type of defects, because they do have consequences.

And a just want to commend you for bringing that up because it's a very good point that hasn't been discussed before.

>> REDGE JOHNSON: Thank you.

If I could add to that, during some professional conversations with folks, they were concentrating on those adoptable animals and bringing them on, as many as they

could, and my point to them was leave some of those genetic markers in your herds so that what you are developing long term are adoptable animals.

Don't leave -- if whatever you are -- your negative traits if you leave those long-term, you will have less adoptable animals.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: I think one of the issues we faced is a lot of true, good, horse people, traditionally have not adopted these wild horses.

There's been some great effort to correct that with Mustang Makeover and so forth, and I told a fellow on the range that day, horsemen want horses that will remain sound.

And so even though the horse is pretty, if he's got bad knees or he's got hoof problems, they are not going to adopt that horse.

And we need to encourage people that are in the horse business that know how to train and ride horses to adopt these horses.

>> FRED WOEHL: Thank you very much.

That was a good program.

Dr. Petersen.

>> DR. STEVEN PETERSEN: Is that working.

>> FRED WOEHL: As they say in a western I watch, shoot Luke, you are loaded.

>> DR. STEVEN PETERSEN: This is a great opportunity to think through these things and come one ideas.

Mostly my background is in rangeland ecology and management.

Soil focus on the ecological principles that tie to range ecology and I don't know if you have seen this book of Jerry Holechek, the rangeland management principles.

I want you to read it and put on your coffee table and it's a beautiful book and it talks about major fundamental thoughts about how we conserve range.

And my focus is talking about some of those.

In that book, it talks about the main conservation for raising our resource practices that we have and they are to sustain rangeland renewable resources and that's a fundamental part.

To maintain green plants and capture solar energy and sustain range animals and maintaining that should be the focus of management efforts.

And then to provide protection to soil, water, vegetation and sustain the multiple uses that Redge just talked about.

With that we have to talk about the things that keep these rangelands sustainable.

They are precipitation which is the single most important factor in determining the plant communities.

And with that are soils that we protect soils, we understand them and realize they have a huge influence on the ability for plants to persist and to respond and when you think about ecological practices and principles we should think about resilience, as well as resistance to these types of disturbances.

It goes along with what Redge was just saying.

I put this map together.

This is of all the HMAs in the West United States.

And if you look at the map of -- this is from -- I can't see the dates on there, but about 30, 40 years, something like that is the average annual precipitation in the United

States and in red there, that red is primarily the driest parts of the state, and then if you look at Nevada, you have the arid environment.

And you have the relationship between where the horses are at and where rangelands are at and these conditions, it's really important to think about the influence of -- of the environment and the ecological responses and the resilience through these sites and the plant communities.

Also major principle of range is that you consider the potential disturbances and one of them is looking at animal density.

It is the most important of all grazing management decisions.

It has to deal with the frequency, the timing, the duration of grazing and how that can influence the plant communities that are there.

I like Redge's picture of the plants that he had on there, showing total grazing and not total grazing but the influence of plants in response to grazing, having to deal with total amount that was utilized, utilization.

And what happens these plants when which have evolved and grazing over long, long time periods they persist with grazing but as they continue to be grazed on, they have to draw from carbohydrate reserves.

If you keep using those plants over and over time, they only have so much they can draw from.

The roots are not able to do that.

The wheatgrass can respond very effectively, and enough hits of grazing in a time period, especially when they are vulnerable can a deleterious effect on that plant.

An important topic is the carrying capacity.

These ecosystems are tolerant of a disturbance, over time you can see what they can actually support and maintain.

And so think about stocking rates.

Your goals are to not over do this to cause damage to vegetation and part of this is to maintain the ecological processes that you see on the environment.

Sort emphasis is then to maintain the interactions so you can maintain the plant community that stabilize the soils, allows for infiltration rates and you get nutrient cycling and all of these processes that are made for rangeland management and health.

And with, that we continue what with has been stated as far as how we manage our horses, the BLM has come one appropriate management levels with the goal of -- this is in the handbook to maintain a balance of free roaming horses and burros with livestock, wilderness and recreation.

If you look back at the 1971 act, a statement that was made was the goal is to maintain a thriving natural ecological balance.

When I was on the committee, we talked a lot about what that means.

And how do you maintain this thriving natural ecological balance and it's an important thing to consider.

And the number of animals, whatever they may be, it's just an herbivore.

It doesn't have to be a horse.

It can be anything like we already heard about, livestock, and it doesn't matter what it is, as long as you are grazing these plants and having that effect, you need to consider

what that stocking rate means as far as the resilience of these sites.

Just for fun, I pulled up this.

This was off of the BLM website.

They showed the different states.

This is for a report from March 2018, and this was a total of horses by state and the total number of burros and their total.

I thought, well, compare that to 2017, how much is that?

Are we seeing a change and these are the results, every state except a couple?

This is Montana that has a decrease, but the rest are continually increasing.

We continue to see an increase in the number of horses.

And maybe more important is the discussion about AML and how many -- what percent of horses are there above AML in these different sites.

And the only one that's below it right now is Idaho.

The rest are all above and overall for the total amount on the bottom right is 207% above AML and that goes back to the concept of stocking rates and what it means to the lands long term.

So I want to show you a few things that have come out of the scientific data collection recently.

This is a site up in northwestern Nevada.

That fencing is great for doing studies.

You don't have to get an EIS, it's called liberty fencing.

So it's part of a team.

There were several of us involved in this study.

We developed those disclosures and five different disclosures.

Gail Collins was the biologist out there who has done a lot of work on horses.

You can see where it's exposed to grazing and on the right it's excluded from grazing.

We had a group out of ARS from Oregon.

And this is from Dr. Davies with Gail Collins and Chad Boyd who have reported on their five-year study.

Effects on horse grazing comparing excluded versus non-excluded.

And basically her base is covering density did not differ between grazing treatment from their study.

What they did find was that horses grazed areas had lower sagebrush density and greater soil penetration resistance and lower stability.

What that implies to those who would read this you have to be careful that you may have an effect, right?

So it may have an effect on the ecological function of semi-arid rangelands with the risk to exposing soils to impact the hydrologic process that occurs.

That was published in 2004 and I have a copy of that paper right here, and I can hand them to you if you would like to have that.

I made one though, I should have made a bunch.

I have that for you.

I will give you the whole pack.

I have a whole bunch of papers here that discuss this stuff.

And so on the right, you can see the grass soil aggregates and both are showing a

significant difference between graze and exposed sites.

And then the same team of people, they put together that study which was looking down.

So Davies was looking at the upland areas.

This study was down in the riparian community.

Again five years.

The same location.

Five different disclosures to show replication in this.

If you consider cover, also the density of plants, that there's an effect.

So bare ground in grazed areas was much higher -- it was much higher.

Significantly higher, and then here significantly lower.

There are these effects that can occur and the next graph shows you this, which is subtle heights and visual obstruction for potentially hiding cover.

To be considered.

And this is for plant community analysis.

This next set of slides is from work that was done by Luke Hall.

Environment was a Ph.D. student out of BYU, Brock McMillan and Redge, this was some of the stuff you were talking about.

They put fences -- they had areas fenced off to horses at Dugway Proving Grounds that's here in Utah and they wanted to see what difference would you see in areas that had horses that were able to access these water sites, versus those that were excluded and this image here is showing the total number of visits of wildlife at a site.

And on the left is your horse excluded sites and on the right are included.

And that's just a total of number of visits for wildlife species and if you break it down into individual species that do show up, on the left is showing you, again, excluded sites where you have got significantly higher number of species that are occurring at these sites where they are excluded.

Three minutes?

Got it.

That's perfect.

So the thought is that you think about the size of these animals.

They are large-bodied animals and, again, it's not just picking on horses.

Tobacco any large herbivore.

It's just the interaction between animals.

We did a study, my graduate student out in the same location, not this one but in Nevada where we looked at pronghorn.

She sat up on the hill and observed pronghorn and horse interactions and 50% of the time, when horses showed up, pronghorn would vacate the water source.

We think mostly because of the size, the pronghorn, 100, 150 pounds and a horse will be 1,000 or 1200 pounds and it's a body size issue.

This is one that Redge just showed.

I want to understand what this is saying in the summer months when water becomes a scarcity and they need the water.

It's showing you the amount of time that the horses will stay at a water hole and utilize that water which can potentially displace other species.

A couple of slides left.

This is a description of the state theory.

An important concept, when a site has a potential disturbance, whatever that may be, over time, that disturbance may cross ecological thresholds.

We suggest that it takes energy, to be time and money and extra management to drive these ecological sites back to the way they were historically.

The goal in rangeland management is to not cross ecological thresholds if at all possible.

And that comes down to doing risk assessment, and so for sites that are potentially being utilized by herbivores of whatever type, that needs to be considered very carefully.

The sites like this are not permanently.

I was a week ago in Australia, at brumby week.

They talk about brumby impacts and they have had -- they got over 1 million brumbies, about 1 million brumbies in the whole country.

And there's an area where they removed horses and they still over the last three to four years have not -- last three to four years have not seen much of a recovery.

We haven't quantified that.

How much can they tolerate in crossing these thresholds.

It may not rebound the way you would like it to recover.

So the thought is to become educated and understand what the ecological processes are like.

And knowing what the principles are like, I think it's really critical and they can apply those, and understand the knowledge to make real fundamental decisions and maintain these landscapes.

And from that, you are able to make predictions about what those impacts might be.

And ecological site descriptions have been produced in many states.

I know for Nevada we they have a lot of ecological site.

It allows them to make predictions of what happens when you cross those and what does it feel like and what does it take to get them back.

I think that's a real fundamental part of this.

And with that, if you have any questions about this, I'm more than happy to answer those.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I would like to comment, Dr. Petersen, I think the all the information, a fundamental impact of what you presented is the most important thing that we have heard yet.

Knowing the significant impact that the rangeland resource has on so many different animals and.

So different people, what's at stake here with the excess population of wild horses, is astronomical.

And I would hope everyone would take an opportunity to review this information and look it over, but could you just touch on, you know -- and you kind of have, but you brushed over this transition that occurs when there is a threshold, an ecological threshold that's crossed.

What are the ramifications on these arid desert communities of crossing that threshold

and how long does it potentially take to return back to that pristine state it was in to between with.

>> DR. STEVEN PETERSEN: I love that question.

I teach to that to my students all the time.

8 to 10 minutes, it's not enough to go into detail.

These sites are sustained.

You have plant communities that have abiotic, and biotic.

You have your plants and the litter in the soil and decomposition rates and you have water and infiltration of the soil and all of that goes to go.

So they maintain these processes which are nitrogen cycling and the hydrological cycle.

These are fundamental parts of maintaining the ecosystem.

As sites become degraded for whatever the cause, is it can cause that disruption to those processes.

The discussion of what a threshold is, it's hard to define with strict numbers.

So the goal is to figure out where you see the decoupling processes.

You get higher runoff which has greater sediment content in that runoff.

That's the concern that you start losing your soils.

You can go from a abiotic, or biotic, where -- abiotic where you start to lose soils and the ability to infiltrate water and those are much more difficult to recover from, the abiotic thresholds.

If you lose your A horizon or the O horizon, that takes a long time, especially in the semiarid and arid environments that I was showing on this map.

If you let it go long enough, you could talk hundreds of thousands of years of recovery, unless you will do something about it.

So many of the discussions we have is kind of -- you could say it's more about triage.

You don't see this long-term impact.

But the goal is we have a lot of effort, we need a lot of effort it do things to restore the rangelands and implement the recovery and maintain the recovery process.

Is that a fair question?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: What is the cost involved and the success rate in the arid communities when you talk about trying to overcome those thresholds through man made manipulations and the re-seedings that you can do to get it back to a state where you would like to see it, especially when you are involved with millions of acres that you are talking about.

What are costs involved in that?

>> DR. STEVEN PETERSEN: I will have to price out seed.

When they do seeding operations, the cost is outrageous, especially in the western -- the Great Basin environment, in particular.

These lands are dry.

Nevada is 10 inches or less per year as an annual average precipitation.

I think down in some of the low elevations where it could be 5 or 6 inches per year.

The ability to seed and have the seed germinate and be established.

If you get 1 to 5% success and you are seeding, then your average is pretty good.

Sometimes they have less than that.

And so it costs a lot to go out and do seeding and have it work and be a successful thing.

That leads to a discussion about, yeah, the whole business of what kind of plants you can seed out there because some will persist and some don't do well.

It's a challenge.

It can be very expensive.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Did you say 1 to 5%.

>> DR. STEVEN PETERSEN: That's not atypical for dry, arid rangelands.

That's typical.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Thank you.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Celeste, you woke up.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I like this kind of stuff, and so I was listening.

>> DR. STEVEN PETERSEN: It is a fun topic.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I wanted to appreciate what you had to say.

This is in particular wild horse study but it does not preclude other large hoof ungulates and the point is not to mace blame at all, it's to figure out how to better manage.

We need better information about our horses on the public lands and doing the right thing.

So I support that.

Thank you.

>> DR. STEVEN PETERSEN: I agree with that.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Anybody else have any questions?

Board, I would like to really appreciate you coming and you have done a good job.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chair?

>> FRED WOEHLE: We will have some talks about that.

I was a bit apprehensive.

This is great.

I didn't ask you if you had a question!

(Laughter).

>> Trust me on that.

>> FRED WOEHLE: I do trust you.

But this was really, really, really, really, really good.

This is first time we have ever done anything like this and it was really, really good.

I'm serious.

I really enjoyed it.

>> Not just you, Fred.

>> FRED WOEHLE: I think they do.

Daniel?

That's what I was fixing to do next.

Sue, are you on the phone?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chairman, this is Barry.

Can you hear me?

>> FRED WOEHLE: We can hear you.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Great.

I have a quick question.

I just went through the Green River Tunnel and I lost everything.

I have a quick question for Dr. Petersen.

Could you explain that, you know, you were talking about Dr. Davies' study up at the Sheldon.

Could you explain for the public very quickly or reiterate once again because you did it earlier in your talk, that there is no such thing as grazing or there's no such thing as grazed or ungrazed.

It's always in some context of timing, duration and intensity?

>> DR. STEVEN PETERSEN: Yes, I can address that.

That -- going back to that fundamental principle in the beginning, that's what matters the most and if there is an ability to manage animals and how they use these landscapes, that is when you have the most effective use as I mentioned these plants, these perennial grasses they evolved with this but they are sensitive to the way they are grazed.

And the timing of grazing is really important.

It goes with upland and riparian system.

You can graze riparian systems every year, but if you hit them again and again, over and over, that can be an issue.

That is a big problem.

Also if you graze them during a critical growing period when they are producing their inflorescences, they can handle that but they can't handle it over and over, especially in one growing season.

So they are vulnerable.

They are adaptive to those conditions but they are vulnerable as well.

Being able to keep your animals where the plant community is best benefited over time, is an important thing to consider.

I don't know if I answered the question or not.

What else did you ask about that?

I don't know if I got the whole thing.

Anyway, that's good.

And that's some stuff for you to think about.

Oh, it was about gradients, right, about over time period.

You know, you have to be able to understand that there will be animals from and there's different levels of grazing, and they will move on to the next ones and so there's movement going on.

But, again, it's this interaction between the grazer and the plant community that's there.

>> FRED WOEHL: Barry, can you hear me?

Barry?

Barry?

Sue?

We don't have anybody on now.

All right.

Okay.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: I can hear you!

(Laughter)

I heard most of what Dr. Petersen spoke of and I just wanted to just add very quickly that the study in the Sheldon, although there was no major differences between the two treatments, it was only true under that specific grazing scenario of timing, duration and intensity.

If you changed that timing, duration and intensity, you can expect a movement of one way or the other, depending on whether it was more intense or less intense.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Thank you, Barry.

>> DR. STEVEN PETERSEN: There are a number of horses -- the Sheldon has had up to in the past, 1,000, 1200 horses on it.

The study was around the Badger Mountain area.

So a number of enclosures were set up in different spring areas springs and creeks and this is a very arid environment as well.

It's a lot like what you see in that picture.

That's next door.

That's over in the Roaring Springs Mountain area of Steens Mountains.

But anyway, that area did have horses that varied in the number and they were doing some roundups at the time and so the intensity of grazing did occur over time and I believe it states that in that document.

You can go through that and read that paper and have both of them here, both the Davies and the Boyd paper that describes that process, but there was -- you know, that was a discussion they had as well.

How many horses are there?

Are they staying in the area?

Are they moving on?

Coming back?

And I don't believe they really carefully looked at the exact number of animals that were present all the time.

We did have some cameras up.

We were take pictures of these horses.

We have knew they were coming inconsistently.

We do have that data that we can go back and look at.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Okay.

Okay.

Board, at this time, I think we will go ahead and take a ten-minute break and then when we get back, there's a change in the agenda, not much of a change, but for the next couple of hours we will have working group reports but we are also going to talk about some recommendations and try to formulate some of those.

We aren't going to finalize them but talk about -- I didn't say you could leave!

We are adjourned for ten minutes.

(Break)

>> FRED WOEHLE: If everybody will get seated, we will take up again.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: I am here, Mr. Chairman.

>> FRED WOEHLE: If the board members would make their way to the platform, we will take up again.

Yes.

Yes.

All right, Board, the next item on the agenda is the working group reports.

We have that until lunch.

We will break for lunch at 11:30.

I want y'all to know we will have an hour of this and then we will take it back up.

One of the things I would like to propose in this thing is I don't think we are going to have a lot of working group talk to describe.

I would like to take this time to maybe work a little bit on doing some concepts and ideas for our recommendations that we will finally formulate and put out according to the schedule at 4:30.

So if y'all don't have any problems with that, and because I think a lot of y'all are -- the recommendations that you are going to make was a direct result of your working group.

So if that meeting with everybody's approval, we will just go right into it.

So one of the things that -- I don't know what to do about this point about who goes first or what goes what or things like that.

So Ginger had mentioned to me that she had a couple of items that she would like to bring up.

So I will just go to her.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

These are really very small things in the scope of things.

A couple of -- a couple of points and recommendations that I would like for you to consider.

We have had some conflicts between wild horses and burros and trucks and cars and so forth, east of Bullhead City where my brother lives and in other places in Wyoming and so forth.

And in Wyoming, they have used something called a Strieter light.

And these are small reflectors and it's s-t-r-e-i-t-e-r, they are on the posts and on the sides of the highway on both sides.

The concept is that particularly the conflicts occurred at dusk and at night.

And when the headlights of the truck or car hit the light, it creates cross beams that go across and has the effect of deterring wildlife to cross there.

They are being used, and there have been studies done on this, that has office has, if that's important to you.

And they are being used in Wyoming.

I drive, of course this to the Pryors, I drive through Wyoming on a regular basis.

And so from roughly Worland, and Thermopolis and it's big, open country but there's a lot of conflict that's happened and also south of Grand Teton National Park they use Strieter lights.

I would suggest to BLM that they review where there are conflicts with wildlife, including burros and horses, and look into using this tool, which I think is very modestly priced to avoid collisions and damages to both humans and mammals.

>> FRED WOHL: I don't know if that's something that is feasible or allowed because you are talking about state highways and BLM has no -- I mean, no jurisdiction.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Jurisdiction there.

Well, I think what BLM could do is since, particularly east of Bullhead City, it's BLM land and Black Rock Desert Burro range, but they could interface, of course, as they do on a regular basis with state and local governments on this.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, I -- okay.

That's something that we can talk about.

Okay.

What else?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: We love what Gus has done as far as having a kiosk with some of the rules of the trail and also those -- those plastic sticks that have also rules on there, don't feed, don't get within 100 feet, and also, they let the public know where they are.

And they let the public know that they are in a herd management area, managed by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service.

I think the Forest Service could utilize this as well.

We raised the awareness that these are wild horses and not domestic horses.

And it also will increase, I believe, tourism and maybe help some of the smaller communities that are around areas that people don't know what they are seeing or they don't know that they have even passed a wild horse herd area.

In one of the small communities in Colorado, Maybell, they have a sign right outside of town that says, you know, that you are entering wild horse country and so forth and there's good signage at Sand Wash, if you have been to Sand Wash Basin but it can help promote the opportunities for the wild horses.

So I would like to see BLM do this in all the herds, where -- where they can identify that you are entering a wild horse herd area and here are the rules of watching and behaving in wild horse area.

>> FRED WOEHL: I'm sure there's a minimum standard but each state stands alone.

I mean, our role as the board is to make broad recommendations from 30,000 feet, not getting exactly in that.

Now, Bruce, isn't there a regulation that requires signage?

Don't you have a -- on your HMAs and things of that nature?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I'm not sure what you mean, require signage?

>> FRED WOEHL: Saying this is BLM land.

This is BLM rules.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Typically when people enter public lands, they see typically all the signs that will say, you are entering the lands managed by the so and so field office.

You know, and I think it's still up -- I think it's those HMAs that have high accessibility to the public probably already have kiosks in them.

I think, you know, again, somebody, I'm from Colorado, we have kiosks in Sand Wash Basin out there, but I think that's the only one.

Well, a Little Books has the friends of the mustang group there has developed a large structure there and that educates on the wild horse story.

So it varies.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: In Wyoming specifically, there's great opportunity for this.

Excuse me.

The route to Riverton, there are a number of herds that you pass along the way and that would be very beneficial, I think, Stewart Creek.

Green Mountain.

But herds where people are driving down the highway -- and I have been in the motel there in Rawlins and people are going, yeah, I saw some horses.

And the owner of the hotel, in fact, said, well, those are wild horses.

And they said, oh, really?

I didn't know that.

So we create an appreciation and more enjoyable trip if you know that long strip as wild horses that you are looking at.

>> FRED WOEHL: I think we could -- we can probably do something along the lines of encouraging BLM to promote stuff like, that but as far as mandating they do, A, B, C and D, I don't think we can.

>> We can include it as part of a marketing strategy that we all discussed earlier.

You know marketing was a big emphasis or push for the bureau in order to meet some of those goals that -- that they put out.

I have think that would be part a marketing strategy, for sure.

>> FRED WOEHL: To promote.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: I think -- yeah, I agree.

It is more marketing.

And in the long run, it's also about adoption.

If people get used to seeing horses and they go, wow, those horses are really cool.

I would like to have one of them one day, it's an incentive to adopt.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

We can talk about that later.

Okay.

Ben?

Do you have anything you want to bring up?

No recommendation or anything like that?

Steven?

We may get to go to lunch early.

My goodness.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Sorry.

Yesterday there was presented to us by Alan Shepherd the on range branch chief, a set of options that were presented to Congress.

There were four different options that were presented to Congress, that BLM spent a lot of time and money adopting and I think as a board, we need to find one that we can stand behind and support and tell Congress, you know, this is -- this is the option that the Board supports.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

So you are referring to the four options, A, B, C, and D, that he presented yesterday then?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

Okay.

I think so too.

I think we need to think about that and we can talk about it a little bit further, but come up with an option.

I think that's great.

I think that's a good idea.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I think it would be beneficial for everyone on the Board, maybe now or during lunch, but whenever you have a moment to kind of review those and look it over and kind of see what -- as you study it, what you think would be the best viable option.

Because I know BLM put a lot of thought and effort into it.

I have think we ought to support next in it.

>> FRED WOEHL: Good idea.

Good idea.

Was there anything in your's and Celeste's working group that y'all come up with?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I don't -- I think just general overall support for the BLM continuing to -- they were given marketing survey, which advised them to do some branding work to get some consistency between and among their adoption events and raise the level of professionalism and train volunteers and things of that nature, just so when you show up at an event, you know exactly what to expect.

Then implementing the solutions in a very, very, very comprehensive plan this they were given is going to take some resources and time and I think the Board needs to be supportive of that so that the adoption program can continue its forward progression.

>> FRED WOEHL: In what way?

What areas?

What type of --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I think that we should be supportive of -- that part of the marketing plan called for subcontracting out some portion of those -- that entire program.

That's going to be expensive and going to require RFPs and that whole thing.

>> FRED WOEHL: You are talking about the Great Lakes Marketing report that we got?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Correct.

>> FRED WOEHL: That was a very interesting report and a lot of things in there.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: It was.

So I think that having come from oddly enough, strangely, I shouldn't have ever had this job, but marketing job for a short period of time.

Oftentimes the marketing studying is done and nothing else happens.

Sometimes what happens is agencies will hand pick from that.

Obviously the low hanging fruit will happen first but they can do within, but I think we need to be very supportive of making sure that they actually complete that project.

>> FRED WOEHL: Do you think that every aspect of that marketing survey should be implemented or do you think we need to cherry pick the ones that applied the best or --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I think they should be relying on a subcontractor to help them in making decisions.

I don't think they have the expertise to make that call but I think that people do.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Do you think that the recommendation we could make as a board, would be to implement the Great Lakes research project?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: So it's a little lazy.

They have begun implementation of it and just making sure that we are backing the continuation of that.

A project like this, that they sort of reach out a top out point and then we sort of run out of money at this point and then everything that you have done down the line --

>> FRED WOEHLE: Well, money is a limiting factor.

We have to admit that.

Maybe y'all could develop something along the lines that implemented, you know, to continue applying, aspects of that report that they can, that's feasible and economically feasible or something like that.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Okay.

