

Appendix 3
Summary of Public Comments

Table 1: Scoping Comments			
No		Scoping Comment	BLM Response
1	Rock Springs Grazing Assoc	This plan violates every principle of high elevation range management by overstocking and year round grazing....substantial investment will be required to reclaim the damage to productive range and pasture.	Please see page 18 of the EA on stocking rates and rotational grazing.
2	Wyoming Advocates for Animals, Jeannine Stallings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I see no plans for birth control. 2. No Cattle, None, Not Ever – Never 3. Will hunting on the ranch be allowed? 4. Affect on Wildlife? 5. Cultural or historic site protection, tourism plan? 6. What provisions made to horses from wondering off? 7. Is there a formal adoption program planned? How does BLM verify animal cruelty violations? 8. Horses must never, ever, never be sent to slaughter. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please see 10 page Of the EA, Proposed Action. Only excess wild horse geldings from Wyoming HMAs will reside on the proposed ecosanctuary. 2. This is private property it is up to the land owner if they return to cattle ranching after the agreement award is terminated. 3. This is private land the land owner will determine if hunting will be allowed. 4. Please see page 28 of the EA on wildlife. 5. Please see page 27 of the EA on cultural resources. 6. Please see page 12 of EA on fencing requirements specific to the Request For Application (RFA). 7. Horses that will reside on the proposed ecosanctuary will be older geldings that are not available for adoption. There may be in the future a way to virtually adopt and support their stay at the ranch. 8. Outside the scope of the EA.
3	Dr. Michael Smith	<p>Supports the proposal provided the rancher get paid adequately.</p> <p>What will be the degree of veterinary care?</p> <p>How will derelict horses be handled?</p> <p>Are horses going to be replenished as older ones die?</p>	Please see the RFA in Appendix 1 of the EA for specifics.
4	Bill Laycock	The term “ecosanctuary” is a misnomer, these horses are not native and are not “wild”, they are simply feral animals. Tax payer money should be spent on providing food for starving children.	Outside the scope of the EA.
5	Noel Wood, Riverton WY	<p>Why should the tax payers be out money and funds to buy private property for a BLM containment to keep horses the rest of their life?</p> <p>It’s obvious this program (proposal) is not self-supporting and a drain on the American tax</p>	Outside the scope of the EA.

Appendix 3
Summary of Public Comments

Table 1: Scoping Comments			
No		Scoping Comment	BLM Response
		payer. When horse are rounded up and contained they are no longer 'wild'.	
6	Chuck Reed, Rawlins WY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantify the age/sex ratio of horses to be included 2. The criteria by which increase from 250 to 400 needs to be explained. 3. What would the supplemental feeding practices be, if any. 4. Explain the number of pastures and proposed season of use. 5. Animal health practices 6. Required facilities, perimeter fencing handling practices, capture and removal, euthanasia policy and procedure. 7. Detailed description of Ecotourism practices to be employed. 8. Degree & type of oversight provided. <p>Regarding Impacts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impacts to soil, veg & riparian resources 2. Use patterns of horses vs cattle as a change agent 3. Affect on wildlife of large numbers of horses. 4. Impacts on wildness of horses. How will this be measured. 5. Impact of this management tool on BLM (Wyoming) wide achievement of Wild Horse Program goals. <p>A. The proposal could provide opportunities to conduct behavioral studies..close proximity of UW could provide an opportunity to maximize both the research potential and public exposure.</p>	
7	Joe Remick, Encampment, WY	Wild Horses, if not sold, should go to slaughter.	Outside the scope of the EA.
8	Alice Hindman, Rock Springs, WY	Concerned about the too many round ups eliminating the 'wild horse'. We must look at the future generations.	Outside the scope of the EA.
9	Louie Claytor,	Horse slaughter plant would make more sense. Squandering tax payers	Outside the scope of the EA.

