Phoonswadi-Brewer, Sean

From: Lander RMP
Subject: My Comments on Lander RMP Revision & EIS

From: Beth Jones [mailto:blj1@direkt.at]
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2012 7:23 AM
To: BLM_WY_LRMP_WYMail
Subject: My Comments on Lander RMP Revision & EIS

To Whom It May Concern

I hereby offer my comments on the draft Lander Field Office Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I consider it a scandal that 97 percent of the public (!) land in the planning area in question is devoted to commercial livestock grazing, while only 25 percent of it is designated as wild horse habitat, which the mustangs are forced to share with livestock to boot.

So I cannot approve of the RMP and EIS as written, for they only perpetuate the previous inequitable policies of flagrantly preferential treatment for commercial livestock grazing on public (!!) lands, while the habitat for wild mustangs is encroached upon with impunity. America's wild horses are robbed of resources and then blamed for the inevitable consequences of the high-handed, unscientific policies that are cynically implemented "on their behalf" by the very agency responsible for their welfare.

As you well know (or should) the BLM is required by federal law to protect and preserve wild horses. So the BLM is woefully remiss in its duty when it neglects to provide fair and adequate resources for the mustangs in its care. The proposed RMP & EIS "zero out" Herd Areas and neglect to establish Herd Management Areas, much less provide adequate scientific data, analysis and genetic assessments of wild horses in the HMAs.

Unacceptable!

Moreoever, management alternatives are virtually ignored on behalf of taking the easy-way-out – implementing whatever coddles the domestic livestock (who have owners responsible for their welfare), while the mustangs have to take care of themselves – once again violating the BLM's federal mandate!

In the final RMP, I support Alternative B, because it offers the greatest environmental and mustang protections, by more wisely limiting livestock grazing, mining and energy development, instead of giving these activities carte blanche to run roughshod over taxpayers' public lands.

But I frankly prefer the additional recommendations for Alternative B made by the American Wild Horse Preservation Campaign, for these would actively increase the AMLs in all herd areas, restore natural population controls, promote much more humane removal criteria, as well as increase the mustangs' water resources and fence removal. All of these things would do much to move the current lax and commercial-friendly standards toward parity for the wild horses the management plans are supposed to PROTECT, not leave to their fates when the humans charged with overseeing their welfare willfully choose to fail them.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments. I look forward to seeing more fairness for America's wild horses and less favoritism for commercial interests.

Beth Jones
222 Southhaven Dr.
Monticello, IA 52310-2032