Let me tweak some wording.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Yeah.

I think -- for those of the board that wasn't there, the BLM in 2016, they did a marketing survey and it was really good.

And Holle' gave everybody one of those the other day.

Great Lakes marketing survey and there's a lot of information in there that is just incredible that makes tons of sense and it's a thing that I hadn't even thought about b when I read it.

We had problems in the past with marketing and there's been a lot of work done along this.

It was us asking questions and everybody asking questions and BLM and how we can do a better job of marketing these horses.

Because a mustang is a great horse and promoting that and pushing that and -- it's a remarkable thing within the BLM is that you have autonomous states and you have the whole Eastern States.

I think you have 30 something states east of the Mississippi that's in the Eastern States.

And each one of them have tried to come up with their own marketing plan.

And to promote and do all of this stuff.

I think the result of this would be to try to put everybody together, and it's incredible.

And so coming up with a recommendation that as many of those that are economically feasible to apply, something along those lines.

Does that make sense?

Okay.

All right.

Good enough.

Was there anything else that y'all come up with?

Yep?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I don't think so.

We were really encouraged by some of the things that the board -- or that -- that the BLM has already implemented.

They have talked about it earlier in the meeting, and being able to increase the number of horses that an individual can purchase.

I think that really opens the door for a lot of willing people who would like to make a go at training wild mustangs.

Also we are encouraged by the BLM's making an incentive to make it easier.

I don't know if we came up with a recommendation but there has been some good discussion about whether \$1,000 is the right amount but I think it's a step in the right direction and maybe when we have a recommendation, there might be something that comes if we want to see that increase.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Well, that's a budget amount and I know Holle' spoke of where they come up with it, but in 2015, when that was the board recommendation, that they do that, that \$1,000 was about what TIP trainers were getting.

And what it was, we wanted the TIP to be -- I mean, if I TIP my own horse, I need to get the same thing.

Do you know what I'm saying?

TIP is a trainer incentive program through the Mustang Heritage Foundation.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Maybe it would be wise to leave it where it's at, but we are encouraged by some of the new approaches that are being looked into by the BLM.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Well, I mean, last year they found homes for 4600 horses.

That's a lot more than what we have had.

I mean, that is a very steep climb.

Very steep climb.

Celeste?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: To add on to the newer sales policy that you have been referring to, and Nancy brought it up in her presentation.

This is some concern on behalf of some of the groups that it's, perhaps, maybe the only problem is that it's written unclearly and so if we could have some direction for -- I'm not sure how to say this, clarifying it and making sure that it is abundantly evident that any loophole or perceived loophole is closed.

I think that would go a long way towards --

>> FRED WOEHLE: Well, you know, and I'm being very honest and very up front when I address this like this, is that, you know, the glass is half full.

It's not half empty.

Just because one person did something wrong, it should not be held against everybody else.

That upsets me that if I go and I assume that I'm going to do something bad those horses I. say pardon me, but to hell with you, I will go buy some quarter horses.

I'm being very honest.

It's up to that person on the field, that's making that decision, whether or not those horses go or not, to make the best decision they can with the information they have.

I mean, if a guy comes up in a trailer and it's got plywood on the floor and cattle panels on the side where it's rusted out and you look at him and he says, I'm going to train 25 horses.

Well, no!

You know?

I mean, that's up to that person in the field to do that.

And the problem that bothers me is that when the Bureau of Land Management makes a decision based on the base information that they have and they are covering everything, they are covering 50 states, and then when -- and then when somebody who brings it on a more personal level because of a terrible instance, terrible.

It's one of those things.

But me judging somebody because someone else made a mistake, is not the right way to handle things.

You have to -- this has to be trust.

There has to be confidence among this.

I mean if you are looking like that, then nobody should have a driver's license because we may have a wreck on the way home.

That's -- you know, that's -- that is more of a chance of you having a wreck driving home than someone else doing something else with these horses.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: But we are not on that panel.

So we don't have to talk about that.

>> FRED WOEHL: No, but you may have to vote on a recommendation.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: This is very true.

Well, perhaps I will work on a little bit more of that wording that may be amenable to discuss.

>> FRED WOEHL: I would have no problem with clarifying it a little bit, but I do have problems with prejudging people based on one person.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I do too.

>> FRED WOEHL: But you want to do it.

So, you know, that's -- that's all I have a problem with.

Was there anything else that y'all want to bring up from y'all's working group?

Yes?

Go ahead.

Yes, yes, help yourself.

>> You know, I think one of the things we have to keep in perspective on liberalizing the adoption numbers and whatnot.

If we had a corral full of horses that we had options with, you know, with what's left over, I think this would be much more of a relevant conversation.

I'm not saying it's irrelevant, but it would be even more relevant.

You know, we are looking at 70,000 horses.

And on -- we are looking to try to -- we are trying to give recommendations of how -- what we are going to do with them.

We are also talking about the populations that are doubling every four years and I think the 800-pound gorilla in the room, we don't know what we are going to do with all of these horses.

I would say to the board and everybody that's out, there we need to be looking for -- for solutions to -- to allow for more adoptions out there on the ground.

I'm not saying we give them away to people who will slaughter them.

That's not my point at all.

I'm just saying that is comes back to what our chairman just said.

I think we need to assume best intentions on people until they prove us wrong and yes, there will be problems out there that we will have to deal with down the road, but I think clarifying what is -- what the consequences are, if you do violate the rule or the law, is -- I think is a good start and it's good place to go with it.

But I think we can do to increase the adoptions to get more of them off the long-term holding site.

>> I wasn't on the board when the \$1,000 incentive program are implemented.

Are there good procedures in place to follow up on those horses to make sure that they are not eventually abused or neglected?

>> FRED WOEHLE: Generally speaking, when -- all I can refer to is TIP.

I mean, and, well, you can do this on the wild horses too.

When they -- the plan that they have got, is when they would go and adopt that horse, they get \$500.

Now, they say that horse.

They don't own that horse for a year.

Okay?

And then at the end of the year, generally in that time, a BLM employee will go out and ensure that the horse is maintained and everything is X, Y and Z, and then at the end of the year, they can get the other \$500.

Now, I have been a TIP trainer for a long time.

And when someone comes to me to look at one of my TIP horses.

If I get the least indication that horse is already spoken for.

But now, I can't say every TIP trainer is that way.

But I'm just going about me.

I can tell you where every one of my TIP horses are.

I can tell you who has them.

I can tell you what they are doing and I'm talking at the last count was 76 of them.

I can tell you where every one of them are.

And it's a -- and so there is that requirement.

Now, on a -- an SA horse, a sale authority horse, there isn't any follow-up on that.

But what they are referring to on this -- in this bonus incentive, there's a year from the time that they pick up that horse, to the time that they get it.

So, yes, there's -- you know -- and I don't think anyone will keep a horse -- I mean, for a year and not --

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Take care of it.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Yes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Those of us who get called out to look at horses or -- not these horses but horses in general to see if they were abused in general.

Otherwise, it always worries me that some of the folks are taking the horses for the money, and not for the horse.

A year is a long time, so I think you would probably pick up --

>> FRED WOEHLE: You pick up real quick, plus the field staff going out there.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: It wouldn't hurt randomly to just drop around two or three years later.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Well, but --

>> DR. TOM LENZ: It's a resource issue, I'm sure.

>> FRED WOEHL: But they don't have any authority.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: After they signed them over.

>> FRED WOEHL: After they are titled, they are their horse.

And so it's a -- yeah.

Ginger?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I think to increase adoptions, back to the increasing adoptions, it's -- it's no fluke that there's a higher adoption rate in the horses in the herds that are known.

And so back to the signage, but there are other things, you know, I think we can do to put a wild face on the adoption program, and that is for people to know where their horse came from.

And so if they visited a range and so forth and then they have a roundup, the adoption rates go up if the herd is known.

I have been around for a long time and spoken to thousands of people all over the country.

I know that that's true.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, that's very true, because, I mean there's -- I mean, groups, you know, get together and I mean, there's folks that want horses from that HMA because they had horses in the past, you know?

So that's very true.

And one of the things that we have done, and BLM has done, there's a lot of horses that were born in -- in -- in holding and they never would keep up with where that colt was from.

You know, they just let it run with its momma and then when they got ready to wean it -- but it wouldn't have a brand on it.

There are a lot of horses on, it that have Oklahoma brands.

I mean, you know, but they were from a horse that was caught from the wild.

And so that -- many are not there.

Well, there's been a lot of work.

BLM has done a lot of work to change that.

So that horse gets the same nuclear brand as its momma to keep that line.

And, you know, it's like buying a Ford or buying a Chevy, or buying a Dodge.

If you go and the truck doesn't have any emblem on, it and it's part Dodge and part Chevy, what kind of truck is it?

There are folks who really care about.

The Tiger Period, or the Pryor herd.

I'm partial to Wyoming horses.

I had a whole bunch of them.

It's like everything else.

And so that is a good -- I mean, that's great.

That's great and that's the -- good.

Anything else that you had from y'all's group?

Okay.

Tom?

>> DR. TOM LENZ: All right.

Let me get my notes up.

So the population growth suppression working group, we had a really interesting meeting, I thought.

We reviewed the on-range and holding population numbers, and the gather numbers over the last few years.

It looks like Nevada has greatest number of horses with over 40,000 horses and 3600 burros and we have -- we view the total number here plenty of time.

So I won't go over that.

Removal numbers increased in 2018, from a previous six-year average of around 4300 animals, up to 9500 animals.

Contraceptive vaccine uses, used PZP and 275 doses of PZP and around 14 doses per year of GonaCon.

And it was estimated that Spain would reduce the greatest number of foal.

So after reviewing fertility use or the contraceptive uses or the gatherings, it's pretty obvious of that group and should be to everybody that removals in fertilities are not making much of a dense to sustainable population.

We reviewed the current research projects and there are some promising results with the use of GonaCon and y-shaping IUDs.

This is not a formal recommendation, but to first focus resources on getting down ton an AML within the next three to five years by using removals primarily.

This can be accomplished and accommodated by off-range holdings and also to consider adding on-range euthanasia, purely from a welfare perspective, or to decrease pain and suffering.

In the herds that are suffering due to dehydration and/or starvation.

We believe the consensus was once at AML, once that use has been achieved, a combination of current contraceptives sterilization, sex ratio adjustments and removals should be able to maintain herds to an acceptable level.

>> FRED WOEHLE: So you are talking about when they are gathered, club footing things of that nature?

>> DR. TOM LENZ: No.

No.

We are talking about situations where you have herds of horses or family groups where there's severe situation due to water shortage or starvation, rather than capturing those horses, perhaps the on-range euthanasia, it would be much better from a pure welfare perspective, rather than breaking up the herd and putting them through the capture technique and transportation, and so forth, and so forth.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I would propose getting to AML in three to five years is too difficult.

I think we need more time, based on the numbers and the parameters within which BLM has to stay within them just based on how many they can physically remove every year.

Maybe that can go a little bit up, but we're -- we have to kind of start at some level of assumption, and I would also propose that instead of on-range euthanasia that any gather, any time, even before AML is achieved that we increase use of fertility control

in all situations.

And we may be able to greatly reduce or hopefully completely remove any idea of euthanasia on the range or anywhere for that matter.

And I would be willing to model that out for you, if you would like, though I probably can't do it by the end of this meeting.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Well, you know, I think in a perfect world, I think that would be great, but, you know, it's our observation that we're in a critical tipping point here, that it's not like we have three or five or ten years to fix this.

I understand that it's going to take a long time, probably, but well before I joined this board, there was a lot of discussion throughout the horse industry about this issue. And we continue to hear in a couple of years and in a few years we are going to have something that will work.

Well, I don't think we have a few years.

I think we need to get on the stick and make some really hard decisions.

These are hard decisions.

No doubt everybody in this room loves horses and a lot of us devoted our entire life to improving their health and welfare and so these are hard decisions that have to be made and I think we need to -- that's what we are getting paid for, is to make those decisions and make the recommendations to BLM.

So that's something I think we can discuss.

>> FRED WOEHLE: It is tough.

It is tough and we have to come up with some kind of answer.

BLM has struggled with this.

There's lots of folks have and it's a tough thing, but the range that we saw in our field trip, as we have heard from three -- what I can consider experts today, the range is at that -- probably past the point, don't you agree, Ben where some of the range will ever come back within -- I'm older than that you.

It ain't going to come back in my lifetime.

Is it going to come back in yours?

>> BEN MASTERS: I hope so, but, I mean, I spent three weeks in Nevada, and I can count the number of healthy meadow complexes on HMAs on one hand.

>> FRED WOEHLE: And so it's kind of -- one of the things I'm taking out from this meeting is the potential of this private partnership where -- Celeste, you and I talked about this.

Where instead of BLM having a long-term holding.

Return to freedom group has long-term holding and they take over these horses or the Cloud Foundation take over these horses, something like that.

I mean -- I mean, I have mustangs at home.

I have my own return to freedom deal.

I mean, I have mustangs at home, you know?

And so I'm doing -- I'm doing my part, but anyway, that is one of the most exciting things I have taken away from here, but if this does not take effect, if we don't do something immediately -- I mean, seriously, immediately, they are in a severe drought here.

And the other day, when we drove back from the range where we were at, where

those -- where those horses was and we drove to that valley of private land and I could look at that range and look at the range we just left, it was just like the pictures we have seen, day and night.

So coming up with an answer, coming up with an approach, you know, and -- you know, and I have always said that a journey of a thousand miles begins with one footstep, but we haven't taken any footsteps and the journey is still up ahead of us and we are talking about three to five years doing this, A, B, and C.

Tom has a point.

In 2016, this board made the recommendation that we impose the 1971 law as written.

Ben was on that committee.

Steven was on that committee.

Ginger was on that committee.

Ginger did not agree.

She voted no, but eight of the nine members did and that kind of brought things to the attention of what was going on.

Now, we haven't -- but we haven't progressed since then.

That's been two years.

The population has grown more.

We have more horses out there.

Long-term and short-term holding, we have more horses than that.

Our budget has gone down 5%, and I anticipate in the budget for 2019 and 2020 is going to be about the same.

So coming up with a proposal and a plan to recommend to the Bureau of Land Management needs to take all of this into consideration.

There's not money to go ahead and increase long-term holding.

I mean, there's not money to do all of this.

And so we got to come up with something that we can recommend that's feasible, that makes sense and that is doable.

That's a tough thing to do.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: I agree 100%.

I'm excited about some of the options that have been presented here from some of the animal welfare groups.

I would like to see every horse out there end up in a happy place.

All right?

But, again, we're not there right now and we need to make some hard decisions in interest of the horses.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: I have been around for a long time, coming to these meetings.

I remember not too long ago, John Fallon served on this board.

He is not inherently in the wild horse loving area, and I release rates speck him greatly.

He was almost begging the BLM to increase the fertility control doses.

He said 400 doses.

What is that going to do?

So when you have the past president of the cattleman's association and also the

advocacy community begging BLM to increase fertility control, you know something is very wrong.

I think this is a moral argument, should our wild horses pay for the inaction, long-term inaction of the government when tools that were available were voluntarily not used. And I totally agree with Celeste that we have to up the game and with Nancy Perry, that every mare that is given PZP-22 and if they are then reapplied in a couple of years, science is indicating that it has very long durability and it would render infertility. And Ben and I didn't even have a person in our volunteer group.

So from a volunteer standpoint, I think there are a lot of people who stand ready to help.

And that goes back to advertising and marketing.

If people know where herds are and they admire them, they are going to be much more inclined to volunteer and we need volunteers like crazy to carry out on the range management.

But back to the moral question: Do you kill the horses because of a failure in management?

>> JAMES FRENCH: Mr. Chairman, I was going to sit on my hands on this, but I can't.

You know, there's also -- I believe there's a greater moral issue as well, and that is should the native wildlife suffer that same fate?

And inaction of any stage is not only assuring that but it is also -- we are at a point and I just have to keep coming back to Dr. Perryman on this thing.

We are not talking about horses any longer.

We are not talking about mule deer and pronghorn anymore.

We are talking about the land ever supporting those animals.

I know that sounds like doom and gloom.

I live in northern Nevada and I absolutely agree with everything Mr. Masters just said, that we are well past the point of no return in some habitats.

We have places right now that we have lost -- literally lost major mule deer populations.

Literally lost them.

We are not talking about the sagebrush that are dependent on them.

I cringe to think what is going to be left.

And so I guess I would say is that because we are at this point right now, we will have to look outside this box, whether we are going to -- we are going to fertility treatments on horses or whether we are going to gather in the long term or short term holding or whether we are going to wonder how the policy -- the shifts in policy are going to result in humane treatment of the horses.

I'm not advocating inhumane treatment of anything.

I'm just saying we have finally gotten to a point where any additional inaction is going to result in -- in inhumane treatment of horses and that is -- that is going to come in the form of starvation and -- and in the form of loss of habitat and dying of the thirst in Nevada in a lot of locations.

You know, we just heard yesterday about the number of emergency gathers that were conducted this year, and just Nevada alone.

Emergency gathers are just that.

You know, you are going to gather them or they will die right there in one spot.

Many of them did die, just the act of trying to put them in a truck, trying to get them into one location to take them off the land where they were starving to death, many of them perished as a result of that.

But nobody wants to talk about what was left over after we pulled those horses off that piece of land, what was left for those indigenous wildlife that's got to -- that are faced with trying to over winter in those locations this year.

I would just say that it's -- I'm going to emphasize this one more time and we will hear about it in terms of recommendations that this is about habitat.

This is about the ecosystem and this is about -- about what we -- it's less about horses at this stage of the game.

It's sad that we have gotten into a corner to where that's all we can talk about now, we have to put the horses on the one side because it is about the habitat at this stage.

I will leave it at that.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Steven.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I completely echo what you just said, Jim.

This rangeland resource that the horses utilize is also utilized by a myriad of other animals, other species, not just mammals and invertebrates and there's so much at stake here that we -- once it's gone, professor Petersen talked, about it could take hundreds or thousands of years to get back.

I would argue in situations with all the invasive species that we have now, I don't know if those thresholds can ever be overcome.

So the carrying capacity at least within our lifetimes assuredly within our lifetimes is removed and the animals that utilize that for their winter range or their summer range now don't have that habitat available to them.

And along with that, the horses don't have that.

And I would argue that there are horses currently that are being abused inadvertently by the BLM, not by any choice of their own, but because their hands have been tied as to what they can do and I think we need to do everything we can in our power as a board to not let that process continue to happen to an agency that has been given two very separate charges that are linked for the management of the land first and foremost and the management of the horses but first and foremost, we have to take care of land so it can take care of horses.

And we have to humanely do what is right for the horses and sometimes it's a lot more humane for a horse to be euthanized than it is for it to starve to death or die of thirst.

And that's all.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Thank you, Steven.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chairman?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Oh, Barry is on?

Go Barry.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chairman?

>> FRED WOEHLE: Yes, sir?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: I just need to weigh in for a little bit too, to echo latest things that have been said.

And as I said yesterday, I think there's a nonlethal way out of this.

I really do.

If all of the parties are really interested in doing something, for the benefit of horses, I think there is a way out of this.

I have to say this, it doesn't make sense to -- to administer contraceptive to a dying mare!

And we're down to the habitat.

We're down to the face.

If we don't control these numbers to the point where this habitat could be maintained in the future, we lose our options for the future.

We lose them.

We no longer have the option to have wildlife species, pasturing birds out, there squeaky dogs and other small mammals and horses and mule deer.

If we lose the habitat, we no longer have those options.

They may be reduced options now in many of the HMAs.

This is not true in all the HMAs, but those critical ones that have just been abused and abused for decades now, we have -- we can't afford to lose the options for the future and if we -- if we sit around with inactivity and if we delay, delay, the longer we delay, the higher the chances are that we will lose those options for the future.

And it just -- you know, for me, it just doesn't make sense to administer contraceptive to a dying mare.

It just -- it just doesn't play.

I can't -- I can't wrap my head around that.

So with that said, I will let you guys get back and listen in a little bit more.

Thank you.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, Barry, before you do that, you talked to us the other day -- the other evening about the horses in long-term holding.

Do you want to address that a little bit?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: As far as the sort of nonlethal way out of this?

Is that what you are referring to?

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, or a lethal way.

Whatever way you want to do it.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Okay.

Well, there's already been some discussion this morning about, you know, transferring the care or the responsibility of the care from the federal government to private entities or NGOs that may or may not exist right now at this moment.

And I think -- I really do think that -- that there are millions of people both on an individual scale and on a foundational scale that would be willing to, you know, contribute whatever is necessary, to the time and the in, and the monetary means to, you know, taking care of these horses.

These are drastic times and I think when -- if we make the case correctly -- you know, Americans are generous people and they are concerned about their heritage and I think they will step up to the plate if there -- if they are presented with the opportunity in the appropriate way to -- to take on this task of supporting animals in long-term holding facilities of one kind or another, various kinds.

You know, maybe in somebody's backyard, you know they have two or three or one, and maybe there's long-term holding facilities that are -- you know, that have thousands of horses in them.

But it's -- I mean, it's -- it's -- I think that's our way out of this thing, we have got to get these horses off the range.

There's no question about that.

And the question becomes how do we manipulate them into various markets or various homes to compensate for that?

Because we are up against it.

And we know we are up against it.

You know, I just think that's the way out of it.

It's through private and NGO-type partnerships with BLM to transfer these horse care, the off-range horse care over to that sector of the -- of the country.

Does that make sense?

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes, it makes sense to me.

Okay.

Thank you, Barry.

Celeste?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Thank you.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I think it's in Quaker circles when you agree with someone, you say, Barry, my brother speaks for me.

I think it would be a bold and empowering move on behalf of this board to unify in a pretty big recommendation that doesn't include euthanasia, because we are stepping outside of the box and we talked yesterday on our way to dinner, sort of informally if the energy in this room right now that will make it happen.

These board members, these cattlemen associations in here, these advocates to continually say, just do it this way or this way, because it's the way I like, isn't going to work.

These are bigger, and newer ideas but without everyone getting behind it, they will fall flat just like all the ideas in the past.

So I want to continue to advocate for this idea you first brought up, being very much on the right track.

If we can sort of broaden it, biggify it, if you will -- I like to make up words -- and get euthanasia off the table.

I know that's not popular with everybody, but I think we still have a way out of it and we need to pursue it, but that is not going to be easy.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, the one thing that I would recommend is that if that's something that you want the board to consider, then you consider the board's approach to applying, spay techniques.

Then you know where I'm at.

I mean, the thing is if we are going to use every tool, we need to use every tool.

We don't need to say, well, no, my way is the only way.

And I don't want euthanasia and all of this.

If we want every tool in the tool box, not only spaying, not only gelding, PZP, GonaCon, anything new that comes up, anything applied because PZP is not the

answer.

You cannot use PZP on every herd.

You cannot use dart every herd.

Well, just gather them.

We will put them in a pen and give them a shot and two weeks later, we will give them another shot but you have got to do it again.

These are wild horses.

The horses we saw out there in our field trip, they were not wild horses.

They were wild horses but they were not wild horses.

When you can go up and a horse looks at you and walks over to you like you are going to give him something, that's not a wild horse.

And so, you know -- and we have to base this on the ten states that is there.

Every HMA is different.

Every horse herd is different.

We heard Gus say them horses, the mob, they are acclimated to humans.

They are acclimated to seeing people.

You go a little further and they see a truck and run.

It's one of those things that yeah, I have no problem with that, but I really have a problem with somebody saying, my way or the highway.

I really do.

So honestly -- and I'm being very honest, I would not use PZP on my horses.

I would not even consider using PZP on my horses.

Would I spay my horses?

I would in a heartbeat.

Because I don't want to put anything unnatural in my horse.

(Off microphone comment).

>> FRED WOEHLE: Well, but you are talking about taking -- taking something that's pretty precious to me off of a male horse.

(Laughter)

I mean -- I have a problem with that!

(Laughter)

You want to be brutally honest, you know?

I mean, it really -- and I have helped geld a whole bunch of horses and it hurts me every time I do it.

It does.

So what you are saying, Celeste is, we're going to do that.

We will take that big, important part of that male horse and not do a thing with that, but don't touch the girls.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I don't say that in terms of management.

(Off microphone comment)

>> FRED WOEHLE: Okay.

Go ahead.

Are you through?

Are you done?

Oh, goodness.

>> JAMES FRENCH: I would like to end this on a positive note, if I could.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, Hallelujah.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Dr. Perryman and I spoke about this last night.

I said this at Grand Junction.

I looked at everybody in that room and the energy that room, some of it negative and some of it positive energy, but it was energy.

I do believe that that is the solution to this problem.

And I do -- this morning, Nancy's presentation, it was -- it reminded me of something I saw happen in my lifetime and I can remember 1963, a lot of you folks don't remember that.

You didn't see 1963, but I remember a small group of people out there that had an issue with the reduction in habitat for Rocky Mountain elk and it had been reduced down to the general feeling at the time was that the elk populations had been reduced to about four and a half, 5% of their original range.

And that group of people, everybody told them the same thing we are hearing here today.

It's too big.

This problem is big.

We got -- society has moved in.

The technology has changed how elk are going to move around.