Appendix 3
Summary of Public Comments

Table 1: Scoping Comments			
No		Scoping Comment	BLM Response
	Jefferey City, WY	money for feral horses.	
10	Blaine Thompson Flying Horseshoe Ranch, LLC (neighbor)	Concerned about ability to keep horses and burros on his side of the fence. Concerned about the maintenance of fences.	Please see page 12 of EA on fencing requirements specific to the RFA. Please see page 12 of EA on fencing requirements specific to the RFA.
11	Arthur Sigel Hecht Creek Ranch (neighbor)	1.Adequacy of existing boundary fences. Existing fences not designed for animal control during periods of winter snow drifting. 2.Elk bring down a lot of fence. How will be compensated in the event of a 'breakout'. `3. What assurance do we have that the wild horses will not bring any new diseases into our valley? What will they be vaccinated for? Will they be inspected regularly by local vet? Will our animals exposure to irrigated water passing through Deerwood Ranch spread disease? 4. What assurance do we (neighbors) have number will not exceed 400 horses? Will animals be neutered?	1.Fences See Appendix 1 RFA pg 10 2. Big Game See EA pg 30 and 35 3. See Appendix 1 RFA pg 10 Disease 4. See Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis, pg 18 of EA
12	Blue Sky Sage horseback Adventures,B ig Piney, WY	Protesting against the proposal. Proposal is cloaking the "warehousing" for animal in feel-good language that is disingenuous and misleading. Proposal takes the very essence of the existence and symbolism as an icon of freedom, and castrates it. Real issue is MONEY. Proposal will take away opportunity of commerce from their business-they have a BLM Special Use Permit to outfit (wild horse viewing) on BLM for which they pay to use yet we are providing Deerwood Ranch w/financial support. Their "Mustang Horse Adventures" allow people to see horse <i>in the wild</i> running wild & free in our state. This has made up 1/3 of their total sales & income. Given so many roundups there are hardly any wild	Outside the scope of the EA.

Appendix 3
Summary of Public Comments

Table 1: Scoping Comments			
No		Scoping Comment	BLM Response
		horses left to show people; the few left are very spooky and elusive. They have had to stop marketing this activity in good conscience because the wild horses are just not there anymore. Now the BLM intends to provide financial support to Deerwood when they have had to spend their own money to offer truly wild horse viewing. What this program does is set up a “canned” wild horse experience this is so contrary to Wyoming’s Travel & Tourism’s “Forever West” marketing campaign is “ROAM FREE”. Last year a gather helicopter swooped their group and chased juvenile horses. Specific indignation is with the fact that the BLM is supplying on courted business w/a ready-made opportunity and helping to fund it.	
13	Marie-Janik Bubreuil, Canada	Against proposal; Wild horses are not supposed to be fenced in; this is not living in the natural environment; once fenced in they become feral horses; not interested in viewing horses behind fences;	
14	Ed (Shorty) Ballard, Encampment, WY	Does not think 10 acres/horse will work – another tax payer funded scheme.	See Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis, pg 18 of EA
15	Bettye Dominick, Cody, WY	1. BLM’s extra revenue could be better spent on training personnel in the bait trapping situation, administering of PZP, studying the family groups in different HMA’s to utilize man power instead of helicopters for a more scientific program when removal needed. 2. Have livestock removed from HMA’s when they become over grazers and water hogs...Livestock industry has too much control over the BLM. The wild horses were put on these selected management areas and have no other place to go;...however livestock are not tied to these areas and can be moved at any given time and should be according to land management and	<p>1. Outside the scope of the EA.</p> <p>2. Outside the scope of the EA</p>