The elk numbers are -- we got genetic issues with the elk and you can't -- a whole bunch -- a whole range of discussions on that.

But that group moved on.

And we -- and they created and outfit called the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation.

And that foundation right now is well over \$100 million a year prospect.

They are buying ranches right now for elk habitat.

They are in every state that has had historic elk populations right now.

They have a presence there.

And they made a difference.

And I would just say that is the challenge we have right here, is create a foundation.

Create those public NGO alliances, not just the federal government.

I'm talking about state and local governments as well.

If you look at what's going on in Utah right now, Nevada could learn from that example.

I really believe that that is the solution to this thing.

That does not negate the fact that we have a train wreck that we inherited.

We have to deal with that.

Any decision that we make that hinders the ability of BLM to reduce the numbers to AML quickly risks the -- risks the prospect that we won't have an ecological system to support horses when we decide to expand our range later on down the road, and it is exactly that -- that issue right now.

So with, that I just -- I -- I just employ -- implore everybody that if you have got an idea about it, if you got a group that you recommend, if you got an idea relative to an NGO to take on these public/private partnerships, let's hear it.

Let's do it.

Because this is our opportunity right now.

Thank you.

>> FRED WOEHL: Thank you.

Thank you very much.

At that, we are going to go ahead and break for lunch and we will take back up at 12:45.

Is that what you want to do?

That's what we are scheduled?

Okay.

We will take back up at 12:45.

Thank y'all.

(Lunch break)

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WILD HORSE AND BURRO ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH
OCTOBER 11, 2018
12:45 P.M.

* * *

REALTIME CAPTIONING AND/OR CART (COMMUNICATIONS ACCESS REALTIME TRANSLATION) ARE PROVIDED IN ORDER TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION ACCESSIBILITY AND MAY NOT BE A TOTALLY VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

* * *

>> FRED WOEHL: Are we back up yet?

Close?

Not yet.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: You can hear you.

This is Barry.

I'm on.

>> FRED WOEHL: All right.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Hi, Fred?

>> FRED WOEHL: We'll come back together.

I have been asked to share another poem.

I will share one that's very short and really quick and about my good friend right here, Dr. Tom.

When you see this old cowboy, just remember he's not ragged by his choice.

He never meant to bow his legs or put that gravel in his voice.

He's just chasing what he really loves and what's burning in his soul.

Wishing to God that he'd been born about 100 years ago.

That's my good friend Tom.

(Chuckles)

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chairman.

>> FRED WOEHL: I hope everybody had a good lunch.

They have the best hamburgers.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chairman, are you there?

>> FRED WOEHL: We will pick back up where we were at.

We were talking about working group reports and some of the recommendations we were going to make.

Where is Steven at?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chairman?

Do you hear me?

>> FRED WOEHL: All right.

We got a lot of stuff to cover because we only got 30 minutes to come up with these and get them written but we will do more formal work towards the end.

One of the things I would like to bring up --

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman?

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes, Lord.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Can you hear me?

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes, yes.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Could you have Dorothea text me the live link.

I would appreciate it.

>> FRED WOEHL: Dorothea text you the live link?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: That is a done deal.

And speaking of Dorothea I have to give her a huge round of congratulations and thank yous.

And we need to thank our sound people.

This is fifth year where they have been around and have done such an outstanding job.

If you get a chance to pat them on the back before the end of the day, I would greatly appreciate it.

They do a really good job.

They do an awful lot.

I'm hunting.

I wish I knew where stuff was in this book.

Steven, do you have something you want to bring up, a recommendation or anything?

Right now.

(Chuckles)

Shazam!

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: All right.

That was kind of --

>> FRED WOEHL: You wasn't expecting it, was you?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Let me get to where I have them written down.

>> FRED WOEHL: I don't know where they are at.

I thought they were right here.

Someone got in my book while I was gone.

There's tab six.

Tab six.

Oh, that -- yeah, tab eight.

Yes.

Yes.

Yes.

Okay.

Steven, it's in tab eight.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yeah.

>> FRED WOEHL: Tab eight and what we are talking about and what we want to do is we want to -- what we really want to do is come up with a -- a recommendation to the Bureau of Land Management on which of these options the Board endorses, I guess, would that be a good way of putting that?

And so I thought we would have a discussion about each of them.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Okay.

>> FRED WOEHL: And then come up.

Okay?

Does that make sense?

Ben?

>> BEN MASTERS: I'm just looking at the schedule and it says that the recommendations is for the 4:30 time slot.

So are we moving that until now?

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, what we are doing, we are not making recommendations. We are working on them.

Since we can't do what we do in 30 minutes.

In our other board meetings we have about two hours where we talk about this and write 'em down and all of that.

We can't do a two-hour deal within 30 minutes since we had a short working group meeting.

We talk about them and then we will go on and discuss.

We will not formalize them.

We will just get our minds around them and then at the -- the 4:30, after we have public comments, we will then formulate them.

Does that make sense?

Okay.

All right.

Okay.

Steven, you got an opinion and which one of these do you think we need to do?

So I will just turn it over to you.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Well, after reviewing over lunch and not -- and also the past several days in reviewing the different options that are available, considering the time frame that we have to -- and the constraints we have to work with, in order to prevent more ecological damage from happening on the range and also considering the budget that the BLM has to work within and the confines of that, I personally believe that option number one is the best option to go with, both in terms of sustainability on the range and ensuring the least amount of ecological damage is done, and also the least amount of money in order to be fiscally sound is spent for the horses.

And so my recommendation is that the Board of the four options given by the BLM

accept option number one and advise that the BLM support option number one in their different options that they have given to Congress.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Okay.

Thank you, Steven.

Any other board member have -- okay.

Celeste?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I have been over these options a lot, and the information that has in front of us on these pages is pretty scant.

And for the purposes of the board, really reading through and understanding what each option entails, and I would say that none of these options are good as they stand for various reasons, but that there are some pieces of them.

But in one of our recommendations that we haven't yet started talking about yet, incorporates some pieces of those options already so I actually would not be supportive of any of these options because I think what we will present takes little pieces of from each of them.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Let me ask you this.

You said -- I know for a fact that BLM just didn't pull these options out of the air.

They worked with a group.

They had a working group that set down and these were -- I mean these were as well thought out as they could based on everything.

And I know some of the things that are in all four of these options is difficult.

I mean, it is difficult but part of the -- part of the reason why they have an advisory board is to help them in these difficult decisions.

Now, no matter what recommendation we make, BLM has the right to say no, we don't like that.

Okay?

But the fact that they put these three options -- or these four options out reflects that they would like to have some input on these options and I really appreciate what you are saying, and, I mean, if I had my way, I could take part of one, part of two, part of three and part of four, and come up with something, but that's not the options that we have and I hate being kind of forced into making a decision like this but you have to have a little bit of trust that these were the four options that they come up with, based on the information that I don't have, that you don't have, and like that.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: But Alan Shepherd did say yesterday that these were options that there was some mixing and matching possible in them, and perhaps -- but perhaps Bruce can -- am I not assuming correctly?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Well, I can't speak for, that but I just want to remind the board that this report was for Congress and not the BLM, not to select an option on the report to Congress.

We were wanting Congress to provide us some direction on how they felt.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Well, let me ask you then, Bruce, would it be advantageous or beneficial if the board did or -- or would it be just kind of a trying to push a truck uphill?

I mean --

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Yeah.

I have think we heard yesterday, I think it was asked of myself and Alan, when do we

expect to hear back from Congress and I think the answer was, we have no idea.

>> FRED WOEHL: No idea.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: And so I mean, in getting your question is that I think that -- no, I don't think it would be pushing uphill, a truck uphill but to make a recommendation on which option or which blend of options, I mean, you either can take them as they are written in the report to Congress or you can mix and match. And -- or incorporate new things as well.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

Well -- and I'm just thinking out loud.

Would a recommendation -- well, we don't make a recommendation to Congress.

So I guess that don't work.

They take action on this as fast as they can due to the situation that we got, but -- but --

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chairman?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: And just kind of following, is that, you know, basically we will take our direction from Congress.

>> FRED WOEHL: Right.

Right.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: If Congress says you will implement option one, we are then -- we will be doing that.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, see -- I was going to say, we don't work for BLM.

We can lobby Congress.

We can ask for answers where y'all can't.

You have to be responsive to them.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: And then I would also add by us saying we are in favor of this option, and voting on it as a board, if I were personally a Congressman and there was a Board that was chartered with making recommendations to the BLM, I would want to know where that Board stood as far as the recommendations that had been given to me by BLM so that I could know going forward what they thought in their collective knowledge was the best option.

>> FRED WOEHL: Could I construe that as a campaign speech?

You are going to run for Congress.

Is that --

(Laughter).

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Not any time soon.

(Laughter).

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chairman?

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Mr. Chairman?

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: I have a question that would help me, if you don't mind.

You don't just deliver a report to Congress.

I mean, did you just put this in the Federal Register and let it go?

I mean who received it?

What committee?

What staff?

What -- who -- who was delivered -- who was it delivered to?

Who was it discussed with, Bruce?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Do you want to answer that question?

You did the briefings.

>> FRED WOEHL: They are passing the buck to Alan.

He will be up here in a minute.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I hate to do it, man, but that's your baby.

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: I believe when we finalized the complete packet and it went through the different layers of approval, through our organization, it went to Congress through our budget staff, I believe.

And would it have been OMB too, Kristin?

>> KRISTIN BAIL: Well, part of it is we don't know everyone who has been discussed because, you know, the secretary's office is involved.

They don't let folks at our level know who has talked to whom.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yeah.

>> KRISTIN BAIL: So we have provided some information because we wanted you to know that we had the support, and kind of the different things that could be emphasized or deemphasized and the investments that were taken.

And, I mean, don't know yet what will come of it.

So the board can say looking at the different things that were emphasized.

Knowing that there were large investments involved in it, there was one level where we doubled adoptions and we used permit sterilization a lot more and others where gathers were huge, or off-range holding becomes very large.

And also the overall assumption of trying to get around a ten-year period, I mean, that's even something that folks interested in a different time frame.

So as far as what helps the board, I don't know that understanding who has seen it or what -- because we don't really know what the next step.

Is I think the opportunity today is to -- to provide feedback on, you know, those different options and then we can always work with you to get better ideas of what that costs and all of that stuff and how we come one those numbers.

So that's my recommendation.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Well, my question -- I mean, if it went to Secretary Zinke's office, I understand it goes up the chain, but I kind of need to know if it was presented to the appropriations committee in the House, if it was presented to Murkowski's staff, or the western caucus.

I mean who saw this?

Because if we are going to make recommendations, I need to kind of predicate that.

So --

>> FRED WOEHL: Barry?

Barry?

--

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: We don't have that answer for you.

And there's no way -- nobody in this room knows that.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Holy cats!

(Laughter)

Okay.

>> FRED WOEHL: I could make something up.

But, you know --

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: That's the information --

>> FRED WOEHL: I see where you are coming from.

Wait a minute.

I found the person responsible for it.

Holle'.

Hang on a minute.

>> HOLLE' WADDELL: Just a little bit.

The request for the report, of course, came through the appropriations.

So when it was submitted, it, of course, went through our leadership and then through the Department of Interior and then, to OMB and then to PMB and then to the appropriations committee.

>> FRED WOEHL: So the appropriations committee in the House --

>> HOLLE' WADDELL: Both.

>> FRED WOEHL: The House and the Senate.

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Okay.

Thank you.

>> FRED WOEHL: The House appropriations or the Senate?

>> HOLLE' WADDELL: It came out of the consolidated appropriations.

So it would have been the Congress.

>> FRED WOEHL: Bruce, can you hear that?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Yes thank you.

>> FRED WOEHL: I mean, Barry, not Bruce.

That will teach me to drink iced tea for lunch.

Anything else, Barry?

>> DR. BARRY PERRYMAN: Not at the moment.

Please continue.

>> FRED WOEHL: All right.

Okay.

Yes, Jim?

>> JAMES FRENCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Has there been any acknowledgment that the report was received?

At all?

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: Yes.

Yes.

We had -- I had a few requests for some additional information from some staffers, and I think our leg folks have seen some stuff as well.

It's always come through them as I worked with the leg affairs to get the information back to them, the leadership and that.

>> JAMES FRENCH: So did USDA or Interior, from the Interior Secretary's office and on down, have they acknowledged this thing at all?

I'm curious.

We can lobby, and we can insert our comments into this process and I think that's -- I think I would like to be able to do that, if we can.

And so I guess rather than cold turkey go and talk with undersecretary Bernhardt or one of those folks, I would like to know who have seen the report and commented on it.

I mean, it's surprising to me that a report that they requested, that was provided to them has gone on deaf ears and I I'm curious about it.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I think we feel the same way.

Alan -- oh, where did Alan go?

Yeah, we really have not gotten much information since then.

So -- because there were several -- besides the options in the report, there are some proposed legislative fixes -- I won't say fixes but amendments to the act.

So, I mean, those were some things that were, you know, would allow us to move forward and, you know, I would ask the board to say, take a look at those as well in the report.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Right.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Those legislative -- the potential legislative amendments that the BLM said this will help us in this situation.

>> FRED WOEHL: Do you -- Board, I will ask you all this.

I'm sure this is something that ain't going to go away, and Bruce has asked us to look at more information.

I was not aware that there was some proposed changes to the 1971 law.

Do you think it would behoove us until the next meeting so we can examine the whole picture and come up with a decision at that time instead of going off half-cocked and not knowing the --

>> ALAN SHEPHERD: So Fred, we didn't think we needed to include the report to Congress in the notebooks.

So that's our oversight.

I mean, it is on the website.

And I don't know if it would be beneficial to put it up on the screen here or what, but, I mean --

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, it would --

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: You are dealing with a complex report in a short amount of time.

>> FRED WOEHL: I don't think so.

I think if you and Dorothea could furnish that up with that website address.

You have don't have to do it now, but --

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Do you want copies of it?

>> FRED WOEHL: Do you have copies that?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I can get you copies in ten minutes.

Then I will excuse myself for that time.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

So we will table this for the moment.

Okay?

One of the resolutions that I would like to bring up is the one that we have made every time because it really makes -- makes sense.

Where is it at?

I have lost it again!

And it's the one that we have recommendation seven and it's one that we have made all the time and it says BLM shall continue to work towards full implementation -- that big word -- previous accepted recommendations of the board and prioritize according to the BLM metrics of meeting AML.

Note, this is the first recommendation from the board's April meeting.

In other words, just make sure that they follow up on this stuff.

I don't like us to make recommendations and they say, yes, we want to do it and then nothing else happens.

Does that make sense to everybody?

So I would like to include -- include that for sure.

Any comment on that?

Does that -- I mean, I really want to know, does that make sense to everybody?

>> It makes sense.

>> My only comment is what was -- what was obvious and urgent when this came up first time has exponentially gotten worse since then.

>> FRED WOEHL: Right.

Right.

And the -- yes, it has.

It has.

But still there's -- the thing is when the Board makes a recommendation, we make it in such a way to where we want them to do something, but there's a lot of -- and for lack of a better phrase, government red tape.

Even though it makes sense to me and makes sense to you, when you apply it to the overall thing, there's no way they can do it because of all the government red tape.

And one of the things that I noticed when I first came on the Board, there was no follow-up on this stuff.

If you go back and look from the very beginning when they had the advisory boards, there were recommendations made on and on and on and on, and no follow-up.

And one thing I want to do as a chair, is be sure that in we make the effort -- we took the time to discuss and develop recommendations.

I wanted to be able to follow-up and say, did you or did you not?

What could you do?

What couldn't you do?

Especially ones that they say we agree with.

Does that -- and so -- so one reason why we did this is so we would always have that up front, so we knew when it would come up again when they gave their answers to it, we would have this and we would be able to see what they were.

And the broad stroke of everything that we have approached is meeting AML.

Okay?

And so everything that we do has a basis, basically of meeting AML.

>> That's exactly right.

And Mr. Chairman, I would just also expand on that idea.

I'm not sure how the other board members report these activities to the people that they answer to.

Being a county commissioner, I know my county commission and I also know the initial and game commission for the state of Nevada, including the department of wildlife is keenly interested in what we are doing right here.

And I have updated them.

I will update them again when I get back from this meeting, in terms of what transpired here and those questions get asked.

You know, of all of those proposals that you made in Grand Junction which ones were handled and if not, why?

And so I would say it's real important that we have that conversation each time.

>> FRED WOEHL: Anybody else?

Okay.

Now, another thing I want to bring up, and it's one of the things that -- Ben, do you have that, that I had you type up for me.

Would you read that for us, please?

By the way, board, Ben is an excellent typist, if you need anything typed up, be sure to see him.

(Chuckles)

I type with one finger on each hand but he uses his whole hands.

Thank you, my friend.

Okay.

One of the problems that we have is water issues.

And we talked about.

This we will talk about this, but here's the -- what we have come up with.

Encourage BLM to gather horses and HMAs that are over AML that are reliant upon supplemental water.

One that AML -- once that HMA is at AML, stop hauling supplemental water, except under very extreme circumstances.

What we have got -- and it's one of those things to where people say, let the horses run free!

And then when they get short of water -- oh, you have to bring them water.

I don't see the game and fish commission carry out water for the deer and the elk.

In extreme situations they do.

It's the same thing with hay and things of this.

And so the problem is AML, getting the horses where they are.

A lot of these areas -- I mean, supplemental water hurts because them horses stay around where that area is, instead of going out and drinking water from this spring while they are graze in this spring.

If they have a horse of nice water right there, that's where they will stay and they abuse that ecosystem where they are at, and it's -- it's just not good.

So anyway, that's one recommendation I would like to bring up.

Anybody have any comment?

Jim?

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yeah, we -- I think we had a pretty robust conversation about that this morning, but it comes back to, from my standpoint, the ecosystems and preservation of those ecosystems.

And one of the things that I have observed in Nevada, which I mentioned this morning, I want to state for the record right now, is that we have districts -- BLM districts in Nevada right now that have actually programmed water hauling as -- on an annual basis.

And before we have a water season, before we know what the season is going to look like.

And so to their credit, there has been historic problems with water distribution in some of those HMAs and so they just but it on -- it's programmed and they get their contributors and they haul water.

The problem with that is if you are dealing with -- if you are dealing with excess -- or with problems with your HMA or your stocking rate and you are doing it as part of your program, you are assuring that you are well above at least the carrying capacity of that piece of country during the cycle, during this weather cycle.

You know, we are in a drought now.

You come out of that and maybe things change but the bottom line is that every year, if you know that will happen every single year, and you are programming for that, that tells me that you know that you have got an issue with stocking rates and all you are doing is -- like I said yesterday, you are drilling holes in the floor to take care of the leak in the roof.

But I would say that, you know, that gathers are an important part of that, and it's -- and for the horse's benefit, as much as for the wildlife benefit.

Because a lot can happen under those circumstances, with -- when you are hauling water so one location things can happen, leek a float sticks open and it drains a tank out on to the ground and all of those animals are standing around an empty tank.

Those kinds of things are -- you know, those are just not tenable.

That's not management.

That's just trying to temporarily take care of a problem.

I'm not saying that we shouldn't -- we should allow these animals to go without water.

I'm just saying from a program perspective, gathers need to occur under those circumstances.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Mr. Chairman.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Ginger.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: I certainly don't disagree with what you are saying.

If this has been done year after year, then have you also habituated other species to count on these water sources, as well as the horses, and might there be a weaning process?

I don't know.

I would worry about that.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Well, as the group we had talk with us today, SMEs, the subject matter experts, he had a graph that when there are horses, there the other animals don't drink and don't come to that water.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Well, that's not universally true, of course.

I mean, there are birds that drink out and there are horses that are not there all the time.

There are other species that use that water.

So I'm asking an informational question right now, because I'm not familiar with -- where are you talking about?

>> JAMES FRENCH: There's several right now, but Owyhee Desert was one that was habitually done and to their credit, we just burned the center out.

So there's a huge gather going on, because there's no winter range for the horses to sit on.

The sad part is we have a fairly large wildlife resource that will come down to that same winter range that's missing right now.

So --

>> FRED WOEHLE: All right.

We have about 20 more minutes.

Anybody else have anything to bring up?

Go ahead, Jim.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Pardon me.

I think, you know in, talking with Dr. Perryman, one of the recommendations that we really wanted to see incorporated in some form is to provide a specifics program at the proposals that would -- would trigger emergency gathers and those HMAs that overlap over the top of habitats which are severely impacted at this moment in time, or are -- have an endangered species or threatened species or species on the sensitive species list that are actually competing right now for that.

Because we are actually seeing -- a good example is the greater sage-grouse, a good portion of those HMAs are overstocked which have issues with -- with limited water distribution right now.

They are directly competing with greater sage-grouse.

And mainly in Dr. Perryman's comment, the big issue with greater sage-grouse right now, according to all of the studies that are on the ground right now, the limiting factor in northern Nevada is late spring brood habitat.

And that brood habitat is directly impacted by -- by horses because they are looking for that -- that lush riparian habitat as well.

That's what they are on.

So rather than push the -- push those populations to the brink to where we have to list them on the endangered species list, we feel that it's prudent for the part of the Bureau of Land Management to actually effect those -- those removals down -- certainly down to AML or low AML and evaluate that following to make sure that we are at a level that will no longer impact those resources.

Did I make sense on that or not?

>> FRED WOEHLE: Yeah.

Ginger.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yes, I had a question.

I don't know if anyone was at the advisory board meeting in Oklahoma City, when Dr. Jeff Manning gave a report and he listed the top eight reasons for the decline in sage-grouse populations and at that time, he didn't list wild horses.

And this was -- I can't remember.

Maybe four or five years ago.

And after the meeting, he was -- he was asked why, you know, did he not list the horses.

He said they really are not a player in -- in this and I think it was based on the fact that at that time, at least, there weren't as many wild horses, but still, he -- he was -- I think he was being very honest, but it didn't meet well with BLM at that time.

But I think he was just giving his own assessment of a study that he had done.

>> BEN MASTERS: I'm not familiar with the man, is he --

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Oregon.

>> I can tell with you 30 plus years on the ground, with respect to riparian and upland riparian habitats which is crucial for late-season brooding that horses have a big impact on them, especially in the years like we are in right now where waters are limited to certain locations and it's not like we see in this part of the country where you can point across the valley and there are two springs over here.

Whitey desert, there may be three springs running which is almost 5,000, if you include the Idaho side of it.

We talking about 5,000 square miles.

So it's a large, large, piece of habitat, very high, sits above 7,000 feet and 6500, 7,000 feet in such of it and the available water certainly this time of year or this -- under these conditions are critical.

And I appreciated Dr. Perryman's comments on that yesterday, because the way he sees it right now, based on what we see in the -- in the priority habitat for greater sage-grouse, the potential impact for wild horses is very real.

>> FRED WOEHLE: The thing that I want to just point out is the sage pictures or the time picture at that stage that we saw this morning from 2012, 2016, and 2018, the change in the -- the -- and that's got to have impact on everything that uses that range. And so I -- what would your recommendation read?

>> JAMES FRENCH: The recommendation would for the Bureau to evaluate those HMAs which overlap critical habitat -- priority or general habitat for greater sage-grouse, and to determine whether or not under emergency gather situation to at least remove horses down to AML and monitor and determine whether or not that is -- that has been adequate.

>> FRED WOEHLE: And that's late season or late brood?

>> JAMES FRENCH: Late spring brood habitat.

That's what would benefit immediately from that right now, but there will be other habitats that are included in that general habitat as well.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Okay.

>> JAMES FRENCH: But that would be our recommendation now.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Why don't you draft that up and bring it for me to the meeting. Ben, you got something?

>> BEN MASTERS: Um, I think that there is a fence from a lot of stakeholders in the west that the Bureau of Land Management is going to get control of the Wild Horse and Burro Program.

I think there's a false hope among the different state wildlife agencies that it will be

resolved in the next decade and if we can look into the past and learn from history, we can see that this program has never been on a sustainable path forward and I think that there's -- that the Bureau of Land Management needs to recognize the failures of the wild horse and burro policy and to not give false hope to the other stakeholders in the west.

So I developed a recommendation to notify -- oh, I have stuff popping up.

Notify all western states governor's offices, western counties, RACs and state wildlife agencies where wild horses exist, that the Bureau of Land Management's wild horse and burro program is unsustainable, underfunded and has no plan to stop the exponential growth of wild horse and burros which are currently three times over the appropriate management level.

Notify these parties that thousands of horses have already left the defined herd management areas, and that large breeding herds are expanding in number and range, far outside before they are legally designated.

Notify these parties to expect the increase potential for ecological impacts, economic ramifications, highway safety concerns, litigation from multiple parties, needed press and to recognize that if it's beyond the Bureau of Land Management current ability to stop either the population growth or the expansion of these wild horse herds, to encourage states and local stakeholders to fully understand that the Bureau of Land Management's wild horse and burro program has no current plan to manage wild horses as dictated by law and to encourage those parties to develop management plans for thousands of breeding horses outside of herd management areas.

>> FRED WOEHL: That's pretty long.

Celeste?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I would say it's a little overkill to continually throw BLM under the bus for everything.

Just because this placing blame on who did what is here nor there.

I think preparing other state agencies for participation in what it's going to take many stakeholders and counties and states and cities, is a way forward.

But I don't think perhaps with that particular language, but I completely appreciate the direction of it and the need to involve different levels of administration of this.

>> FRED WOEHL: One thing I have been greatly impressed with, and I'm pleased and it's -- I'm surprised a little bit to be quite frank with you is the reaching out of the advocacy groups to try to come up with a solution by working with everybody that's involved.

That's something that Celeste, our new board member, who I appreciate a lot, has drilled home to me, that -- and it's really, really neat, and it's one of those things to where I'm really feeling good.

She's talking about private placement of these horses in long-term holding and more and more of that, and that's really, really one of the things that I feel more encouraged about and enthused about, is the joint working together.

You know, if you have got two horses in harness and they are both pulling different weights, you ain't going to go nowhere.

But if you put those horses where they are pulling in the same direction, you can move a lot of stuff!

And I'm encouraged about this.

But one thing that I'm a little bit -- and I guess I'm -- I don't know.

I'm an old man and I'm kind of stuck in my ways at times, but there has to be given and take in every aspect of it.

And Celeste and I have had lots of talks about this and I'm -- I want to congratulate BLM for picking her because I think she's going to be a great board member and I mean that from the bottom of my heart.

But I agree with Ben's position in that some of the things that have been done don't make any sense and it seems like it's getting worse and worse and worse.

Ben has been on the board for three years and he's been a very active and vocal proponent for the Bureau of Land Management.

He's done an awful lot to help them.

He's done a lot to help Mustang Heritage and I sense his frustrations.

And I have had talks with Ben.

It's kind of like turning a great big ship.

It takes a while to turn it, but also just like we did in 2016, you sometimes have to take action to make it that everything is -- you are serious about it.

And so this is something that we need to talk about a little bit further and -- and explore.

And I sense Ben's frustrations and -- but the other thing I want to do is when we make recommendations -- recommendations, I want them to be of the kind that we can get an answer from.

I don't want them to be where BLM says that's too much.

We don't want to do that, do you know what I mean?

I don't know.

I'm just thinking.

Anybody else have a comment?

Jim?

>> JAMES FRENCH: Mr. Chairman, thanks again.

We talked a little bit about this this morning, and I -- and I don't disagree with what you decided here.

I think I do disagree, though, with the direction that's going to take both us and the Bureau of Land Management because I have been sitting here last couple of days and I -- I have been encouraged by the -- by the reaching out, as our chair has talked about from the NGOs, I think we have -- and I do believe this, I'm not being Pollyanna about it.

I think we have an opportunity to take a whack at trying to rectify, at least, a good portion of the mistakes of the past and, IE, all of those horses in captivity.

And I think I would like -- I would not want to send a message to the folks that might have an interest in becoming a partner in this, saying -- I would hate to send them the message that we are defeated and that -- and that, you know, their involvement as such would be irrelevant.

I want folks to know that this is another shot at trying to do the right thing, but I also want them to understand what I believe in my -- down deep inside, is that we are -- this is our last best hope.

What we are doing right now.

I know it sounds doom and gloom and the sky is going to fall, but I can tell you right now that everybody that knows anything about range ecology right now, and has been watching what's going on on the ground in the last 30 years are all saying the same thing in unison.

This is our last best hope.

So I would -- I just want to say that I want to -- I want to embrace what has been offered so far and -- and I have been heartened by the involvement of those folks who want to be a part of the solution in this thing, and I would just tell the Bureau of Land Management that there's a lot of folks who are elbow to elbow with you right now and want to see you succeed, because we succeed and so do the horses right alongside you.

>> FRED WOHL: Right.

Steve, you had a comment?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I might change the verbiage a little bit and maybe shorten up what Ben's recommendation is, but I think it comes in the context of hope for the best, but prepare for the worst.

And I think, you know, in the day's modern age when there's a hurricane coming off the coast, they don't wait until it hits to make preparations for it.

I think there's an urgency, now more than ever, just as -- as Jim has talked about.

That there are drastic changes that need to take place.

There's an ecological disaster, that's disparaging as we speak and is just going to get worse and worse, if some drastic and hard decisions aren't made in this big ship, as big as it may be, and as big as it is growing, doesn't get turned around real fast.

And so I think it would be advantageous to, I guess, have a call to arms even for all the other agencies involved to get in and participate and help out in any way, shape or form.

Because we are facing an ecological disaster real quick if things don't change.

And we need every player that can be at the table here at this time.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Just a couple comments.

I'm relatively new to the board.

I have been following this issue for 15 to 20 years.

I talked to a lot of BLM people and various areas, I have no doubt that the BLM people are 100% committed to this and the issue is well above them.

It's not them.

But I think -- and the interesting thing I have observed over the last two years, three years, I spent a lot of time around the horse industry and up until about two years ago, the horse industry paid no attention to this issue, because they felt it was not their issue.

Veterinary medicine paid some attention because we were concerned about animal health.

What I noticed over the last two or three years, there's strong interest throughout the horse industry, and there's strong interest throughout the veterinarians over the country that we reached a point that something needs be done.

They are willing to step up and do something.

And I think that was reflected when the people from the various animal welfare groups okay.

Up with some suggestions.

I would like to know more about this.

This is not just a wild horse and burro issue.

It's an issue for everybody that has any interest in it, whether they be wildlife biologists or hunters or veterinarians or horse owners.

I have think that's encouraging.

Every meeting I go to, there's discussion about the plight of the wild horse and burros and what should be done.

And so I think that's encouraging to me, because it's a significant shift in how folks have viewed this in the past and these some are folks that can do something about it.

They are not -- you know, they are not just wondering about it.

They can adopt the horses and they can buy the horses and so forth.

Okay.

I'm about done anyhow.

I think it's encouraging.

I think there's a lot of activity that maybe even BLM and some of the folks involved close to this are not aware of.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, one thing I'm going to do in my role as board, I'm going to establish two new working groups, and one to work with that group that you have.

I'm really going to appoint you as chairman of that.

And the other thing is with my vice chair Sue, and with you, I'm going to appoint a couple of others to work with the advocacy groups and come up with the answers and pull this to go.

I'm really excited about that.

Really excited.

So as we go to break, I have some very good news, something that I'm excited about.

At this point or at one time during the day, we had Belgium, Switzerland, Denmark, France and Australia, watching us on TV.

And so that's pretty cool because next week I'm going to Australia.

So maybe they are trying to figure out what I look like.

Anyway.

(Laughter)

And then we had -- how to receive me.

Yeah.

We had almost 400 people watching this thing the whole time and we had total minutes watches of almost 26,000.

So y'all didn't know it, but y'all are movie stars now.

Well, Ben always has been but that's neither here nor there.

Anyway, we will take a break and come back at 2:00 and one of the most exciting parts of this is letting the public get to speak and that will happen beginning at 2:00.

So we'll break until then.

Thank you.

(Break).

>> FRED WOEHL: If everybody could take their seats.

Everybody take their seats.

Board members, please make their way back to the podium.

>> FRED WOEHL: It's now time for public comment.

I will turn the microphone over to my good friend Dan, he will give us the rules of the room.

>> DAN ADAMS: We are glad to have you here and to hear your thoughts and ideas.

What I will do is walk through real quick the rules of the room.

You should have received this when you walked in the room.

It comes out everybody gets four minutes.

So what I will do is I will be sitting here next to you and I will give you a one-minute warning when you are at three and we ask everybody to be respectful of everybody else and end it right at four.

Also you can't roll your time over to somebody else.

So it's your four minutes for you only to speak.

If on this sign-in sheet, if you did not mark yes in the far left column, if you left it blank, that means you are not signed up.

So if you want to sign up, you had to have marked yes on that sheet.

(Off microphone comment).

>> DAN ADAMS: Okay.

My right and your right may be different.

A couple of rules of the room that we want to follow is the seating, we want to make sure is available for everybody.

We don't want to have anybody's view be blocked.

If you don't want to stand up, we ask that you do so behind the chairs in the back and make sure that everybody has a seat so that you are not blocking.

The second item is that speakers or other attendees are not allowed to approach the dais at any time without consent from chair.

So there's a tape marker right here in the front.

We ask that you don't cross that, unless it's your turn to speak.

And then we ask that you come to this chair and take a seat.

What I will do is I will call out three people at a time, so the other two speakers can queue up here behind the tape and be ready to come up.

The media, we ask that they check in at the door and there's a taped area for them to set up.

Number four, no attendees can place microphones or equipment in the space set aside for the board.

Nothing in the front.

Could you use a camera if you're seated and not blocking somebody.

If anybody disrupts the meeting, we will ask you to leave, or you will be escorted out.

Number seven, those wishing to address the board, like we said, have to sign in.

And to know that your comments are to be addressed to the board.

This is the board's meeting and so we are all here to help them with information.

Number eight, attendees wishing to provide handouts to the board, need to give them to Dorothea, at the sign-in table when you come in.

You are not allowed to hand them to the board when you come up to speak.
Number nine, within the meeting room, attendees will not be allowed to display signs being placards that block the view of the participants.

Number ten, the board will not respond to comments made during the participation period.

This should not be interpreted that the -- to mean that the board members do not agree or disagree with anything you said.

11, the chair does reserve the right to comment on any factual inaccuracies that may be shared during the public comment period.

And lastly, number 12, the BLM commits to maintaining these rules and maintain cooperation with these recalls.

I would just add as has been said in the last little bit of the meeting, there has been a lot of positive energy and people talking about ways to solve problems together.

I had a number of you come up to me and say, gosh, I hope people are positive because we want to solve these tough problems together.

So we would ask you to approach this as a way to helping each other solve a really tough challenging problem.

I would also point out that Dr. Barry Perryman and Dr. Sue McDonnell who are on the board, both weren't able to be here today but they are participating by phone.

And lastly, just everybody's safety is very important.

And also -- so if we need to exit for some reason, as you go out these doors here, you can go left or right to an exit.

You can go left or right if you need a restroom too.

Yes?

(off microphone comment)

>> DAN ADAMS: So you would like to speak but you didn't sign up?

(off microphone comment).

>> DAN ADAMS: Do you mind if she goes first?

If you have a long drive, you are up.

A small fee.

That's true.

That's true.

Okay.

So then our other two that would line up here, if Gary Watson and Ethan Lane would queue up here.

And then just -- so this is being Livestreamed.

So it's really important that we speak into the mic and if it's pointed right at your mouth, it works best and then we push the button here too.

Okay.

You want to go ahead and state your name.

>> Okay.

My name is Lori Klein, and I'm here today because I have -- I'm very passionate about especially the Muddy Creek HMA herd, and I was listening Livestream yesterday from back home, and I wasn't planning to come up here until I was listening to the last end of Gus speaking, and from that point on, I was listening.

And later in the evening, I got a phone call telling me if I had heard about what Gus had said.

And I didn't realize it pertained to me.

So today, I wanted to make this 400-mile round trip to verify exactly what my discussion with Gus was the day before the roundup.

And I find this very important because I have dealt with the various horse specialists with BLM, and we have always had decent conversations and I wanted to be educated.

And the day I pulled up to Gus because I wanted to make sure I was in the right spot to -- at this time, when they were setting up the panels and I wanted to make sure that I was not out of place.

And so Gus and I started to have a conversation.

And I said to him -- it was my first time I had ever been to a roundup and I felt like I would be emotional because I had gotten to know the horses for many years, photographing, staying out there for weeks on end, and I became very interested in allotments, cattle grazing and the horses.

And how they -- you know, how the ecological works -- how everything works out there.

Anyways, when I told him that I thought -- I felt that if I show emotion it might show weakness and I don't know if that was appropriate way of describing it, but he said, oh, yeah!

We should -- you should see some of the people that come here, especially one woman.

All she did was cry, cry, cry, cry, cry, cry, cry.

This is the man I talked to that day.

And I am defending my honor and my truth into what happened that day.

And that's what I get from the BLM specialists has been that attitude.

And when I asked him -- I photographed and documented the Emery County search and rescue chasing the horses with mares with new foals and chasing them until they saw me walk out with a camera with one of them was just taken off of one of the trucks by men.

When they saw me, one went out -- radios and went out to get the other guys to come back.

And as they came back, I was in the woods.

I had been photographing the horses up in the trees.

So they don't know I was around.

My car was down at the other end.

So I left the area.

I went and called a friend to ask them to call search rescue -- the Emery county Sheriff to see if there were any rescues out there because they pulled one their trailers.

Oh, okay.

And I just want to say there's been -- there's horses that have died out there because they couldn't get through the gates to water, and, I mean I could fill a book.

I have given my affidavit to the BLM and my statements and FOIA, and I hope you view on that.

I worked hard on that, doing interviews with people who were trying to hear what I had to say.

And I really hope the board members here will contact me to find out more of what I have experienced out there.

And the hazing by the ranching community.

And I have learned that a great amount of ranching community is embedded in federal, state and commissions in the counties and I feel there's bias.

And when you talk about ecological damage, I don't hear anything about the cattle or the algae from the cattle mature, or the destruction from them at all.

Okay.

I appreciate it.

Thank you very much.

>> DAN ADAMS: And after you is going to be Barbara Sunblade.

>> Good afternoon, chairman Woehl, members of the board, I'm Gary Watson, chairman.

Mojave county board of supervisors and also part of the BLM RAC board and recognized breeder for the American quarter horse association.

While Nevada is ground zero for the horses, Mojave County ground zero for burros.

I made sure that each one of you have a map and it should be in front of you.

And simply all it does is it provides the herd areas and the HMAs for western Arizona.

There's some horse areas but it's a burro population of about 7,000 burros.

They are currently moving to the east, to areas with more forage and more water.

The western Arizona habitat, which they have been there for quite a number of years, can no longer support the current population.

Most of this area receives only 8 inches of rain per year.

The environmental devastation is affecting other populations.

The indigenous populations of the desert big horn sheep, the mule deer, Gambel quail and many others.

Our state director of the BLM Ray Souza has achieved about 800 adoptions this year.

Still, it's not enough to change an effective change of that population control.

In the Bullhead City area, of which is in Mojave County, there have been 11 recorded burro incidents in last 18 months.

So far, no human fatalities.

So far.

Near lake pleasant, north of Phoenix, on I-17, there have been a number of other accidents.

This is getting to the point where we are looking at human safety, ecological safety and the safety of those burros, and wild horses.

I as a board member and my board backs me in this statement, we urge us to use every available tool to reduce the populations in Mojave county and western Arizona.

And with that, I thank you very much.

>> Good afternoon, my name is Ethan Lane.

In my day job, I'm the executive director of the public lands council, representing all of the western cattle and sheep associations in all of the western states that support horse populations.

I also currently serve as the chairman of the national horse and burro rangeland management coalition, made up of 18 national organizations and representing roughly 10 million Americans, ranging from sportsman to professional land managers, ranchers, outdoor enthusiasts and others with concern about how horses and burros are managed on public lands throughout the west.

My comments will be in addition to our written comments already submitted for the records of this hearing.

We heard a lot over the last couple of days about the dire straits we are in, in managing these populations.

Since this board last met, the populations on range are up approximately 15,000 horses, give or take.

The solutions we have seen short of full use of the Wild Horse and Burro Act are a BB gunshot at a tank when you look at their impact on that exploding population.

Ten horses here, 20 horses, their limited use of PZP, small scale gathers will not get us to a point where we can sustain this.

Question call for the use of full options available, including euthanasia and sale without limitation to achieve these goals because only then can we talk about some of these other solutions, getting us to a sustainable long range population.

Ben was right earlier when he said there is no plan.

That is not necessarily the BLM's fault.

We have an activist Congress that has saddled them with this management nightmare and then demanded a report on how they should deal with the situation that they created themselves.

That is a challenge that has proven to be almost insurmountable as everyone in this room knows.

But what's incumbent upon this board is to be taken to speak truth to power and to continue to outline that there are options that must remain in the conversation.

We cannot afford to pretend that half measures will get us where we need to be to maintain a healthy viable population, while also allowing these rangelands to heal.

We can support all multiple uses in the West.

And wearing my hat as the head federal lobbyist for the cattlemen, I strongly support that.

Horses, recreation, and others, but we have to have balance to allow that to occur.

We cannot allow one use to take over those resources and consume them to the point that nothing else is viable in that environment.

We have thank the board for their time and attention over the past few days.

We look forward to their recommendations and their future work.

Thank you.

>> DAN ADAMS: After Barbara, Teresa Klein and then Tom Allen and Kimberly Ehrhardt.

Barbara is up.

Yes.

>> Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

The number discussed in the four options for managing growth suppression presented yesterday were, indeed shocking.

However, my understanding is that the numbers were based on claims by the BLM that the growth rate doubles every four years.

The two-year NAS study commissioned by the BLM and funded by US taxpayers indicates that the growth is 15 to 20% per year.

In some areas since then, the herd growth has been reduced due to increased predation, and climate change and other items that would affect reports from the NAS study and also the numbers that the BLM have claimed.

Why are you not using the impartial NAS data and recommendations?

Why are taxpayer now funding scientific studies handpicked by the BLM.

On the subject of rangeland health integration, why is there no mention about the degradation caused by cattle and sheep?

In terms of water, in Sandwash Basin, Colorado, the supplemental water provided was placed far enough apart to allow the forage -- you know, the horses not to degrade the forage.

Have you considered digging wells?

The NAS report stressed that addressing issued with science-based management approaches that were applied consistently and communicated transparently to the public could help to increase public confidence in the Wild Horse and Burro Program. The report was published five years ago.

And I'm looking forward to that recommendation becoming a reality soon.

Someone mentioned for the first -- or the first person who spoke, mentioned the helicopter roundup issues that have taken place, specifically this summer.

I would like an investigation into that.

They have clearly violated the comprehensive animal welfare program for wild horse and burro gathers, standards that the BLM found necessary to come up with on June 30th, 2015.

I have some handouts in the back for each of you.

So I have a copy of those standards and I underlined --

>> One minute.

>> Thank you.

And I underlined those areas in case you are not aware, a refresher, if you will.

I also have some considerations for management that for land use planning, this has not been popular, but some closure to livestock grazing, which is, again, recommended or temporary removal.

I will also provide you with a copy of that.

I also have the NAS brief report version, kind of like the cliff notes in the back for you as well.

I'm hoping that you read its recommendations and use them in your advisory to the BLM.

>> DAN ADAMS: Teresa Klein.

>> Thank you for having me here today.

My name is Terese Klein, I'm with the wild horse league in Dayton, Nevada.

I have heard a great deal about getting to AML.

I heard about the available tools in the tool box that will enable the BLM to reach those AML goals.

I have heard how long it will take to getting to use these different scenarios and how much it will cost to reach AML in these time frames.

What I haven't heard is how to maintain genetic diversity with these AML numbers.

I have relocated over 100 horses to better forage.

I'm concerned about inbreeding.

We had three club foot stallions.

Just a small number, 100, and three, I thought was a rather high proportion.

It was a diverse band, but considering these three horses bond, they might have been from the same family.

They were very bonded to one another.

The information I'm about to relay is readily available to me online.

It should be available to the BLM.

I apologize in advance for pointing out problems with no solutions, but I only have four minutes.

In many areas, the BLM's plan to reduce wild horse herd population numbers for this arbitrary AML number will drive that area herd to inbreeding and potential extinction.

A leader in the field of equine population is Dr. Gus -- you have talked about somebody by the name of Gus.

It may be a different Gus.

He's involved in the horse genome project.

He's director of the equine blood typing at the University of Tennessee and I believe he's still a professor at Texas A & M.

Dr. Kaufman suggests that leaving them vulnerable to a long range loss of genetics.
(Background noise)

How small is too small?

At what point do the wild horse populations suffer the risk with irrefutable genetic damage.

Based on the DNA analysis, he now believes that the minimum wild horse and burro herd size is 150 to 200 animals.

He has worked in collaboration with the Dr. Francis Singer, research ecologist at the biological resource division for the United States USGS.

Preliminary evidence with the range in some areas, the example was the prior wild horse.

The preliminary evidence suggests that the heard of prior wild horses has been managed at dangerously minimum levels over the past 25 years and an increase in established appropriate management levels need to be considered in order to preserve the genetic viability of the herd.

(Background noise)

According to BLM's own statistic, the herd is larger than 61% of the herds under the management, prior AML of 121 larger than 70% of the herd AMLs by AML based on the BLM's last formal report in -- (Inaudible)

I only have one minute.

The last thing I would like to say, the BLM is setting the national heritage species up for inbreeding and failure to reproduce and low vitality and population fragmentation and eventual distinction.

Thank you for letting me speak.

>> DAN ADAMS: After Tom, we'll have Kimberly Ehrhardt and -- (Inaudible)
Sorry if I messed up your last name.

>> Thank you for the opportunity to provide a statement.

My name is Tom Allen, a member of the board of directors of public lands foundation. I'm here representing our members who have collectively thousands of years of experience professionally managing that resource.

No one in the Foundation receives -- (Inaudible) -- someone once told me when I use the word "hope," the word "doubt" could be used as a substitute.

I remain filled with hope but plagued with doubt about the wild horse and burro program.

Hope is that Congress will fund the BLM to bring the numbers to appropriate management levels as soon as possible.

And either allow the sale animals without limitation or provide the funding to place an additional 60,000 plus animals in holding facilities for the remainder of their natural lives.

And as well provide the funding to gather nearly all animals each year to give fertility drug PZP to the proper number of mares.

My doubt is that any of the above options will occur.

There will be somewhere near 150,000 wild horses and burros on the range in another four years absent significant -- (Inaudible) -- to give this number perspective, consider the following.

Those excess numbers are greater than putting at least 500 new ranching operations or enterprises on public lands each funding 500 head of cattle for six months of the year.

No one would think this is a good idea.

Yet predictably, that's the equal of what we will have in another four years with unmanaged wild horses.

The program is unsustainable and functional with only minor variation.

The result has been uncontrolled increases in numbers resulting in destruction of healthy horses, financial impact on small businesses, and starvation and dehydration of horses.

If the numbers are not brought to AML, the preview we are seeing of starvation and dehydration will accelerate.

Mother nature will ultimately -- (Inaudible) -- you will prevail using a heavy hand.

Heavy hand that she has reviewed and she will add disease to this, to bring us -- (Inaudible) this must be avoided.

You deserve our appreciation for willingness to serve and hopefully you will prevail where others before you have been largely -- (Inaudible)

You must work to influence the administration to take your advance.

And we look for a way forward that can provide for wild horse and burro, wildlife, land and the people who depend on healthy plans for their use.

>> This is not a change in weather, but in attitude, and human cooperation.

This climate that we are in right now is essential for constructive progress because challenges interconnect us as to wise and acceptable solutions.

First, I'm a wild horse advocate.

I also advocate for healthy public lands, local communities, and wildlife, including apex predators of species.

Over last few days, we have heard the phrase all the tools in the tool box as an analogy for authorized management methods.

Several such tools in on range wild horse population suppression are PZP and GonaCon.

These vaccines are proven effective with years of scientific data, trials and use.

They are acceptable and supported by the BLM, majority of wild horse -- majority of wild horse advocacy groups and the current concerned American public.

As humane.

Cost effective in that they are \$50 or less per month per mare and with some evidence that a few years.

Consecutive vaccination may produce infertility, which at this point, if they are on range, is that such a bad thing?

Without the cost of surgery.

So two things for one.

Yet with all of these benefits, to both the wild horses and budget, this tool is allocated the smallest percentile of the program's budget.

No solution -- no solution can ever be effective if it is underutilized or in some HMAs not at all.

It's not utilized at all.

The combo tool -- the combo tool from the tool box is full implementation -- full implementation of PZP, plus volunteer darters.

>> DAN ADAMS: You have one minute.

>> This compounds the savings.

In large HMAs where access and mare identification is difficult, modifications such as roundup, dart, mark, release, could be used producing a documented, significantly less reproductive on-range herd, allowing holding facilities and adoption programs to further reduce the off-range population.

Will this tool alone achieve BLM's goal of AML overnight?

No.

It won't.

But combined with volunteers, advocacy groups and the rest of the tools tool box, moving forward cooperatively, knowing we have made the wise decisions and are on the right dirt road together.

>> DAN ADAMS: After Mark, we will have Adam P, Peggy Coleman Taylor and I think it's Gailey Hunt.

Gail Hunt.

>> Good afternoon.

You should have a handout that you can follow along and make things a little more easily understood.

My name is Mark Graker and I'm with SpayVac for wildlife.

SpayVac was formed in 2017, to advance SpayVac which is a PZP-based contraceptive vaccine with proven long lasting single dose efficacy in horses and

several other species as well.

With respect to formulation, SpayVac is similar to other PZP vaccines that are familiar to and widely accepted by the Bureau of Land Management and the animal welfare community.

You can see from this unnamed table, PZP, and ZonaStat H and SpayVac all share PZP as the antigen.

We all use similar adjuvants but we have different sort of special technologies associated with trying to enhance the immune response.

SpayVac uses liposomes with adjuvant and antigens between them.

This way the antigen is released more slowly over a period of time, resulting in a much more robust immune response.

So that's the key to the difference in efficacy between SpayVac and the other PZP vaccines is this liposome technology and we have licensed this technology from the inventors, the IMV in Halifax, Canada, and we're in the process now of registering SpayVac with the EPA and we expect to get approval in about a year or so, about late 2019.