Appendix 3
Summary of Public Comments

Table 1: Scoping Comments			
No		Scoping Comment	BLM Response
		<p>not the whims of the livestock owners.</p> <p>3. These new areas to store BLM horses is not similar enough to where the horses originated.</p> <p>4. Notification of the public comment period too short.</p> <p>5. How will this proposal save tax payers money?</p> <p>6. Why this place was picked over 30 others?</p> <p>7. The BLM has plenty of BLM land for the horses – designate more as HMA (?)</p> <p>8. Why would tourist want to go to a ranch to watch horses eat? They want to see how the family groups interact amongst themselves and w/each other.</p>	<p>3. See EA pg 27 and 34</p> <p>4. Notification period set by National Environmental Policy Act Sec. 101 [42 USC § 4331]</p> <p>5. Outside the scope of the EA</p> <p>6.</p> <p>7. Outside the scope of the EA</p> <p>8. Outside the scope of the EA</p>
16	Vermillion Ranch Ltd Partnership, Rock Springs WY	<p>Objects to the concept the sanctuaries are a remedy; funding these is moving appropriated funds from mandatory activities to discretionary funding and is improper; rates of reproduction; sustainability –how does this reduce the cost of keeping horses in corrals vs in a “sanctuary”; how will trespass be handled, i.e. trespass onto neighbors? Compensation?</p>	<p>Outside the scope of the EA.</p>
17	Sweetwater County Conservation District	<p>DITTO (exact same comments as above-Vermillion Ranch)</p>	<p>Outside the scope of the EA.</p>
18	State Farm Bureau Federation	<p>Concerned about impacts on neighboring landowners: disease, liability if disease discovered, containment, stocking level/carrying capacity – 4 horses/10 acres untenable; how dead horses will be disposed of – will draw predators; disclose effects on big game especially elk & pronghorn-related to stocking rate; cost of operating the</p>	<p>See Appendix 1 RFA pg 10 Disease</p> <p>See Appendix 1 RFA pg 10 Fences</p> <p>See EA Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Detailed Analysis Pg 18</p> <p>See EA pg 30 and 35</p>

Appendix 3
Summary of Public Comments

Table 1: Scoping Comments			
No		Scoping Comment	BLM Response
		sanctuary.	
19	Wyoming Game & Fish	Perimeter fencing – concerned about barriers to wildlife; prefer BLM use a 3-strand laydown fence	See EA pgs 10 & 14
19	Jim Clay T- K Ranch (neighbor)	Perimeter fences; overgrazing @ 400 head; elk habitat; share ditches concerned about disease & physical destruction of ditches (banks); if horses escape –what recourse would he have; all geldings? What is definition of “long-term” care –horse can live upto 20 years; travel on State Hwy 11 more & more bicyclists – no shoulder-safety.	Fences See Appendix 1 RFA pg 10 Capacity See Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Detailed Analysis Pg 18 Big Game See EA pg 30 and 35 See Appendix 1 RFA pg 7 Period of Project Performance State Hwy Safety: Outside the scope of the EA.
20	Chad Wood	BLM owns ½ the property in the State, why should the tax payer be out money and funds to buy private property for a BLM containment keep horses the rest of their life...harvested horses should be sold at auction private (not government) or given to US citizens that want them or clubs that could give them a good home. Horses that need to go to canners for slaughter should be done. This program is not self-supporting and a drain on the American tax payer.....reduce the program where it will be self-supporting or discontinue it. When horses are round up and contained they are no longer wild.	Outside the scope of the EA.
21	Brett Moline, Directoer Public and Gov't Affarirs Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation	Concerned about impacts to neighboring landowners. Should imported wild horses bring in disease, the BLM must accept responsibility for any animal or monetary losses suffered. Containment of the wild horses. Stocking level at 400 head for 4000 acres 10 acres per horse insufficient. Range analysis must consider the lowest level of the ranges productivity, i.e. drought. Should forage be insufficient,	See Appendix 1 RFA pg 10 Disease See Appendix 1 RFA pg 10 Fences See EA Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Detailed Analysis Pg 18 Fences See Appendix 1 RFA pg 10 Capacity See Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Detailed Analysis Pg 18

Appendix 3
Summary of Public Comments

Table 1: Scoping Comments			
No		Scoping Comment	BLM Response
		<p>likely hood of horses escaping the ecosanctuary would increase. Should horse escape, neighboring land owners don't want to be responsible for gathering the horses. The BLM must be the responsible party to contain the horses and gather any strays. How will horses be disposed of . Any dead wild horse must not be allowed to remain on the sanctuary, either above ground or below. This would attract predators to the area and thus the neighboring livestock would be threatened. BLM should be responsible for any losses. BLM must determine effects on big game, especially elk and pronghorn</p>	<p>Big Game See EA pg 30 and 35</p>