In 2003, the USDA, the national wildlife research center undertook the trial of SpayVac and in the first year, all 12 mares received a single dose, were contracepted and 10 of the 12 were contracepted, all from dose, two, three and four, and most of the controls were -- were pregnant during the trial ranging from 75% to 100%.

Consequently, the USGS undertook a study of two formulations and one of these performed quite well.

Tables one and table two.

>> DAN ADAMS: One minute.

>> Although not as well -- it's not as strong as the formulation that was tried in Nevada. It was nevertheless at about 60% efficacy at the end of five years and the formulation that we plan to register is the formulation that was used in Nevada.

Thank you.

>> DAN ADAMS: Mark?

>> Thank you for the opportunity to address you during the public comment period. My name is Adam Peel, I'm the natural resource policy specialist for the national association of conservation districts.

NACD represents the 3,000 conservation districts and the men and women who serve on their governing boards.

As you know, state governments carry out natural resource management programs at the local level.

NACD's full comments were submitted in writing prior to the meet, but I will highlight some of the top line concerns.

We encourage the board and BLM to implement alternative methods to address the over population and reduce expenses to the taxpayers.

Use scientific rangeland health practices, continue to manage the populations to balance their impacts on rangeland resources, while protecting native species, oppose HMA and support spaying and neutering of wild horse irrespective of their final destinations and the management of tribes on their impacted land.

NACD supports long-term fertility control of wild horse and burros.

The sterilization of females and males are used humane practices to reduce the population.

We recommend to the board and to BLM to follow its Resource Management Plans to ensure it meets AML.

Wild horses and burros found on private and public lands outside of HMA should be removed immediately to prevent detrimental impacts to rangeland health: Board emphasized the importance of science and rangeland health.

One thing to highlight is -- and this echoes the commission statement of NACD is we have to have all the tools in the tool chest for the local land managers to use in their decisions.

We cannot handcuff land managers with certain restrictions as though may be appropriate in other areas.

As you guys all know, are aware and support, local land managers know the local land the best.

As we heard yesterday, from the BLM Utah increase in private property and public safety concerns across the state are due to an expanded wild horses population.

Wild horses and burros will be there.

This must be a priority.

As we saw on the tour on Tuesday morning, the land is struggling to provide a healthy diet and water sources for the horses to have a substantial population.

Today, Dr. Petersen addressed the critical impacts happening to the rangelands.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak and to address you.

NACD looks forward to continuing our efforts with the BLM and this board to address the over population of wild horses and burros.

Thank you.

>> DAN ADAMS: Peggy?

>> Thank you for this opportunity.

I wanted to agree with Mr. French, that the climate of this particular gathering here is really great.

A lot different from last year.

So it's very promising with the ASPCA to join forces and to step up to try to resolve the issues to benefit the horses.

So as I listen to the presentations, the questions and the boards, I hear political agenda of persuasion or propaganda, whereas truth becomes unrecognizable.

One would be led to believe that the world is going to explode, if the wild horses and burros continue to roam free on their legally designated public land and state that it's only for wild horses, burros and wildlife.

And when sets policy pertaining to our public lands appears to be motivated by greed.

The repeated dialogue on what is best for the wild horse and burros is what's in best for the special interest groups.

Let's follow the money better the BLM 2018 data as follows: Truth, the BLM cost to support the wild horse and burros we always hear 50 million annually, pertaining to 26.9 million acres and a total of 81,952 wild horses and burros.

In 2018, there was a 44% loss of wild horse and burro originally designated land since the 1971 free roaming wild horse and burros land.

The BLM cost for the grazing is up to 1 million annually at 155 million acres, and 1,000,933 cattle equivalencies that are being charged \$1.43 per AMU, which is lower than the 2002 costs.

Truth, BLM oil leases, Utah averages about \$23.50 an acre.

And netted this year 3 million plus in 2018.

Truth.

The BLM manages 254 million acres and administered 700 million acres to oil, mineral coal interest and the feds receive 12% of the profit and states 25%.

BLM generated 96 billion from sales and goods.

Truth oil fracking operations once established on public lands stop becoming multiuse, not to mention the huge amount of water usage required for these operations.

Truth, wildlife population comprised especially deer, due to fracking platforms based on environmental assessments and the extensive roads created that disturb the sage-grouse nesting.

>> DAN ADAMS: One minute.

>> Nesting habitat, not horses, bears or mountain lions.

The tools available for years and seem to find on blind eyes and ears, without cost and inhumane.

Once is to release the geldings back into the acres of public land that was once theirs and as such, presently not being used for any other usage, living out the rest of their lives free without cost to taxpayers or reproduction.

Another such suggestion, pay cattle ranches not to graze in exchange to keep the same number of wild horses on the range whereas the rancher makes more money at the end of the day by not grazing therefore BLM costs for holding wild horses is reduced.

A win/win.

Present the truth of all factors that represent issues of concern.

Not blame the horses for each -- for the lack of participation which is due to geoengineering, extreme land erosions when perhaps the floods are more likely.

>> DAN ADAMS: Time.

>> Okay.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thanks, Peggy.

Gail Hunt and then after Gail, we'll have Redge Johnson, Keeley Hendrickson and Brianna Schwartz.

>> Hi, board.

I would like to say it's a pleasure to be here, but it's not.

This is really difficult, especially for us dainty and gentle women.

I was a designated banjo player for the Forest Service.

And I was never any good at it.

So compared to that, this is much, much harder because of the sheer level of contention, and understand that everyone has to be so committed to their position.

It's basically livelihood vs. life, and we're loyal to those positions.

I get that.

But I think there are a couple of things we could all agree on.

One would be in 47 years, there's been a failure to launch.

The other might be that nobody I know is interested in the no action alternative. There's got to be some progress.

And thirdly, I hope that everyone involved would agree that we just need to get real serious about hiring vets.

And I'm not talking to be clear, about hiring vets to do permanent sterilization on mares.

I'm talking about veterans, our war fighters, the people who risked everything so that we could all be in this room and be contentious and we could come before our federal government and have a dialogue with them.

I'm talking about our veterans.

Virtually everything that has been discussed in this room in the last two days, that needs doing, can be accomplished by task force of veterans.

We need to do that.

I have done a little ground work with veterans and talking to my Congress people and others and everyone I approach with this seems to be very enthused.

I think what we need now is to sit down with agencies, with all interested parties and talk about the tasks ahead of us and how do we accomplish that.

One thing I do know, I can say from my history with the federal government, this is something that I believe a multitude of partners would get on board with.

So if you are looking to save money, I think you can get a very qualified workforce and have some other people help us with the bill.

Because we are all interested in providing employment opportunities that aren't just, you know, menial tasks.

I mean, we have the people that bring the most knowledge and skill and experience and problem solving capacity, more so than any other sector of our population, and they deserve to be challenged just like we all want to be challenged to do our best and to solve new problems.

So I'm not talking about just fertility control, but that would certainly be the place to start.

And I believe knowing what some of these --

>> DAN ADAMS: You are at one minute.

>> What some of these tough, remote ranges look like, I believe we could sit down together and analyze some HMAs and see what it would take to have a means of getting that done, even with these high-flight horses such as Warm Springs, the remote areas.

I know we can get it done and I think we can get it done by late winter if we got busy. Thank you very much.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thanks, Gail.

Redge Johnson.

>> Good afternoon.

Good to be back with you this afternoon.

Redge Johnson with the Utah governor's public lands policy coordinating office.

I gave most of my comments this morning during the presentation.

We have also given you some written comments that I would like to you review.

We will just take a couple of minutes and go over some highlights.

I have to support what has been said here before, that I think the temperature in the room is conducive to getting some things done and I'm hopeful that we can do that. We have been working some of the advocacy groups on trying to come to some solution.

But it's critical that we get that done and get that done immediately.

We hope that you will concentrate on the condition of the rangeland and we are at a crisis point right now.

And that's why I say during the earlier presentation I was calling for three years to get back to AML.

If we let this go any longer, the program will keep going.

It's critical to the state of Utah.

67% of our state is public lands and a good part of our west, southwest desert includes the areas where we have wild horses and burros.

And they are welcome there.

And we want to support them but we also need to find a way that we can have thriving ecological balance on those areas and allow other multiple uses in that area.

We are not there for just one single use or any use.

We would like to have the full range of opportunities for all the people across state of Utah and all the people across the nation to be able to go out there and recreate or do what they like to.

So each HMA also requires specific management categories or management categories and so we include the permanent controls, including the mares and studs.

I'm afraid without that kind of that full range of authorities, it's going to put too many restrictions on what the local managers can do and, I like the suggestion you had earlier about working with the local governments.

Our county Resource Management Plans, especially in those areas that have HMAs and our state management resource plan also cover how we can work together on some of the wild horse and burro issues, but it has to be a partnership, a true partnership, 50/50 partnership or better with all levels of government trying to solve this I don't think any one area is going to be able to solve this on their own and it's going to take private citizens, the groups working together and everybody to try to solve this.

Most importantly is time.

The time is now to implement.

We can't let this go until next year or the year after that.

The crisis is right now.

And I'm glad to hear, that you know, a lot of groups are willing to work together with --

>> DAN ADAMS: One minute.

>> The government and at the national level, at the state level and the local level, with all the divergent groups out there.

Wildlife is coming to the board and the horse advocacy groups are coming to the board, animal rights groups.

I'm encouraged to see what we are hearing right now in this room but encourage us to move today.

Thank you very much.

I appreciate your time.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you, Redge.

Next Keeley Hendrickson.

>> Good afternoon, board members.

Kali Hendrickson.

You are good.

No problem.

I have been called worse.

>> DAN ADAMS: Sorry.

>> I'm the executive director for the White River and the Douglas Creek conservation districts in northwest Colorado.

We are home to the Piceance-East Douglas herd management area that does have an AML of 135 to 235.

Within the county we are 900 head of horses.

So as many of you know, I have been involved in this issue for a while and I used to say Colorado, you know, felt kind of funny for Colorado to be speaking when we had Nevada with issues they have got.

But unfortunately, we are growing and that's been our concern, is we are growing our numbers as well.

I am trying to remain hopeful that BLM and Congress will provide a full tool box to honor the legacy of the wild horse and burros by ensuring that they are treated humanely and with dignity.

The taxpayer dollars are prudently expended.

Those are the three criteria that I believe we must follow.

I want to thank all of you guys for serving on the board.

You are making the hard decisions that need to be made and your recommendations to make use of all of those tools that were available through the act are greatly appreciated.

Without all the tools in the tool box, the program will continue to be going down a disgraceful path.

We have submitted written comments.

I specifically ask that you take a look tell pictures attached.

You saw some of them earlier today on other presentations but as you know, pictures speak volumes.

And we all need to pay closer attention to those if we can't get out on the ground itself. As the board is made up of various interests and points of view, your views are critically important.

We hope that the administration will recognize your expertise and act upon your recommendations.

Over the past three days, you have seen and heard the realities with a multitude of scientific research, showing the impact of the horse over population on rangeland health, and all that depend on them, including the horses, the wildlife, the livestock, the recreation and the local communities.

Once we cross that state and transition threshold, it's basically a point of no return for productive lands.

I'm very pleased to hear most of the discussion centered around the habitat and ecological impacts during this meeting.

I recall many of those same conversations while I was serving on the board from 2012 to '14.

The board at that time warned us all this is where we are headed, where we are today.

>> DAN ADAMS: You have one minute.

>> Unfortunately, we all have seen since that time the number of horses double, the land and water resources deteriorate, and more horses and wildlife suffering.

And we continue to hear that PZP will solve the problem and some saying remove the livestock and all will be well.

We can find long-term holding and a plethora of interest.

We all have the responsibility to solve this issue.

Those who distracted the issue with the horse vs. cow conversations and those who litigate the agencies of BLM need to accept the primary responsibility of the situation that we are currently in.

It's time to stop the nonsense and take real action to stop the degradation of the land. And that does include Congress.

Thank you.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you, Kali.

Next is Brieanah.

After Brieanah, we will have Mark Ward, Linda Hannock and then Barbara Flores.

>> Good afternoon, many chair, members of the board.

My name is Brianna Schwartz, I'm the government relations and policy council for American wild horse campaign.

And I'm here today with my colleague Mary console, recommending our organization and over 750,000, excuse me, members and supporters and followers that is.

With my time, I would like to address two things.

First, the BLM's report to Congress.

And second, this board and the Interior Department's March towards mass sterilization of our federally protected wild horses that's against the will of over 80% of the American public.

First, in the agency's report to Congress, the BLM stated that each of the four management proposals, some implementing mass surgical sterilization would require new legal authority.

They understand that the authority to sterilize federally protected wild horses is not cheer and requires clarification from Congress.

Therefore, mass surgical sterilization is not a viable management tool.

As you choose options to support, I ask that you keep this in mind.

Second, as we have heard this week, the BLM has begun its experiments in the Warm Springs HMA by beginning to round up 100% of the horses that live there.

Next month, the agency will then remove the ovaries of 100 mares in a barbaric procedure known as ovariectomy colpotomy.

This is unnecessary.

They know and admitted that many of the mares would abort their foals would suffer awful complications and possibly die.

Yet, the BLM is not observing the welfare of the animals during the procedures, and has refused to allow for meaningful public observation of the public of these procedures.

Instead of these -- of these options that go against the directive under the wild horse act for humane management.

All they have to do is spend more than 0% of their budget on implementing PZP.

The BLM spent 0% of its budget!

And NAS has recommended that the BLM implement PZP over and over.

The 253,000 petition signatures in the boxes behind me, that we are delivering today, on behalf of my organization, are testimony to the desire of the American people to see their federally protected wild horses and burros managed humanely.

Republican, democrat, independent, rural, suburban, urban, male or female, it doesn't matter.

The American people want humane management options for their wild horse and burros.

>> DAN ADAMS: You have one minute.

>> Thank you, sir.

Therefore I ask this board to consider the full picture when making a recommendation. Recognize the agency's obligations under federal law which includes the Wild Horse Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, recognize the directives from Congress, the will of the American people, and most importantly, the horses and the burros that we all love.

We understand the crisis and we want to help find humane solutions.

Thank you.

>> DAN ADAMS: Mark Ward.

>> I'm going to refer to a handout that I hope you all have.

The cover page is the national association of counties, American county platform and resolutions for 2018 and 2019.

And I would -- if I could, I would like to direct you to the last page of that handout, that I will discuss.

The NGO that I'm with, balanced resources, a good deal of our mission is to advise and represent and advocate for rural counties in Utah, in particular, those who are affected by this issue, three of which are Beaver, Iron, and Miller Counties and Beaver County commissioner Tammy asked me to make these comments.

She was here yesterday, but had a conflicting obligation in Arizona with the national association of counties.

The national association of counties, not just Utah association of counties or the Nevada association of counties or what some may say are counties with an extreme point of view, but as of this year, the national association of counties this past summer in Nashville at their annual convention, adopted the language that you see there, highlighted in yellow regarding wild horse and burro management.

Most notably, they support restoring congressional funding for the acts, meaning the wild free roaming horse and burro act, sale without restrictions provisions.

Further, NACO, supports the sale and the fertilization ever them.

This is in recognition -- the fact that the national association would unanimously adopt

this is in recognition of what's been said over and over the last couple of days.

We are not approaching ecological disaster.

We are in the midst of it.

The eye the hurricane is here.

And counties feel this acutely.

Three counties I mentioned feel this acutely.

Much ever the economy of those three counties is grounded in traditional livestock grazing.

That grazing operates on a legal premise that has existed since 1934, the Taylor Grazing Act, the creation of the -- the grazing districts and allotments.

And it's the -- the ranchers that the permittees who dutifully and obediently follow increases and decreases --

>> DAN ADAMS: One minute.

>> -- thank you.

In AUMs and that's the backdrop.

That's the legal backdrop against which we are having this discussion.

And the AMLs as you all know were set in a scientific way to achieve perpetuation of those AUMs so everything could be in balance.

So when the AMLs, when the herd sizes blow past the AMLs, what suffers?

Grazing.

Not to mention the landscape.

So it's in recognition of all this, that NACO has weighed in on this and we just want you to know that this is not -- this issue has come main stream throughout the United States.

It's not an outlier position, it's a main stream position, okay?

I'm talking about the restoration of all the available tools.

I want to make sure that you are aware of that.

So thank you.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thanks, Mark.

Linda?

Linda Hannock?

>> Good afternoon.

My name is Linda Hannock, I'm from Colorado, and I also am on the board of directors for the Cloud Foundation.

This is not an emotional issue.

This is an intellectual issue and this is an economic issue.

It's all based on money spent and facts and figures.

My background is my life long adulthood, I have been an educator and I have been a small business owner for almost three decades.

I come with a varied background on these topics.

What I want to talk about today is the grazing program and how it impacts the budget of our wild horses.

I had a chart that I didn't get in time, and so I will send it to you.

It's based on 2018 BLM numbers.

The current numbers from the last ten years.

What is the economic impact of our public lands from the grazing program?

The ranchers that participate self-report, and the AUMs don't always reflect under reporting interest and past grazing.

The actual numbers of livestock on our public lands is higher than represented.

The average grazing AUMs for last ten years is approximately 1 million -- 1 million per animal units per year.

There are currently 15,000 grazing permits using public lands.

That's individual permits, and those are also group -- corporate groups.

Less than 2% of the land is used for beef that is even been Americans.

That's something that people don't really understand.

The public lands beef is not feeding America right now.

What is the elephant in the room?

In 2017, long-term holding costs \$5 million.

That's pretty black and white thing.

Since 2008, we have lost \$1.2 billion or 120 million a year from the grazing program.

How do we lose that?

We see a lot of photographs of horses on the lands, but we don't see pictures of cows on the land much.

What is wrong with these pictures?

>> DAN ADAMS: You have one minute.

>> The current BLM numbers, the ratios of livestock to wild horses is 28 to 1.

Is that over population by the wild horses?

The grazing program must be more fiscally responsible and must be self-supporting without millions of dollars of subsidies every year.

The one thing I would like to remember that the 1971 act states, wild horses shall live on public lands principally, not exclusively.

Thank you.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thanks.

Thanks, Linda.

Barbara?

Real quick, Barbara, let me jump in real quick, after Barbara finishes, then we have Joanna Grossman, and Mary Decancel, and then Elise Lovon; is that correct?

Okay.

Thanks.

Go ahead.

>> I have been a wild horse advocate since the mid-1980s when I adopted my first mustang.

She was a great divide of the Wyoming basin.

I recently had to put her down at the age of 35 in June.

We did a lot of things to are promote the mustang as a great horse.

She did hunter over fences and trail riding, western pleasure.

Anything.

She never said no.

So she was best horse I have ever had.

A group of us in about '87, '88, formed with the Bureau of Land Management the

Colorado wild horse and burro coalition.

We helped Fran Ackley of the BLM write guidelines for checking on adopted wild horses once they were in their adopted homes.

We checked on horses within first month or so of their adoption and directed adopters towards available resources where needed.

We reported back to the BLM and we all worked together.

Over the next few years, the BLM began to send us adopter information and asking for visits and signoffs only when first year was ending or had ended.

All that was wanted was to get the horses off the BLM books and not their problem anymore.

I objected to this.

Saying that in order to assist adopters we needed the information and the ability to contact them sooner.

Nothing happened to correct the situation.

I told Fran Ackley I would no longer do adopter checks for the BLM if all they wanted was a signature to terminate the BLM responsibility.

The CWHBC members helped at adoptions.

We also started going out on herd areas and herd management areas by ourselves to observe wild horses in range conditions.

I myself have been on the ground on herd areas and herd management areas in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and Nevada.

As time went by, it became obvious that the BLM was not interested in the welfare of the wild horses but simply in removing them from their homes as we became more critical of BLM and contractor practices that harmed the horses.

The BLM severed ties and pulled support for the CWHBC group.

We began to see that all they wanted was our support, not our input or criticism, no matter how constructive it was.

The Bureau of Land Management seems to have forgotten that America's wild horses and burros belong to the American public, not to the BLM.

>> DAN ADAMS: One minute.

>> They are only responsible along with US Forest Service for protecting, managing and controlling the public's wild horses.

The big thing I wanted to say is that AML has been set on a national level at a number according to Gary Sigodick that the national cattleman beef association said they could tolerate.

AML needs to be set on each herd area by monitoring, by scientific methods and each area is different and not at a national level.

If we were to maintain AML at this national number, it would be 3% of what the livestock AUMs have.

Thank you very much.

I have a flyer that I gave out that has more information.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you, Barbara.

Next will be Joanna.

>> Thank you all for the opportunity to provide comments today.

My name is Joanna Grossman and I'm the equine program manager for the animal

welfare institute, a nonprofit founded in 1951 and dedicated to reducing the suffering inflicted on animals.

The new policy which allows for the sale of 25 horses at one time, with no waiting period between transactions replaces a far more prudent policy that allowed only four horses per sale for the waiting of six months between purchases.

Although we appreciate the BLM's desire to find good homes for horses, the agency needs to be transparent with stakeholder as to what oversight mechanisms the BLM to make sure that they are not sold to the kill buyers.

The killing of 2,000 horses must not be repeated.

Several people wrote to Secretary Zinke to a relinquishment of BLM's responsibility and I included a handout for your review.

We must look at what protections are in place, and the standard boiler plate in the sales contract.

They have must demonstrate that it's doing its due diligence to make sure that someone seeking to purchase 25 horses at one time is not falsely representing their intentions.

Second, we fully support humane management tools to curb population growth, such as PZP fertility control but the manned sterilization is not humane.

The ovariectomy and colpotomy is widely outdated and carries significant risks.

It's astounding that the agency would aggressively pursue an option with the National Academy of Sciences explicitly regarded as inadvisable.

When Colorado state withdrew from partnership with BLM, like Oregon State before it, it should have been a sign to weigh other options.

Instead the BLM is proposing to move forward with the surgeries that the BLM admit it's may not be conducted in sterile condition and no welfare operations in the in place.

The BLM received thousands of comments in opposition to the ovariectomy experiment but regrettably chose not to heed the concerns that were raised.

Finally, the omission of the herd area repopulation working group from this board meeting's agenda seems counterproductive of the goal to find viable and long-term in the hold facilities.

They should look at herd areas that have minimal populations and develop pilot reintroduction plan.

We recognize a single solution to the ongoing problem of the long-term holding at enormous taxpayer expense does not exist but a multi-prong approach will be necessary.

In like of, that we must return some of these animals to the range on the millions of acres of public land previously occupied by wild horses.

Thank you again for your time.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you.

Next will be Mary.

>> Good afternoon, everybody.

My name is Mary Console and I'm a staff member with the American wild horse campaign.

I very much appreciate this opportunity to talk with you.

I'm here to speak out against the BLM's failed strategy of roundups and removals, of

America's wild horses and burros from our public land.
And this board's L. unanimous backing of this failed strategy.
This year, the BLM is planning on removing over 11,000 wild horses and burros to make room for the over 1.5 million livestock, private livestock grazing on public lands at the expense of American taxpayers.
Yet neither the BLM, nor the board have talked about that livestock or the damage that they are wreaking to the range.
Additionally, despite all of the talk about using all the management tools, this year the BLM has only PZPed 119 horses.
I repeat that number 119 horses.
I remind the BLM -- let me use my glasses.
I remind the BLM that roundups and removals are not supported by science.
They are brutal to the horses and burros that the BLM is supposed to be protecting and they are not supported by most Americans.
First, in 2013, the national academy of science has warned that roundups and removals fueling high population growth rates on the range.
And that they are expensive and unproductive for the BLM and the public that it serves.
Yet, they continue because the BLM continues to cater to special interest groups, including ranchers.
Also, while the BLM maintains that roundups are humane, nothing could be further from the truth.
Old and injured horses, pregnant mares and tiny foals, along with stronger, and healthier horses are chased for miles with foals often paying the biggest price.
Abortions, broken legs and necks and horrendous deaths are all too common.
Horses are also routinely euthanized for nonlife threatening conditions or for the severe injuries they sustained during their capture.
Although the BLM claims that roundups are necessary to keep wild horses from starving, most are coming off the range in good condition.
Ironically, as a result of the BLM's new sales policy, most of these healthy horses will end up in the slaughter pipeline.
>> DAN ADAMS: One minute.
>> Third, besides the quarter of a million signatures, 80% of Americans oppose the roundups and removals, and the killing or the slaughter of our wild horses.
It's time that the BLM and the advisory heed the recommendations of the NAS and the will of the American people.
Stop the roundups and removals.
Stop making excuses.
Prioritize PZP fertility control as a safe, humane and sustainable alternative for managing these iconic symbols of our American heritage.
With 30 years of science supporting it, PZP does work.
It just needs to be used.
Thank you.
>> DAN ADAMS: Thanks, Mary.
Okay.

Next we'll have Ginger.

After Ginger, we'll have Elise Lovan and then Justin Shannon.

Adam, I think we had you on here twice.

You only get to go once, man.

Oh, did I have --

>> Right before me.

>> You are Ginger.

Yep.

You know what I got that wrong.

Ginger, you are first and then Elise.

Unless you guys want to wrestle for it.

(Laughter)

>> Okay.

I better put my glasses on.

>> Let me make sure, there's only one Adam P, right?

All right.

So after -- so we'll go with Ginger and then Elise, and then Justin Shannon and then Ken Brown.

>> Ready?

>> Yes.

>> Hi.

Oops!

I am Ginger Fedek, I'm the wild horse and burro project chair for In Defense of Animals, a nonprofit organization.

In hearing the presentations and comments from the past two days, I. struck by the complete absence of mention of the effect livestock has on these very public lands we are discussing.

In many areas.

Wild horses and burros share the land with livestock, yet all the degradation is blamed on the wild horses who are vastly outnumbered by livestock.

We agree that healthy rangeland is a priority, but there are multiple uses contributing to the degradation.

What happens when you get to AML and the degradation of the range continues?

You are going to say, oops, I guess we were wrong.

It wasn't just the horses.

You've got to take the livestock into consideration.

I am not here to ruffle any feathers.

I have worked on cattle ranches and helped our sheep ranching neighbors with their stuff.

I have been a rancher myself, and I have needed to utilize my range management and range animal science degrees in protecting my own ranch an my own rangeland.

So I would like to end this on a positive, because I don't want to ruffle these feathers of the ranchers because I understand you.

I do want you to know that the wild horse advocates here today did not travel all this way to say leave them alone.

Do nothing.

We want to work together with you, the BLM, stakeholders, communities, for success and we believe in the multiple-pronged approach to solution.

It's not just PZP.

But PZP is important.

You can't just use less than 200 per year and expect any kind of an outcome.

So we believe we can accomplish our mutual goals without permanent sterilization or killing excess horses as Ms. Carlisle had stated before.

We believe we can capture this so-called energy in the room, that Mr. French talks about, and throughout our country to be the solution.

You talk about having limited tools in your tool box.

It's become a cliché this meeting, but yet the most potent and cost effective tool you have available is completely underutilized and that is volunteers.

>> DAN ADAMS: You have one minute.

>> There are places where advocates and community stakeholders and BLM all work together.

There are ID databases run by volunteers.

There are starters, all at no cost to government as opposed to 3,000 per mail in the BLM report to Congress.

It costs nothing to do this darting where volunteers are involved.

The increased budget funding for fertility control went to research, rather than to field application and we keep talking about how we are at this crossroads and time is of the essence.

Let's get it out in the field.

It's more than one.

Now, there are plenty of other solutions that you were presented in this document that was signed by 100 other organizations and these are solutions that use a multiple-pronged approach and in working together.

>> DAN ADAMS: You are at time, Ginger.

>> And there's this other document as well.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you.

Next is Elise.

>> Good afternoon.

I'm Elise Lovan and I'm a volunteer for foreign national wild horse advocacy groups on policy.

And in my day job, I'm a government employee with 25 years directing federal and state employment and training programs.

My state budget alone is larger than the entire BLM budget for wild horses in the country.

I find that disheartening because the cost to run real programs and make real change costs money.

In my job, I have learned the value of broad-based coalitions and the need for inclusion.

The work is hard.

But through efforts such as public/private coalitions, you build foundational work that can weather the tides of political change and make real advancement that last beyond administrations.

You think we have heard some real dialogue and we want to look at further.

I want to talk about how we build solution-based toolkits and manage wild horses and burros that could -- that could follow and add potential fiscal resources for on-the-range management and create economic generators for rural communities. Some of them can be done by developing pre-apprenticeships and registered apprenticeships for diverse populations.

Those can be done at federal, state and local government positions.

And they would help ensure that we have a workforce needed to manage our rich resources and also worker pipeline that is diverse, as we have seen from many of the people here, there is an aging population and building a workforce is very important. You start that from the ground up when children are young.

Federally, these earn and learn programs are ways to create no skill jobs without debt, engage youth at early ages so they stay in school and can be leveraged with the federal work-based learning programs that can assist with cost for the individuals and also allay some of the costs to government and the private sector.

Gail talked about the creation of the veteran core program.

This is one that would enlist returning an unemployed veterans to participate in fertility of darting animals.

Research has proven the healing powers of such programs and this could go a step further, as it could help them use this as a career pathway into jobs related to the environment.

The veteran are an important part of our workforce and we need to find jobs that are growing jobs that can help to use the skills that they have.

Public/private collaborations can help with increasing the visibility and the marketing programs through volunteers and the use of community connections.

It all happens they ground level, but government needs to manage and make things fair.

Training programs can be offered to those who are living --

>> DAN ADAMS: One minute.

>> The day-to-day experiences their new adoptees at home.

Such partnerships further increase more direct support, more access to in-person and online technical assistance, home visits and updates on the well-being of the wild horses before they are adopted.

BLM doesn't have the resources to provide one-on-one support and this approach can further ensure adoption success.

Thank you to the board and BLM for this opportunity to offer ideas for consideration on the complex issues before us regarding public lands, our wild horses and burros and future generations.

I invite you to be leaders and work with all -- wall the public, to create a future state for our environment, our wild horse and burros and be leaders for future generations.

Thank you.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you, Elise.

Justin?

>> Good afternoon, my name is Justin Shannon.

I work for Utah division of wildlife resources as a wildlife section chief.

I just have a short statement.

The Utah division of wildlife resources has a strong partnership with the BLM on resource-related management issues.

We encourage the BLM to manage horse populations to appropriate management levels using all available options.

We feel that managing horse populations to appropriate levels will result in improved habitat, less competition at water sources and will benefit wildlife populations in Utah.

UDWR, my agency, is willing to partner with and assist the BLM in managing the horse populations to appropriate levels.

Thank you for your time.

Thanks.

>> DAN ADAMS: Next up we have Ken Brown.

And after Ken, we have Pat Shea, Maggie Orr and Lori Klein.

Oh, thanks.

Okay so -- yes so we have Ken Brown, and Pat Shea and Maggie Orr and Kelly sublet.

>> Thank you, Ken Brown representing western counties alliance, deals with counties in the west.

I appreciate the opportunity to respond.

As you noticed, I parked close to the mic because I knew you would charge me with travel time.

WCA continues to support the wild horse and burro program on public lands when proper management exists.

Excess numbers continue to be a major problem in areas where WHB animals cause over grazing and resource damage.

Wild horse burro populations need to be managed within established, appropriate management levels, which they are not.

Good coordination and communication between state and federal agencies, county officials and private stakeholders relating to population data and monitoring.

WCA continues to support an enhanced gathering process which assists in reducing numbers, particularly in overpopulated areas.

We continue to support the reintroduction of disposal facilities, which are necessary to care for animals in need.

WCA continues to support your working is group, which is a very good concept dealing with various issues with the program.

WCA does not support reducing livestock AUMs to accommodate additional WHB roaming animals.

WCA thanks the Board and staff as you endeavor to improve the WHB program.

And have a good day.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you, Ken.

Pat?

>> I'm Pat Shea I'm a research professor at the University of Utah.

I was the director of the BLM in 1997 to '99.

At that point, we had 32,000 wild horses and we were close to 28,000 as a carrying capacity.

So I want to make four suggestions today and I need you to follow through on them. First, there needs to be a concerted spending on research and application of that research on fertility control.

That's the first Catholic BLM director to implement the birth control, it was not without controversy.

Second, I think using the veterans is a very good idea.

I'm an honorary colonel in the Utah National Guard, and there are frequently projects that they are looking for.

So I would suggest each director of BLM in the western states try working with their state governors to identify acreage of greater than 500,000 acres of public land where wild horses could be put and tourism could be encouraged to go out and visit and see the wild horses in their natural habitat.

We came close to doing that Carson City, but then for political reasons that never happened.

I do think that there's a great possibility of tourism -- excuse me, tourism and wild horses going together in an economically viable way.

Mentioning the National Guard is another one of my favorite topics because with our pull down in Afghanistan and Iraq, the defense department still has a large logistical capability.

I teach in Pakistan, and there are places in the world like Pakistan where horsepower still means a horse and so one of the things that would be considered is to take many of the horses that are in grazing areas now and transport them through the DoD to those countries that could use them, and using the USAID to figure out what would be the most effective and humane way of doing it.

These horses would be a great, great value to the people that I will see in developing worlds.

So I would like to thank you for your time.

I suggest that Congress really is the forum in which these things have to happen.

I have to tell you at any time I went to see Congressman Young or some of the other powerful members of house or the senate, and suggest that they needed to buckle up and do some things about the 1971 act, I was shown the exit door quite quickly.

So that's where the forum has to be focused on doing the things that will get us back to a manageable size for these herds.

Again thank you for your time.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you, Pat.

Maggie?

>> Hello my name is Maggie Orr and I'm with the Lincoln county conservation district and the Nevada association of conservation districts and the Nevada conservation commission.

The conservation commissions came out of the dust bowl.

They are entities of state government, elected by local people.

In Nevada where the federal government owns 85%, CDs connect public and private

industries to ensure proper management of rangeland resources.
The Nevada conservation commission, supports these statements.
It is essential that wild horse and burro numbers be kept at or below AML.
All established solutions to excess numbers must be allowed and followed, adoption, sale, sterilization and human euthanasia.
Long-term holding is not a solution, but a misuse of public funds.
The 1971 wild horse and burro act should be enforced as enacted.
The Lincoln county conservation district, it on lands in Lincoln county.
My local BLM office conducts emergency gathers as they are able, both for protection of human lives and on our highways and when wild horses do not have enough water or food.
When horses are in jeopardy, rangelands are already in jeopardy.
The frequency of emergency gathers is increasing.
Since you last met, BLM has completed the NEPA removal of horses from multiple herd areas as the 2008, ELRP and 17 HMAs.
This he have moved out of the herd areas ton private land.
Every sage-grouse project that the BLM completes is negatively affected by the negative use of horse numbers exponentially over AML.
Managed livestock grazing is not the cause of degradation.
There's one solution to reach the desired goal of healthy horses on healthy rangeland.
We have to get to AML by all means allowed.
It would be great for off range horses, however, Nevada can't wait for this option if people don't step up.
I sincerely hope that they do.
I serve on boards like you to try and make a difference.
I cannot ignore what can be observed by anyone who goes to look at Nevada's rangelands where wild horses and burros are present.
I said that the CDs came out of the tragedy of the dust bowl.
Conservation districts stand ready to overcome the tragedy of our rangelands where wild horse and burro numbers are above AML.
We have can't come to solutions until we deal with the problem.
Please continue to recommend that BLM be given all the means to solve the problems as described in the recent report to Congress.
>> DAN ADAMS: One minute.
>> Option one in the report is the most viable option.
I understand this is not easy.
Thank you for doing the right thing for the horses and the rangeland.
>> DAN ADAMS: Thanks, Maggie.
Kali.
After Kali, we will have Debbie Gonzalez, Shawna M and Sundays Hunt.
>> I'm Kali Sublett with the Mustang Heritage Foundation.
I'm going to try to keep it short.
I will focus on one of our most successful programs the trainer incentive program and kind of give you a snapshot of where we are.
And just if I don't get to it in the end, I guess my goal is to encourage you to continue

to encourage the BLM and supporting organizations like the Mustang Heritage Foundation who are actively placing animals into adoptive homes.

I know adoption is not the answer.

But it definitely is working, and like Dr. Lynn said, there's a lot of enthusiasm and interest if, not enthusiasm at least interest from the entire equine community.

We are seeing it across the United States, and I think this is a really important time to give it all we can and do as much as we can to support those programs that are working.

Since 2015, we have seen a significant growth in the TIP program year over year.

However, the past two years we have either had to suspend or delay the program due to lack of funding.

We have not advertised the program in over 18 months, and are still meeting and exceeding adoption goals.

Based on the trainer interest, even without advertising, we are confident we can place upwards of 4,000 animals in fiscal year 2019.

We have over 450 animals currently in training with 40 to 60 being picked up by trainers each week.

We have 430 approved TIP trainers five or more applications coming in weekly.

Again, this is without having advertised the program since 2017.

We feel confident that if we are able to reach our goal of 4,000 adoptions in 2019, we will continue to see an increase in momentum that could take us to placing 5,000 to 7,000 animals annually.

The TIP program costs on average 1400 to \$1,600 per animal per placement.

This includes a \$1,200 or \$1,000 payback directly to the TIP trainer and into the local economy.

The program has been supported financially by the BLM for the past 12 years, and saves BLM an average of \$14 to \$16,000 per animal.

That's a savings of more than \$100 million in holding costs since 2007.

The past two years we have expended our budget before the end of fiscal year.

We are currently stagnant at approximately 1600 annual adoptions.

However, again, our potential is 4,000.

In FY '19, we are hoping and planning to receive BLM funding to support 2100 adoptions through the TIP program.

That leaves with us a need to fund an additional 1900 adoptions.

That leaves us --

>> DAN ADAMS: One minute.

>> 2.6 million.

We are now looking for additional funding sources to fill the gap between BLM funding and program potential.

So that's just kind of a quick snapshot.

BLM is supportive of the TIP program and has continued to support the TIP program, but we are fortunately and unfortunately at a point where BLM funding is no longer covering the program potential.

So I just want to put that out there.

I know there's a lot of talk about other organizations.

We have been talking with other organizations about supporting the program. So we are talking a lot about what we want to do and need to do and just want to remind everybody that there is a program that is working and there are some positive things that are happening and a lot of excitement and we want to keep that momentum going.

That's it.

Thank you.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you.

Debbie Gonzalez.

>> I don't look like a Gonzalez.

Thank you for allowing me to speak today.

My name is Debbie Gonzalez.

I am a mustang owner and a horse own created and a member of Welco.

Today, I wish I could remind you of the exponentially expanding body and the entwinement with ecology and our environment.

As you know, all species -- all species on the range have an impact on our -- have an impact from ants antelopes, cattle to cougars and horses to hare and sheep to sage-grouse.

It can't be hoisted on to one species' back.

You know that to be true.

The ecosystem of our high plains and mountain states has been in trouble since people decided to break it up into bits and pieces without regard for anything but the money that could be made from the land.

Unfortunately, I can't remind you much of anything.

I have only been allocated a scant few minutes.

But even if I had been allotted an extended amount of time, it wouldn't make a difference.

I feel your agenda has been set.

My background as a multigenerational native Coloradan, raised on the high plains of southeastern Colorado and my land grant college degrees aren't worth a hill of beans in your decision making process.

Awful though I would like to point out two items.

The current set AML of 126,000 is the same number that Congress deemed endangered when it enacted the 1971 wild horses and burros act.

And since 1971, the mustangs have lost over 40% of land originally set aside for them.

Finally, keep in mind that the idea of ecotourism, since 80% of the American people support the mustangs, and those 80% will ultimately affect the decisions made regarding the icon of our western heritage.

Thank you.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you, Debbie.

Shauna.

>> Good afternoon, board and thank you for the opportunity today.

The spreadsheet and information that I'm utilizing today converts grazing receipts, reported by the BLM budget, justification report for the private livestock grazed under the public lands grazing program.

Utilizing BLM data, we are able to get a closer head-to-head count comparing wild horses that are estimated by the BLM and permitted cattle grazing from 2002 to 2018. The BLM's own data completely undermines the BLM's entire argument for getting rid of wild horses to mitigate the environmental and fiscal costs of overgrazing on public lands.

The wide spread overgrazing across BLM land is due to cattle and the numbers show it.

Grazing receipts are self-reported by ranchers on an honesty basis.

The grazing fees done actually reflect under reporting or trespass grazing.

Therefore, the actual number of subsidized privately owned livestock on public lands is likely much higher as those are not reported but BLM.

The federal grazing program subsidies lose taxpayers 1.25 billion over ten years or 125 million a year in direct costs by the BLM's own estimates.

When direct and indirect costs are factored, in those taxpayer losses rise to between an estimated 500 million and 1 billion a year, according to the GAO.

Why are we hiding the public lands ranching costs from the public?

Why are those costs not publicized as those of the wild horses and burros?

Why are the wild horses and burros continuously made out to be the culprit of over grazing?

The accounting for cattle, deer, antelope, moose, it never makes headlines but the BLM wants to blame the wild horses it seems for their own poor mismanagement.

I do want to commend some of the BLM field offices that jumped into with advocacy groups this year as we were in drought situations that they worked with the advocates that were so willing to go out and take and deliver water to the wild horses.

That's what it takes.

It takes a group.

It takes a tribe.

So thank you so much for allowing me to speak today.

And I hope that you will continue hopefully to take care of our wild horses.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thanks, Shauna.

Next, we will have Sunday.

After Sunday, it will be present Beiling.

And Brent will be our final.

>> My name is Sunday Hunt, I'm the Utah director for the Humane Society of the United States.

And I'm here to represent our position.

The BLM estimates that there are approximately 82,000 wild horses and burros living on our land while questions remain about the validity of the population claims and whether current appropriate management levels and AMLs have been appropriately established.

The Humane Society of the United States and the legislative fund understand that there's conflicts related to wild horse populations and we recognize that the BLM is mandated to maintain the public lands for multiple-pronged approach.

Uses and that the BLM has determined that wild horses and burros is necessary.

The USUS, in satisfying the diverse stakeholders in the debate, however, we also

believe that where the agency is working to manage wild horse and burro populations that those efforts must be humane and in that release rates speak we must first acknowledge that the HSUS, that slaughter or destruction is not an option that should be on the table.

It's simply inhumane.

Furthermore, it's an action that only runs against the instincts of American public, but also nullifies nearly 50 years of federal policies that calls for the protection of these living symbols of free spirit of the American west.

Policy that was put into place in an attempt to halt the very actions of agencies attempting to pursue now.

We include in this concern serious reservations at HSUS, and hold with revised policies, particularly IM number 2018-066.

That could open the door to slaughter.

The previous policy put into place in 2012 came to fruition as a result of investigations which reveals that the BLM was selling horses to a known kill buyer who was subsequently sending them to slaughter.

It limited the agency to selling only four horses at a time, with the required six month period between sales and its intent was to prevent kill buyers from the subsequent and resell of wild horses and burros.

Immediately, after documents are signed, this policy limitations was one of the few safeguards in place to prevent horses and burros from ending up in the slaughter line. It removes the safeguards and allows up to 25 horses without petitioning the agency. More than 25 horses -- if you petition the agency and it appears to place no wait time between sales.

While Congress has put language in from selling wild horses to slaughter, it is clear that sell authority animals have ended up in the slaughter pipeline in the past, and the revision of the policy could very well mean that many of our iconic wild horses and burros may end up into the slaughter pipeline.

The HSUS firmly oppose these policy revisions.

We also believe that --

>> DAN ADAMS: You have one minute.

>> Where the agency is working to manage wild horse and burro populations that they must be both effective and humane.

We also express our concern with the BLM's proposed research in Burns Oregon.

Due to the possibility and the ability of federally approved less invasive methods of fertility control, we believe it should focus on the implementation of already available controlled tools and look less invasive surgical methods and it would allow the agency to begin large scale implementation immediately and help avoid the public backlash.

That said, we are not suggesting a hands off policy.

We have always brought a constructive approach to the resource challenges and a fresh perspective to the wild horse and burro move.

We want to continue to work with stakeholders.

>> DAN ADAMS: You are out of time.

Thank you.

Brett?

>> Good afternoon to the board.

Thank you for letting me make comments today.

I represent Utah farm bureau federation which represents 34,000 farmer and rancher families in the state of Utah.

I would like to commend the board and the audience for the civility of the comments today.

I think we all can come to solutions when we have this kind of a civil discussion and commend you all for that.

I have submitted written comments but I wanted to talk from the heart.

I grew up in southern Utah and I have come from a ranching family.

One of the places that we run cattle is near the Muddy Creek allotment.

We also run cattle on the Tavaput plateau.

Both places you don't have gathers this year.

We applaud your efforts and thank you for helping us.

The last time I went out there this summer to gather cattle, we had a poor mare, a mustang, a wild mustang there that she had a colt at her side and she had been deteriorating in the drought conditions, and she had died the night before and her poor baby foal followed us the rest of the day.

So we as cowboys were gathering cattle and we have this orphan foal following us.

As ranchers, I'm telling you, it's unethical to watch wild horses, sheep, cattle or wildlife being managed on this.

The AML will allow 70 mustangs.

The last count they had over 600.

When you have those kind of conditions, there's no way that you can sustain the population in good condition especially when you have a 40-year drought like the one we have been experiencing.

They didn't have water to drink in many cases.

We had to move all of our cattle from the area where the mustangs are and this occurs in all of the areas where ranchers are bordering these mustangs as they graze.

They graze differently than cattle.

One of the things that we want to point out today, we don't expect any -- any favorable treatment or special treatment as ranchers in how we manage our animal units.

If I exceed my numbers, I'm going to be penalized.

I'm going to be trespassed and forced to comply with that.

But I will tell you this, if -- if there are conditions on the range that don't support the animals, our ranchers don't send animals out.

In fact, in southern Utah this year, most of our ranchers have voluntarily taken as much as 90% cuts on their range.

The problem is the mustangs are not managed in the same way.

And when you are at five and 600 head above the carrying capacity, it's devastating to the range.

One of the things that Redge Johnson and others have pointed out earlier is when -- when you have utilization rates that you have to follow, that means --

>> DAN ADAMS: You have one minute.

>> The cattlemen can only graze up to 50% of the grass available and they have to

remove the cattle.

Horses on the other hand, will take up to 90% because they are never -- they are not managed.

They have can't be taken off the range.

So as we look for solutions to this, the farm bureau would like to offer its support to helping the BLM find funding to find all available solutions that have been mentioned today and we would love to -- to use our power to lobby and to help find sources of funding to take all of the animals that we can off the range and give them back to the AMLs.

And I appreciate you for your time.

And I want you to know that farmers and ranchers really do have the best interest of these wild mustangs and burros at heart.

>> DAN ADAMS: Thank you, Brett.

I would like to echo -- I'm highly impressed with how civil and great people have been about being respectful and listening to others.

There's been some difference of opinion, but yet you guys have handled yourselves extremely well.

So very impressed.

I pass it back to you.

>> FRED WOEHL: Thank you.

I echo your sentiments.

Board, we are going to take a five-minute break and then we have a lot of work to do for the rest of the day.

The board is adjourned for five minutes.

(break).

>> FRED WOEHL: I need the board back up here.

We are running late.

I said five minutes.

You've already took nine.

All right.

The meeting will now come back to order.

Is Barry still hooked up?

He is?

Barry, are you there?

No.

I hadn't heard from Sue or her -- or him.

Okay.

All right.

Board, at this time, we are going to talk about recommendations.

I have got about three that I want to talk to y'all about and then we'll just start over there with Ben and come this way, and we'll talk about all the recommendations that you have and we'll address every one of them and I will start out.

I've got -- like I say, I've got about three.

And one of the things that I am -- board, I'm really feeling good about.

I mentioned this a little bit before.

Although there are several advocacy groups out there that really have an opinion that they don't want to work with Bureau of Land Management on anything, we do have several of these that have expressed a desire to work with us and to -- to come up with a -- with a program and they might need a little bit of time to do this in.

And so here's the recommendation that I proposed.

Now, Daniel, are you going to put them up here for us?

You do -- you do need to.

You need to type fast.

All right?

Okay.

Let him get this up so we can do this.

And like I said, I'm going to -- these are proofs and we are going to talk about them and we can change anything you want.

We have to get this done in about an hour and a half, an hour and 20 minutes.

So we have to move fast.

Within two years, if positive solutions and cooperation between parties and BLM, doesn't correct the current problem, BLM should follow the stipulations of the wild horse animals deemed unadoptable for sale without limitation or humane euthanasia.

This is a -- this is a recommendation that we made in 2018.

I am encouraged greatly by the -- and I -- I'm going to blame Celeste for this, in that she's got me convinced that within two years or less, they can come up and start working together, sharing the cost of these long-term holding maybe put horses in long-term holding and try to get a handle of this program, without detriment to the range, and further detriment to the horses.

So I will start over again.

Within two years, if positive solutions and cooperation between interested parties and BLM does not begin to correct the current problem, and you might put in -- the current problem, and probably put in parenthesis, overpopulation, BLM should follow stipulations of the 1971 Wild Horse and Burro Act, in long and short-term holding -- all suitable animals in long and short-term holding, deemed unadoptable for sale without limitations or humane euthanasia.

That's straight out of the 1981 law.

So any of the board have any comments on that?

>> Well, there's a couple.

The second line, it should be interested parties.

It should say between interested parties.

>> FRED WOEHL: Interested parties.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Interested parties.

And at the last line, it should be or euthanasia.

>> FRED WOEHL: Or, yes.

Okay.

In other words, my thoughts behind this is to give them two years -- I mean, and get something going by that time, and if it don't get going by that time, then we have to do something.

There isn't any ifs, ands or buts about it.

Yes, Celeste.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Is this our -- does this encompass the recommendations that Jim, you and I were talking about.

Is this supposed to lead into that?

>> FRED WOEHL: This is separate.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Okay.

I feel like I don't know about this one.

>> FRED WOEHL: No, you don't.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Okay.

Just checking.

>> FRED WOEHL: You do now.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Okay.

I need to clarify.

Okay.

Let me read this.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay go ahead.

>> Could you define correction of current populations?

How are you going to measure that?

>> FRED WOEHL: You are right.

>> Do you want to add a percentage?

>> FRED WOEHL: Not begin to reduce AML?

Established AML?

I hate the word "begin."

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

What would be a good word?

I'm not an English -- hell, I'm from Arkansas!

>> DR. TOM LENZ: There has to be a measurement or else it doesn't mean anything.

>> FRED WOEHL: You want to do --

>> BEN MASTERS: How about taking possession of 25,000 horses annually for ownership?

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, I agree that should be the ultimate goal but it will be hard to -- when they kick this off to take 25,000 at once.

Am I right, Celeste?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: And also this is so broad, that I think it could be interpreted in any way by anyone.

So --

>> DR. TOM LENZ: That's right.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: So let me clarify exactly what you are getting at.

I think what you are looking for is that all of these promised partnerships that we have been talking about, we need to see some measurable movement with -- with and among those groups by some certain -- those groups need to step up and prove that what they have offered up is in the works or beginning to actually affect any sort of change, and if not, the board will be put into a situation, again, of saying we need to release all of those restrictions.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: But I think you still have to put in either a number or a percentage

or something.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

What do you think --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Can you give us a week?

>> FRED WOEHL: 10%.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: 10% of what?

>> FRED WOEHL: Go ahead, Jim.

>> JAMES FRENCH: I would hope that we would fall back on the standard protocol that BLM carrying capacity.

>> FRED WOEHL: AML.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Whether it be for allotment evaluation, or the context of an HMA, the difference, is that in those units of measurement, there -- there can be a wide variation in terms of what carrying capacity actually is, given conditions.

>> FRED WOEHL: How about if we put over population, 10% of the current number of horses on range?

>> DR. TOM LENZ: I would say that does not decrease the total number of horse and burro inventory, which would be everybody.

I think 10% is not a lot, if we are looking at two years down the road.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, the reason I said that two years is it's going to take them at least a year to get up and running, I think, and then it's going to -- and then -- you see, whatever they do, they are going to have to run by BLM and dah, dah, dah, dah.

And so I don't -- I mean --

>> DR. TOM LENZ: It just doesn't seem like a big --

>> FRED WOEHL: 10% would be 8,000 horses, almost 9,000.

Which is a drop in the bucket, but it's a start.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: It's a slow start.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, 20%?

Or 25,000 like Ben said.

>> BEN MASTERS: Yeah, I mean, I think that these ideas and the language is kind of too arbitrary and open to interpretation.

I'm not comfortable voting in favor of this and don't really plan to.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

>> BEN MASTERS: How do you define interested parties?

How do you define problem?

How do you define positive?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: This is a whole meeting in and of itself.

Yeah.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, positive solutions is just positive is not negative.

>> BEN MASTERS: I mean --

>> FRED WOEHL: Cooperation is cooperation.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: How about the board being supportive of the fact that these partnerships and programs that are coming to the BLM and that the BLM knows about many of them, that the board is supporting those actions and is encouraging the BLM to actually step into the role of assisting with the implementation of these programs.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, here's my approach on this.

We have stuff like that ever since we have begun.

If these folks are really serious about stepping up and helping, that's I didn't said two years.

I mean, I don't want to come back next April and not have anything done and the population has grown by 20,000.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I totally understand that.

>> FRED WOEHL: The colts will be on the ground.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: But what I'm saying -- I'm not saying that -- what am I saying this I'm trying to say that BLM has to step into the role as well.

It's all well and good to say, great, groups come up to the table and tell us what you've got and then do it.

But if from DC the communication to state leave, the communication to field offices is not there, none of this will happen.

The BLM also has to be vested in this completely throughout their structure.

That's what I think the board should recommend.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, the thing is -- and here we, go I want to reiterate this, we are flying at 30,000 feet.

We are not going to make a recommendation to the field office.

That's not our job.

Our job is to make recommendations to BLM as a whole through the chief over here.

And so I am confident in my mind that BLM is doing every that they can to prevent this problem from getting any more but their hands are tied.

One of the promising things that we have had is the partnership between the advocacy group, like yours -- and I will be brutally honest for you.

I have no respect for any advocacy groups that don't have any horses.

None, zero, nada, zilch, but those who want to make this thing work and I think personally, I want to give y'all a chance.

Because I know you love these horses.

>> Fred?

>> FRED WOEHL: But we can't go on without doing something.

We can't go on without doing something.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Who are the interested parties?

And by the way, we do have horses.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I don't think it precludes other interested parties.

>> FRED WOEHL: And that's why I said interested parties so we might have some state agencies.

We might have some -- some animal -- you know, those live animal park that you go and visit.

I'm serious.

We got to get rid of these horses!

We are faced with two options.

The only two options we have is placing them in homes or get rid of them.

There's no in between.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: This may be a few things in between.

>> FRED WOEHL: Not on the range, there's not.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I'm not going to support this.

So I would like some portions of the idea, but, like Ben said, this is just way too broad, with no -- there's nothing actionable.

I think coming up with money --

>> FRED WOEHLE: There from the parenthesis where you are at, erase everything up above that.

Back that way.

Yep.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: So this is the thing that the board always recommends.

>> FRED WOEHLE: We don't always recommend it, but that's what it is.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Does this preclude the other recommendation that I think is coming down the pipeline?

>> Mr. Chairman?

>> DR. TOM LENZ: I'm sitting here trying to put together some language real quick in my head here.

I think one of the things we are missing here because we are tripping over the wording on some real broad language is that I think the intent -- and I don't want to put words from anybody's mouth here.

I think the intent is that we need to offer -- offer encouragement and a -- an admonition to the Bureau of Land Management to embrace what has been offered today.

And -- and then we can talk relative to -- you know, there was a lot of deliverables that were actually reported on in the Bureau's -- in the Bureau's document in terms of where they were sitting with regard to AML and where they were sitting with regard to holding short and long term.

And I think those are deliverables that we all would recognize or those numbers are all -- are kind of indicative of how the system, the program has kind of gotten out of hand.

I think if we can measure that in terms of where are we relative to the annual production, where are we with regard to holding, long-term holding and where are we with regard to the volunteer program and -- and how that has developed over the last year or two.

And I think it would give -- personally, I think I would be more comfortable in evaluating that in a year and trying to get a feel for whether we have the momentum rolling.

And if we have to use some sort of midcourse correction, tap the brakes a little bit down the road, in a couple of meetings.

I have think that would give us the opportunity to do that.

And I think it's always open -- we are always open to being able to -- if it doesn't work, if it's -- let's say, if it's a failure, we can always recognize that as well and we certainly have that option of -- you know, we are still operating within the two-year time frame that Fred, that you were interested in.

What I would like to do is I would like to look at it from the standpoint of the positive and try to look at it from that.

>> DAN ADAMS: Can I offer something?

I have 30 minutes until five.

You have a tremendous amount in common.

I could just bullet the list out.

What are all the things you can agree on as a board that you want?

So you want to achieve AML.

You have a whole list of things, but then you can take that and very easily make a statement like you are trying to do here.

Maybe the idea would be to list the desired outcome, or the elements of it and then you could put it into a statement off that.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: How about it can be a bullet point or whatever you, the board encourages the BLM to collaborate with interested equine advocacy groups to decrease the total number of horses and burros in inventory, or whatever verbiage you want to use -- I mean, somehow we want to encourage the BLM to form these partnerships in order to decrease the number of horses that they are responsible for, right?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: That's what I'm saying, that's a statement.

That's a desired outcome.

We can take them and list them and it's easy to put into a paragraph.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Well, there it is.

>> FRED WOEHL: There's no paragraph on anything.

These are recommendations one, two, three, and four.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I understand.

It feels like we are kind of taking ambiguous ideas here and maybe we need to get a little more concrete of what those exact points are.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I have a concrete recommendation.

Encourage volunteers --

>> FRED WOEHL: No, hey, I'm the board and I'm the chair and we will finish this before we go anything further.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: One thing I noticed working on the board, it usually takes at least two years for the BLM to enact any recommendation we make.

And so I think that we should just leave it as it is.

BLM should follow the stipulations of the 1971 Wild Horse and Burro Act by offering all suitable animals in long and short-term holdings being deemed unlikely to be adopted.

We are standing on -- we are falling off the cliff as we speak.

I don't think we should wait until we hit the bottom to start putting groups together.

We can have this ongoing as we go.

And I would also like to touch on this term sale without limitation.

It doesn't mean they have to go to slaughter.

No, by no means does it mean that.

Horses that are offered for sale without limitations anyone can purchase.

That means the Cloud Foundation, the wild horse federation, whatever other organization would like to purchase these horses has an ample opportunity to do so and should do so and I would encourage to do so.

And so my personal belief from the time I have been on this board, let's start now.

Why wait two years?

Every recommendation we have made has taken at least two years to fully enact.

>> FRED WOEHL: True.

That's true.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: So I --

>> FRED WOEHL: Go ahead.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Just to be very clear here, I don't really think this has anything do with the workability of groups and their approaches to the BLM, and I would -- that's fine.

Put that out there.

You know I won't vote yes on it, but I don't think they should be tied necessarily to a recommendation.

So separate it out.

>> JAMES FRENCH: You are saying separate out the --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yes, I don't think there are needs to have anything to do with groups that are interested in working with BLM.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Oh, I agree.

>> FRED WOEHL: No, no, no.

That's not what I'm saying.

I guess I am but the thing is, you told me in two years, you would have a solution that would work this done.

What happens if -- (Off microphone comment).

>> FRED WOEHL: Someone mentioned two years.

And in two years we will say, oh, my goodness, we forgot to do something.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yeah.

>> FRED WOEHL: And then we will have 120,000 horses on the range and another 80,000 in holding.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Because this is too vague, I would not tie it to anything. Something must happen for this or something doesn't happen and then this.

It's too vague.

I would say that we are very near to having all kinds of great ideas to partner with the BLM and be ready to act on, but I'm not going to put a timeline on it.

It's going to fly or it's not.

And we are working as hard as we can.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

All right.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I'm not going to say --

>> FRED WOEHL: Erase it and start over.

I don't we have enough support for it.

>> BEN MASTERS: Mr. Chairman, can we leave that one to be voted on and list more?

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, I don't think there's enough support for it.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Well, that never stopped us from voting on it.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

All right.

Okay.

Just leave it there.

All right.

Number two.

Okay?

What's the one you got over there on your computer?

>> BEN MASTERS: I have two recommendations.

>> FRED WOEHL: But mine?

>> BEN MASTERS: The recommendation that Fred wrote which I have on my computer is: Encourage BLM to gather horses in HMAs that are over AML that are reliant upon supplemental water.

Once that HMA is at AML, stop hauling supplemental water, except under extreme circumstances.

Once again, that was Fred's recommendation.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

>> BEN MASTERS: I have some that I have written.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

I've got one more.

Okay?

Now drop down one more.

Continue to support an increase use of organizations like the mustang -- well, back up and take out -- take out organizations and put in programs.

Like the Mustang Heritage Foundation Trainer Incentive Program.

To place horses in good homes.

All right.

Ben, your turn.

>> BEN MASTERS: Including inmate training programs --

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Say that again.

>> BEN MASTERS: Inmate training programs.

4-H and youth programs.

4-H.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Oh, my gosh.

>> BEN MASTERS: Youth programs.

Local fertility control advocacy groups, ecosanctuaries.

And the Mustang Heritage Foundation.

Celeste, would this be a good recommendation to incorporate some of the ideas that you have?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yes.

For sure.

Some of the ideas.

That's a good one.

We wanted to make some sort of recommendation to support the marking research that the BLM has already had, and to continuing supporting the various phases that that plan recommended to the BLM.

They have begun implementation of some of those phases but I think to encourage that that -- that it continue following the -- finding the right terminology -- I think the recommendations within that marketing report.

They are picking them off to a certain extent but, I think we should encourage them to

pick off the entire list.

>> FRED WOEHL: I would think we would need to define the recommendations that they can, because some of them they probably can't because of federal law.

That's great marketing.

They had nothing to do with federal law.

And believe me, the federal law is way different than what a private company can do.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: So maybe saying the feasible recommendations of the marketing report.

>> FRED WOEHL: There you go.

All right.

Okay.

Good.

>> BEN MASTERS: Mr. Chairman, I have more recommendations.

>> FRED WOEHL: Go ahead.

>> BEN MASTERS: Reach out to military and veteran organizations for help with adoption and volunteer fertility control application.

Control application.

I have another one.

Relocate 2,000 geldings to Cliven Bundy's grazing allotment.

(Laughter)

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Do I have to write that one?

>> FRED WOEHL: Lord, I apologize.

All right.

Steven.

>> You are going to get me in trouble, Ben.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: So I still think it would be good to have -- we have all go the full congressional report.

Hopefully you had a chance to look at that.

I think it would be beneficial for the BLM and for Congress if they choose to act upon it to know where the board stands.

I think it would be good for us to take an official stance on the options that -- the option of one of the four that we felt was the best as a board.

Personally, I believe that option one is the best.

I open that up for discussion.

That's found on page 13.

Official report.

My recommendation is that the board accept the BLM's recommendation to Congress of option number one as a bath forward for achieving AML as the preferred path forward.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Steven where is that again?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: It's on page 13.

Official report.

And make sure you have the colored page because first one they gave us --

>> Yes, use the colored version because the black and white one --

>> FRED WOEHL: You had your hand on it.

It's under your right hand.

Okay.

Steven, do you have anymore?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: To go with this?

>> FRED WOEHL: No.

To go with it.

Do you have --

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: And recommend Congress give the BLM the authority to carry out this option.

>> FRED WOEHL: Now, doing these recommendations, it needs to be something that the BLM has -- we have no -- we can't recommend to Congress.

We are not a congressional recommendation board.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: But we are citizens who can make that recommendation.

>> Not as a board.

>> FRED WOEHL: Not as a board what we do is make recommendations to BLM.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: So should we just delete the last sentence?

>> FRED WOEHL: Yeah.

Yeah.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Okay.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yep.

Steven, do you have any other recommendations?

Take off that last sentence, Dan.

>> DAN ADAMS: Okay.

Drop this right here?

>> FRED WOEHL: Yeah.

Okay.

Do you have anything else?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes, I do.

My recommendation is that the advisory board recognizes the value, supports and recommends increased research, funding, and implementation of permanent sterilization as one of many viable tools in our quest to achieve a thriving ecological balance, by achieving and maintaining appropriate management levels.

>> Make sure I got it right.

>> FRED WOEHL: Sterilization.

>> DAN ADAMS: Okay.

>> FRED WOEHL: Looks good.

>> DAN ADAMS: After implementation.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: And supports ongoing research -- funding and implementation of the main permanent sterilization --

>> DAN ADAMS: Wait, hold on.

>> FRED WOEHL: Of humane permanent sterilization.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: As one of many viable tools.

>> DAN ADAMS: Everybody look away.

One of many --

(Laughter)

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Viable tools.

In the quest to achieve a thriving ecological balance by achieving and maintaining appropriate management levels.

>> FRED WOEHL: Dang!

I would hate for you to write me a letter.

Anything else?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: No.

>> FRED WOEHL: All right.

Celeste?

Nope?

We are just bulleting down.

We will come back and take 'em one by one.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: I want to separate this out.

We have a large advocacy group, and I hope others follow that are willing to put up some money, and some resources to actually alleviate the issues.

So I would like to add something like the board encourages the BLM to collaborate with equine advocacy groups for wild horse and burro inventories.

>> DAN ADAMS: Can you help me out again?

>> FRED WOEHL: To collaborate with -- if not effective, implement the 1951 --

>> DR. TOM LENZ: I thought I said that.

>> FRED WOEHL: Anything else?

You and Sue had one, didn't you?

You better.

(off microphone comment).

>> DAN ADAMS: Your mic if you don't mind.

>> FRED WOEHL: Don't you two have one?

Hold it a minute.

I might want him to finish up.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Sue has one.

If I don't read, this I will be in trouble.

So we recommend that --

>> FRED WOEHL: The board.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Resources on getting down to an AML within the next three to five years by using removals as can be accomplished and accommodated off-range --

>> FRED WOEHL: He does pretty good.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: First -- underline first focus resources on reaching AML within the next three to five years by using the removals as can be accomplished and accommodated by off-range holdings.

>> Is there a second?

First focus or is that it?

>> FRED WOEHL: No, BLM first focus resources.

I mean when they have resources, their first focus is reaching AML.

>> DAN ADAMS: Okay.

Gotcha.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

All right Jim.

No.

No.

Go.

>> JAMES FRENCH: This is the remaining one that Dr. Perryman and I have worked out last night.

On those HMAs exceeding AML --

>> FRED WOEHLE: Hold it a minute.

AML.

>> JAMES FRENCH: I wanted to include HMAs and AMLs.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Back up.

No, back up on --

>> JAMES FRENCH: Right behind HMAs.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Yeah.

HMA and HAs.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Meeting AML, initiate emergency gathers where horse boundaries overlap priority habitats for threatened and endangered species. Threatened and endangered and sensitive species.

>> FRED WOEHLE: I don't think you need horse in there because HMA and HA are horse.

Do you think that --

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yeah, that's true.

>> You have threatened, endangered and sensitive.

>> FRED WOEHLE: I would add, threatened, sensitive, and endangered.

>> JAMES FRENCH: And initiate evaluations to establish carrying capacity.

>> DAN ADAMS: One more time.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Initiate evaluations to establish carrying capacity.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Any others?

>> JAMES FRENCH: One other that we haven't talked about, but maybe we would --

>> FRED WOEHLE: Add it.

>> JAMES FRENCH: One of our recommendations is to meet in DC.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Okay.

We will talk about that later.

>> JAMES FRENCH: I'm done then, Mr. Chairman.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Ginger?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Here we go.

Apply PZP, PZP-22, and any thoroughly vetted, safe reversible vaccines to all mares captured and returned to their ranges.

Maybe.

To all mares, captured and returned to the range.

Safe, comma.

Save is a good word too.

Safe, reversible vaccines to all mares captured and returned to their ranges.

I have some others.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Okay go ahead.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Okay.
Develop a national database to track all treated mares.
And this is a little bit similar to Ben's, I think.
Utilize volunteers -- utilize volunteers, including veterans to apply the vaccines --
>> FRED WOEHLE: We already got one of those.
>> GINGER KATHRENS: In the field.
>> FRED WOEHLE: We already got one of those.
>> GINGER KATHRENS: I don't think you do, in the field.
>> It was inclusive.
>> GINGER KATHRENS: Oh, okay.
Great.
Sorry.
>> I think it's different -- I think it's in the field.
>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yeah.
>> STEVEN YARDLEY: You only want it to be in the field?
>> GINGER KATHRENS: No, no, I don't, but including in the field then.
>> FRED WOEHLE: Well, adoption and control.
I don't remember.
I mean --
>> Ginger, do you want to change this one as Ben had it or is that acceptable.
>> GINGER KATHRENS: Each out to veterans and fertility control applications.
I think implied in that is field darting, since they are cracker jack shots.
>> FRED WOEHLE: No, they are not.
>> GINGER KATHRENS: Did you think of veterans delivering PZP by darting.
>> BEN MASTERS: That was my intention.
>> FRED WOEHLE: Okay Ginger, anything else?
Celeste?
>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Well, I don't know how this will fly but we have all said
maybe in secret, but -- I would say almost this entire board is first and foremost
supportive of nonlethal management populations and I think it would be nice to say
that.
That is the priority and the goal and the hope.
I -- I know I'm sounding like I always do, like the Pollyanna.
But the board has never said that before and the board makes recommendations for
other forms of control but I think it's important to say that -- maybe it's important to say
that the priority is nonlethal population management solutions.
>> GINGER KATHRENS: Certainly what we heard today through the comments, the
vast majority of people would support that.
So I definitely --
>> FRED WOEHLE: Depends on where you are at.
I don't think the vast majority of people support.
That there's 350 million people who --
>> GINGER KATHRENS: I said the people who spoke today.
>> FRED WOEHLE: Oh, okay.
>> JAMES FRENCH: Mr. Chairman, it's sitting here and bouncing around in my head,

I think nonlethal is exactly what we want to see happen.

I don't want to say that imply that that could never be applied in the worst case scenario.

>> FRED WOEHL: I don't think I could support -- the priority of the board is nonlethal. I mean, we are going to have to do something.

What do you think, Tom?

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Well, that's a broad statement.

I think there are a lot of situations where you have horses that are in body condition one or two or you have horses in remote areas that you are not able to gather or there are horses that are starving to death or horses that are severely injured and they need to humanely be euthanized to decrease pain and suffering.

I'm not an advocate of euthanizing healthy horses.

There are so many exceptions to that, I don't know if I can support it.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I think there's potentially a way to capture this sentiment in those talks we were having about foundations that might support -- absorb some of those costs of care and -- and pasture-type situations and have that wrapped around this idea of nonlethal forms of managing these populations ahead of other forms.

>> FRED WOEHL: That's what I mentioned in the first one and based on our talks to give them enough time to get that done.

But in they don't get it done -- there would have to be a time limit on it.

So, I mean, that's what my recommendation was, based on our talks.

In two years if they don't have programs in place, then there's no other option that we have.

My humble opinion.

But if you want to leave it in there and have the board vote on it, that's fine.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Well, maybe we don't -- maybe we don't have the quite right formulation of this idea.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Well, maybe prioritize nonlethal, you know?

So that anything that's lethal would not be the first option.

Whatever you think.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I think it's important here to recognize that the BLM has never really even used to this point -- to any major extent --

>> FRED WOEHL: They haven't done it at all.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: They haven't done it at all.

I think that's important to recognize.

And Celeste, honestly, I'm sure we would have varied opinions on this subject, but I think our intent on both sides is pure.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

Let's go back up to the top.

>> DAN ADAMS: Okay.

I want to do a quick time check with everybody.

So it is 4:56.

>> FRED WOEHL: But we go to 5:15.

>> DAN ADAMS: We go to quarter after and then we have the hard stop.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, we have to stop the air.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Just the two points of clarification, the one where we call it ecosanctuaries they call it public off range facilities.

>> FRED WOEHL: Up, up, up.

That's where they are.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Public off-range pastures.

And then the second clarification, off range.

>> FRED WOEHL: Off range.

We're not in church.

So we have can't take up an offering.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: The second one, regarding option one where it says recommendation, in reviewing the report to Congress, those aren't recommendations.

They are only options.

We did not -- the BLM did not make a recommendation.

They are options.

>> This one here?

>> FRED WOEHL: Yep.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: No, no, the one where it says page 13.

>> Oh, okay.

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: So that needs to be rewarded because they are not recommendations.

>> FRED WOEHL: Just back up and say the board accepts option one to the report to Congress.

>> Yeah, right.

>> FRED WOEHL: Option one from the report to Congress.

As the preferred path.

Yep.

To reach AML.

Okay.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: When I made that, could I put also in the required changes to enact that?

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

And -- of the board accepts option one and the required changes to the regulations.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: In the act -- back up.

And.

A-n-d.

And the act.

Capital A.

Okay, board accepts -- back it up so I can read it.

Board accepts option one and the -- and the required changes -- and the required changes to the regulation and the act from the report to Congress as a preferred path forward to reach AML.

(Off microphone comment).

>> FRED WOEHL: Are you changing how it's worded or --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I will just quickly say that I would recommend that we don't

vote on these options at all, because I think there's a combination of these options that is potentially useful but we do not have time to go over that and I do not think any of the options as presented are quite there, but they are almost there.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

All right.

Go back up to the top.

Okay.

Take that out.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Wait.

Why we are taking that out?

I thought we were going to vote on that.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yep.

No need to have it there.

Take it out.

No -- okay.

All right.

Recommendation number one, we are going to go through these pretty quick.

Okay?

>> Do you want me to number these?

>> FRED WOEHL: Number one, encourage BLM to gather horses and HMAs that are over AML that are reliant upon supplemental water.

One HMA is at AML, stop hauling water in extreme circumstances.

Jim, aye or nay?

Ginger, I'm sorry.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Aye.

>> JIM KURTH: Aye.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Aye.

>> FRED WOEHL: Aye.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yes.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Aye:

>> BEN MASTERS: Aye!

>> FRED WOEHL: Number two.

>> KRISTIN BAIL: Are you going to record the vote?

>> I can do that behind each one.

>> FRED WOEHL: We have one right here.

Barry, are you there?

Sue, are you on the line?

No, it's all right.

It's all right.

Okay.

Number two, continue to support an increased use of programs like the Mustang Heritage Foundation trainer incentive program to place horses and burros in good homes.

I would like to increase use.

Increase funding and use.

Add the word funding.

Right there.

And use.

Okay.

Anybody else have any comments about that?

Okay.

Ben, I will start with you.

>> BEN MASTERS: Aye.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Aye.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Aye.

>> FRED WOEHL: Aye.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Yeah.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yep.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yep.

>> FRED WOEHL: Number three, encourage volunteer and partnership opportunities for fertility control and adoptions including inmate training programs, 4-H and youth programs, local fertility control action groups, public off-range pastures and the Mustang Heritage Foundation.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I have think it's advocacy groups.

>> There you go.

>> FRED WOEHL: I don't think we need to name the Mustang Heritage Foundation.

I would recommend that we say organizations like the Mustang Heritage Foundation.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Do we have to even include them on it or could it be --

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, it is a model.

Organizations like -- l-i-k-e.

Mustang Heritage Foundations.

What do you think about that, Ben?

Are you okay with that?

>> BEN MASTERS: Aye.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Aye.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Aye.

>> FRED WOEHL: Aye.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Yes.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yes.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: It's going pretty good.

Number four, support the existing marketing research BLM has completed and support implemental phases and items from the marketing report.

That didn't -- let me read it again.

Support the existing marketing research -- we probably need to name that report, from Great Lakes --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Great Lakes.

>> FRED WOEHL: The existing Great Lakes research.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Great Lakes marketing.

>> FRED WOEHL: Go back up after existing, at Great Lakes Marketing -- marketing

research report submitted to BLM.

And take out has completed.

Take out completed and support implemental -- implementation.

Back up.

Implement.

Implement.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: No, no, no.

Let me speak.

>> FRED WOEHL: Shoot Luke, you are loaded.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Listen to me.

To BLM and support -- oh, my God, how did this get so messed up?

And support implementation --

>> GINGER KATHRENS: And implement.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Well, they are called something.

Ollie, do you know what this is off the top of your head?

Support and implement list of recommendations.

Take out phases.

>> FRED WOEHL: The list of --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Support and implement list of recommendations -- I'm talking so that he doesn't get confuses.

>> FRED WOEHL: There you go right there.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Feasible recommendations of -- there you go.

Thanks, Fred.

>> FRED WOEHL: Ginger.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yes, sir?

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yes.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes.

>> BEN MASTERS: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: Number five, reach out to military and veteran organizations with help for adoption and volunteer fertility control applications.

Help with what type of adoptions?

Adoption events or what?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Well --

>> All the above.

>> FRED WOEHL: Ben aye or nay.

>> BEN MASTERS: Yes.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Yes.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yes.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: Number six, take out that page 13 from report.

Good.

Board accepts option one and the required changes to the regulation and the act from the report to Congress as a preferred path forward to reach AML.

Okay.

We got about five minutes.

We got to go fast.

Ben?

I will come back to you.

Steven?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: No.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Yes.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yes.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: No.

>> BEN MASTERS: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

The vote is 4-2.

The motion carries.

Or the recommendation carries.

Okay.

Number seven, the advisory board recognizes the value of and supports ongoing research and funding of humane permanent sterilization as one of the viable tools in our quest to achieve a thriving ecological balance by achieving and maintaining AML. Now, to clarify this, we are talking about gelding and spaying, correct?

>> Yes.

>> And IUDs.

>> FRED WOEHL: Right.

Okay.

>> Should I put that here in parens?

>> FRED WOEHL: No.

No.

No.

No.

>> Okay.

>> FRED WOEHL: In other words, we are as the phrase that we have been using increasing tools in the tool box.

Ginger?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: No.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: No.

Can I say a quick thing just for the record parameters developed over the years by

wildlife fertility control researchers and scientists and applicators it makes me nervous and it doesn't fit in the parameters.

I like the general idea but I have got to say no.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

Steven?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes.

>> BEN MASTERS: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: The vote is 5-2.

Passes, carries.

Number eight, the board encourages the BLM to collaborate with interested equine advocacy groups to decrease current unadoptable horse and burro inventories.

This is one submitted by Tom.

Ben, starting with you?

>> JAMES FRENCH: Can I ask a quick question?

To increase the inventory?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Decrease.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Oh, to decrease.

All right.

Sorry.

>> BEN MASTERS: Yes.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Yes.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yes.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: The motion carries 7-0.

Number nine, we recommend that BLM first focus resources on reeving AML in three to five years by utilizing removals as can be accomplished and accommodated by off range holding.

Ginger?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Well, I don't know how to vote on this.

Reaching AML in three to five years --

>> FRED WOEHL: We haven't got much time for comments.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Okay.

Then I have to vote no.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: No.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: No for the same reason as Ginger.

We are almost there but no.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: No.

>> BEN MASTERS: I don't think it's realistic.

So can I not vote?

>> FRED WOEHL: You are going abstain?

>> BEN MASTERS: I abstain.

>> FRED WOEHL: All right.

The motion carries 3-2 or 4-2.

And with one abstaining.

On the HMAs and HAs that exceed AMLs that overlap the -- initiate the evaluations to establish carrying capacity.

I'm going to start with Celeste on this one.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I'm going to say yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: I'm going to say yes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Yes.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yes.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yes.

>> BEN MASTERS: Yes.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: The motion carries.

Okay.

Number 11.

Apply PZP, PZP-22 and any safe reversible vaccines to all mares captured and return to the range.

>> Can I make a comment on this?

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes, if brief.

>> Well, in light of 12 where you want to establish a national database I would like to see us microchip those horses before we return them to the range.

Is that acceptable?

>> And we are doing, that yeah.

We can do that.

>> FRED WOEHL: But now here's the thing that I want to say about that too is one of our other recommendations at Carey, we recommended using spay.

So how can we microchip --

>> I'm talking about microchip.

>> FRED WOEHL: We are talking about this right here.

All mares captured.

No, no, no, no, no.

We already --

>> JAMES FRENCH: We would have to delete "all."

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I think it's important here to have fertility vaccines probably.

Because are this says reversible vaccines.

So you need to have fertility in there.

>> FRED WOEHL: What he's saying after reversible, add fertility.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Control.

We don't want them to get fertility vaccines.

Fertility control.

Reversible fertility control.

>> FRED WOEHL: I love the way we have all ever these chairs.

Fertility control vaccine.

Add vaccine.

I'm going to start this one and I will have to say no:

>> JAMES FRENCH: The word "all" has to stay in there, flight.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: I can vote for it if all is out, but if it's not, no.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: I think it could be taken out.

>> FRED WOEHL: The trouble I have with this one here is that we have already voted to use spay and we are already doing this.

If you want to go back up and -- or say along with or whatever add -- you know, use PZP and spaying or whatever to mares captured, something like that.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I have a good one.

How about implement safe reversible fertility control vaccine, as part -- as at least as part of the fertility control management of mares captured and returned to the range. So that doesn't preclude one thing or another, but it makes it important that this be implemented alongside gathers.

>> FRED WOEHL: That's good.

All right.

>> I would drop this part here then?

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Aye.

>> FRED WOEHL: I can live with that.

I vote yes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Yes.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yes.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yep.

>> BEN MASTERS: Yes.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Just a point of clarification before I vote.

If we have mares that have permanent fertility control, and they are returned to the range, we don't need to give them fertility control vaccines.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: That's correct.

(Off microphone comment).

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I will vote yes.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: All right, develop a national database to track all treated mares.

Bruce, we are doing it now?

Aren't we microchipping them?

Ollie?

Microchipping?

>> That's not what I meant by the database.

>> We have a database?

>> I would clarify what you mean by this.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: I will.

>> But you have to have a permanent identification which is the microchips.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: That's a good thing.

But the database would be allowing the people to identify the mares without capture.

So they would be doing this by all kinds of techniques, photographic techniques and developing a database.

>> FRED WOEHL: Oh, no.

Okay.

I mean, the Bureau of Land Management has their microchip database so they can keep up with the horses.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Right, right.

But this is to track them when they are in the field.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: BLM does have an outdated database.

There is a lot of interest behind updating that database, but I -- it's been very slow and clunky to get going.

So I think encouragement from the board to continue on that track is important.

>> So should it say something about update existing national database or --

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yeah, developing.

Yeah.

That's good.

>> FRED WOEHL: Develop and maintain?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: And make available to all field offices.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Well, whoever is in charge of that herd volunteer efforts should be included, not just Bureau of Land Management.

To take the load off of BLM in that regard.

>> FRED WOEHL: Now, here again we have to realize the fact that we are flying at 30,000 feet and we cannot dictate to the individual field offices and ten state offices. We can't -- but -- but we can update and make available -- no, no, don't change anything yet.

So what we are doing to the national BLM which is Bruce is to update and make available to all BLM field offices the existing national database to track all treated mares.

That's fine.

Because we are not making any recommendations to the field offices.

>> Do you want to drop that part?

>> FRED WOEHL: No.

No.

No, it's good.

Okay.

Jim?

(Inaudible).

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yes.

>> BEN MASTERS: (Inaudible).

>> BRIAN STEED: Steven.

No.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: I will vote yes.

Go ahead now.

Here's your chance.

Type this in as she reads it.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Strike the sentence number 13, prioritize nonlethal management options for population control purposes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: So define prioritize for me.

>> FRED WOEHL: If I may put words in your mouth, you are saying that's not -- nonlethal management would be first option.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Correct.

>> FRED WOEHL: And if that don't work, all other methods apply.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: It's getting a little tricky.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: I think I would be comfortable with setting the priority -- the word prioritize as the first choice for nonlethal management options but I don't want to remove all of the -- all of the tools, because it --

>> FRED WOEHL: I agree.

I agree.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: We are at a point where we don't have much choice --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: So prioritize nonlethal, blah, blah, blah, it does not preclude --

>> FRED WOEHL: I have no problem -- I have no problem personally making nonlethal management a priority, but if that don't work, we got to --

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I think we should wait on this and figure out as a board when we have more time to discuss it.

>> FRED WOEHL: That's up to Celeste, if she wants to pull it off, we can.

But if you don't, we can vote on it.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I don't know.

>> FRED WOEHL: I mean, I have no problem with that right there, voting yes, if that's the -- I mean prioritize --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yeah.

I think if we could just vote yes on that or if we could just vote on, that it shows that we are prioritizing that.

I don't think we necessarily need to list that we are precluding other things just showing as a board this is what we would want and prefer that's it.

>> BEN MASTERS: I think it's overly simplistic.

My priority as the wildlife management chair is the wildlife and the habitat that that wildlife depends on.

So that is my number one priority.

And in order to achieve that priority, if lethal management options are necessary, due to budget constraints, then I'm willing to do that because my priority is wildlife and wildlife habitat.

There's so many -- like, I just have issues with this.

Like, would I prioritize nonlethal management?

Yes, I would.

But I also understand that the BLM might not get a \$500 million a year budget next year, which is going to be what it takes to have nonlethal management there.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Just as a clarification, lethal management is not free.

>> BEN MASTERS: Okay.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: My argument would be, okay, by prioritizing nonlethal management, is that saying that that has a priority over rangeland health and rangeland management?

And --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: No.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: But it could be interpreted that way.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: No.

We are still managing the horses for all the other priorities that we have listed.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, let me say this.

Congress the last several years has made this statement in the appropriation bill, appropriations hearing shall not be available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted wild horse and burro for the sale of wild horse and burro that would result in their destruction or production into commercial products.

There's a rider since 2010, I think.

So, I mean, what we are saying here is something that is already being done.

So I honestly -- with this, I don't see any need for this.

So what I'm asking, Bruce, right now, this is what you do anyway, isn't it?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

>> Mr. Chairman?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Thank you for that explanation, Bruce.

>> FRED WOEHL: He really poured it on.

>> You know this goes back to a conversation I had with Celeste this morning.

I don't think this is a statement for Congress or for the Bureau of Land Management as much as it's a statement of where we sit with regard to the question of euthanizing horses.

I think Celeste's comment this morning have to do with assuring any of those -- any of those NGOs that may have an interest in partnering as we are trying to build this coalition to manage that this is -- this is -- in a perfect world, with that question at hand, not a question of wildlife management or habitat or wildlife itself, a question of lethal versus nonlethal management for the horses themselves.

Here I am putting words in your mouth, but that's how I understood it when we talked about it.

In a perfect world, we are not interested in the lethal option either, but we are also not -- I don't think we are -- I think -- I don't think we are willing to walk away from it either if that's the last resort.

We.

Have I think from the standpoint of making a statement that we have a nonlethal management priority, given the two choices, that -- that I'm okay with that statement for that reason.

But I just -- I will just state for the record that that is -- you know, that we still need to retain all of the tools in the tool box.

>> FRED WOEHL: Any other comment?

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Well, my only concern -- I'm happy to hear from Bruce that that's

what they already do but I don't want someone to interpret in an isolated situation where there's some herd isolated off in the middle of nowhere, where you can't access them that are over populated that this option is not utilized, right?

I don't want -- it could be interpreted that way.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, how with b could we say that BLM prioritize --

>> Gentlemen, can you make sure that you are speaking into your microphones.

>> FRED WOEHL: Can you say that BLM prioritizes and then -- you see, then that would -- well, if we add something -- the decision is up to the Bureau of Land Management?

Or --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Now wordsmith idea.

We as a board prefer nonlethal management for population control purposes whenever possible.

>> FRED WOEHL: That's better, I agree.

We as the board -- so we are not making a recommendation.

We are making a statement.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Correct.

Correct.

Which can help us to build some of the -- a lot of the support we are going to need to go forward with collaborative working groups.

>> FRED WOEHL: Where possible.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: You don't need to write that part.

>> FRED WOEHL: Yes, he does.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: No, I don't want it on there.

>> FRED WOEHL: When possible.

(Off microphone comment)

>> GINGER KATHRENS: And we just put a period after population control.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: We could.

>> FRED WOEHL: We as the board prefer nonlethal management options for population control purposes when possible.

(Off microphone comment).

>> Your microphone, Jim.

>> FRED WOEHL: Are we still on air?

Good.

>> JAMES FRENCH: I don't want to give the impression that euthanasia by gunshot is not acceptable form of euthanasia.

>> FRED WOEHL: I agree with that.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Because the American veterinary medical association, supports the use of gunshot.

>> FRED WOEHL: But let me ask you this, Tom.

Should that be the first option?

>> DR. TOM LENZ: I don't want it to be the first option.

I don't want to give the impression that that's a bad thing.

>> FRED WOEHL: No, no, no, no.

And I think that when possible -- I mean, I don't want to go out there and just start

euthanizing horses and I agree where possible, we prefer nonlethal management. Where possible.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I would say too, though, it's kind of inherent to me, that nonlethal management is normally the preferred method that I don't -- I don't feel comfortable and I don't feel like I want to vote in favor of it, simply because normally that is -- but there are exceptions and I don't want --

>> FRED WOEHL: But now here -- let me explain something to you and this is what I'm picking up on this.

And we're going to have to express some trust in this, okay?

Celeste is trying to work with other advocacy groups to come up with an approach that will bind us together where we can work together and we can have a team that moves forward and she's ask for this so she can show these other groups that this is the preferred management if we put the preferred management is to shoot every horse, then she will have trouble -- am I putting words in your mouth?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: No, this is the goodwill.

This is the ambassadorship.

It's a statement that I have heard almost all of you say, of course we prefer nonlethal management options.

And I think it's really nice to state that publicly.

That's all.

It doesn't take other options off table.

>> Mr. Chairman, if I could say to your point, your question, if you look at the first part of that statement, the first thing we say, we as a board and basically what we are stating here is that we -- the consensus of this board personally feels that based on what we know about this program, prefer nonlethal management as an option when possible and I -- I think I have heard that also, that none of us would prefer or shoot the lethal option if -- if there was another option out there.

So I think basically all we are stating for the record, what we all said all along.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: But there are some people on the board who I spoke with, who do believe that it's a lot less devastating, emotionally, to a horse to on the range euthanasia, than to be gathered up and knotted up.

And so --

>> BEN MASTERS: Can we have it because that wording has my yes, undoubtedly, 100%.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Celeste, are you okay with this?

Because I'm going to have to vote no on it.

If the idea is that we are trying to be inclusive and have advocacy groups and welfare groups, then I -- you know, I think we --

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: What is the win possible is what --

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Well, yeah.

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, that just makes sense.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I think it's straightforward.

>> FRED WOEHL: That just --

>> GINGER KATHRENS: That means that --

>> FRED WOEHL: Where possible -- listen where possible, my wife makes me wash

the dishes after supper.

She don't make me wash them every night because I leave early, but where possible, she makes me wash them.

And so where possible, there be some places where nonlethal management is not possible.

So --

>> JAMES FRENCH: I think I would propose that we on this with the -- (Off microphone comment).

>> FRED WOEHL: All right.

Ben.

>> BEN MASTERS: Yes.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: No for the time being.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: Yes.

>> FRED WOEHL: I'm voting yes.

>> DR. TOM LENZ: No.

>> JAMES FRENCH: Yes.

>> GINGER KATHRENS: No.

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: It didn't go but I think this is an important -- I'm not trying to re-up it at all, I just want to say these are good -- these discussions are good for the record.

>> FRED WOEHL: There's seven of us here so I got six votes.

Ben voted yes, you voted no.

You voted yes.

I voted yes.

You voted no.

You voted yes.

You voted no.

The yeses carry it, 4-3.

>> BEN MASTERS: Now just saying that wording we as the board, that that be revised to four out of three members of the board?

>> FRED WOEHL: Nope, nope, nope, nope, it's we as the board.

When the board votes, that's how it is.

>> BEN MASTERS: Okay.

>> FRED WOEHL: That's just like Congress and the Senate when they vote, that's how it is.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Even though it passed, I think we should revisit it in another board meeting.

>> JAMES FRENCH: One of the conversations that Celeste and I had ago, this is part of the record right now.

This conversation we just had right here is part of the record right now.

And that was her intent is to get this out here, because I think it was a good conversation to have and I think -- I think we pretty much stated our position left to right on this thing and I think that --

>> FRED WOEHL: Well, and, again, honestly, with the BLM people I know, this is what they do anyway.

I don't know any of them that go out there and start shooting horses.
I mean, and I don't know any of them that if there's a way to help a horse without putting it down, that they would.

I think what this does, it allows us to be a little bit more proactive in my humble opinion.

We will go ahead and talk real quick.

Do we have any other comments?

13.

Did you hear that, Bruce?

13 recommendations.

We should have went 14.

>> Baker's dozen.

>> I have been sitting here formulating what the responses will be.

>> Can we do a process check-in, if that's okay.

So with the IT group do we -- have we lost our closed captioning?

Are we still streaming or -- I'm sorry, our super awesome team of wonders.

>> FRED WOEHLE: No, you.

We're still on the air.

(Off microphone comments)

>> FRED WOEHLE: Well, if -- I mean, I -- I apologize for that, but this meeting -- we need to finish up our meeting, and so -- all right.

Let's talk as a board about making a recommendation to Bruce while he's thinking about stuff, but where we want our next meeting.

I think we pretty much talked about this at length the other night and we all chose DC?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Yes.

(Laughter)

>> FRED WOEHLE: All right.

So for the record, the board unanimously recommends Washington, D.C., for our next board meeting, hopefully in April.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: No, late March.

>> Is that calving season or --

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: We're off the board in open.

We would like it to be before we go off the board.

I -- I think Ginger would too.

That being said, early March --

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Oh, I don't know.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: Well, that's our bread and butter.

>> All right.

You are proposing Washington before the end of March?

Because of three members expire March 30th?

>> FRED WOEHLE: Okay.

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: That's my birthday.

>> Okay.

So location, we will -- we will get back with you on the location.

We will weigh that in, and look at the benefits of Washington and -- and potential other

places as well.

>> FRED WOEHL: Okay.

Fair enough.

We would appreciate that.

All right.

Ben?

Final comments?

>> BEN MASTERS: Just --

>> You also had approval of meeting minutes.

Does that have to happen before you adjourn?

>> FRED WOEHL: Oh, shoot!

I forgot all about those.

I will entertain a motion to approve our executive summary and minutes that were done from the last meeting in Grand Junction.

Do I have anybody to make that motion?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: So move.

>> Second.

>> FRED WOEHL: Moved and seconded.

All in favor, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Phew!

Did I forget anything else that?

>> Not that I can remember.

>> BEN MASTERS: Final comment, if we don't meet in March and this is our last advisory board meeting, I enjoyed working with all of you.

It's been an honor to be on this board.

I have learned a lot about the federal government and land management and how easy it is to criticize a program, and how hard it is to get inside of it and actually try to fix it.

And it hasn't been ease, but I'm so grateful for the opportunity to sit on this board and thank you all for the knowledge and working with me.

>> FRED WOEHL: Thank you, Ben.

Steven?

>> STEVEN YARDLEY: I would echo what Ben has said.

I enjoyed serving on this board and getting to know the various people, their expertise, their willingness and their desire and their passion for the program, for the horses, for the range, for the ecosystem that we are dealing with here.

And a desire to make a difference, and a step in the right direction.

I have learned a lot.

I would agree wholeheartedly with Ben.

It's a lot easier to say what needs to be done than to make all the changes necessary to enact it, and I appreciate those who are striving in the right direction to make those necessary changes.

I do think there is a sense of urgency with the wild horse program that we haven't seen in the past because we have excess horses and there's a lot of ecological damage that

is occur, not -- and it's not their fault.

It's our fault as people, because of our mismanagement and our choices to kick it down the road.

They are just doing what God intended them to do.

Grow and reproduce.

And so I hope that we can make some changes in the future for the benefit of the horses and for the benefit of the range that them along with so many other species rely on upon for their homes.

Thanks.

>> FRED WOEHL: Celeste?

>> CELESTE CARLISLE: I just have a deep amount of respect for every single one of you sitting up here and for every BLM staff member that we have interacted with.

And also the people who stood up and spoke today.

What you say does not go on deaf ears even though I know oftentimes it seems that it does.

But your comments are taken to heart and then, you know, weighed against a lot of different things, but it really does matter.

And I'm really honored to sit here even though it's hard!

>> FRED WOEHL: Tom?

>> DR. TOM LENZ: Well, this is my first board meeting.

I'm pleasantly surprised because I had a lot of folks warn me that I would be frustrated an upset by the end of it, and I'm not all.

So I'm really happy with the collaboration, discussion, commitment, of everybody and I thank everybody out there that's presented their opinion and we certainly consider those.

So I want to thank you all for a good meeting.

>> FRED WOEHL: Thank you, Tom.

Jim?

>> JAMES FRENCH: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

I echo everything I heard here.

I have to say I got the same admonition from my colleagues when I was selected for this board, and told me that I was going to be pulling my hair out.

And I'm pleasantly surprised.

I think they looked at me like I had two heads when I came back after my first meeting and I told them, I don't agree with you.

That this is worth doing.

It's hard and it's difficult, but everything that means something in life is.

And -- and I think it is -- I want to just assure the folks that are still in the room and that are streaming with us right now, is that there's a group of people up here that are -- are -- volunteered to do this job, that are very committed to doing the right thing.

And I'm honored to be a part of that.

>> FRED WOEHL: Thank you, Jim.

Ginger?

>> GINGER KATHRENS: Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I have been around for a long time on that side of the advisory boards

and I will have to say that many times during meetings, there was not the civility and respect for each other that I think this board has.

And I commend you all.

I'm not only honored to serve.

I was very surprised to be selected to serve and I very much appreciate it.

Thank you.

>> FRED WOEHL: Thank you Ginger.

>> Just in case the other two are on the phone still?

>> FRED WOEHL: Barry?

Barry?

Sue?

They are not on the phone.

(Laughter)

It's been a -- whenever you come -- I mean this is starting in my fifth year of doing this.

I have been the chair for the last four.

And it's always interesting to get new board members because some of them come in with a big idea of how they are going to change the world and then some of them come in like Ben that come up to me and said, buddy, we are going to work good to go, let's go have a beer.

And so that was really good, you know?

And what I will tell about you Ben is don't ever sing with him, because he screams.

(Laughter)

Anyway.

It's been an interesting thing and I have really enjoyed being here.

It is an honor to serve as a chair of this.

It's kind of like herding cats.

It honestly, is but it's a -- it's a lot of fun.

I'm really appreciative of Bureau of Land Management and the ones that put this on.

Our sound system, our new lasting meant ore over here.

>> Just happy to be here.

>> Who by the way is getting a new knee tomorrow.

>> FRED WOEHL: Oh, really?

Wow!

>> This made me not think about it.

>> FRED WOEHL: Oh, that's good.

That's good.

That's good.

I really appreciate the young lady setting next to me.

She is very patient about things.

She's very nice.

She is just a really -- and we are honored and privileged.

I wish every person in her place was as nice as she was when I worked, because it would have -- I would probably still be working.

I couldn't serve on the board, but I will hand the microphone over to her.

But before I do, way I want to give my pal Bruce.

He allowed this.

13 recommendations is pretty good.

We had a lot of progress.

They are good preparation recommendation.

So I'm proud of that.

So without further ado, I will send it over to my good friend, Kristin Bail.

>> KRISTIN BAIL: I want to thank you all again.

Many traveled but you have definitely spent a lot of time in these last few days working -- speaking with us, listening, helping us wrestle through quite a number of tough issues, and I thank you for that and for those folks who have listened on the Livestream, and I'm even more grateful for those who have -- are reaching out a hand and say, hey, we want to help.

We want to do more.

We are going to look forward to our next meeting.

Please call Bruce and set that up next week because we want to get started on those conversations.

But there's some ideas I'm personally really excited about and let's -- let's keep the momentum going because this is some really good stuff.

So I know I'm bringing up the tail end, and I want to get you all either on the road on to family, friends or a beverage of your choice.

So thank you again.

Great meeting and we will continue the conversation.

Thanks.

>> FRED WOEHLE: Thank you very much.

All minds clear.

Would you like to say something brief?

>> BRUCE RITTENHOUSE: I'm good.

>> FRED WOEHLE: We appreciate everybody.

This meeting is adjourned.

(end of meeting)