

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/3/2020 10:03:34 PM

First name: Mary

Last name: Ballard

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To whom it may concern:

I have lived in Overgaard for going on 16 years. I so enjoy taking friend and family out into our beautiful forest, one of the highlights of these trips is the opportunity to view these majestic creatures in their element.

The plan indicates only keeping 50 to 104 horses, Where is the data that states 50 to 104 horses fosters a self sustaining population for the territory. The BLM handbook recommends at least 150 horses in order to maintain an acceptable level of genetically viable herd. Has any genetic testing been done. This plan seems to want extinction not management. I would ask that this herd not be subjected to cruel roundups, being placed in pens for the rest of their foreseeable future and not to be bought up by kill buyers. Now I understand there will be no long term holding, this equals death not management. Not many people have the ability to adopt due to room and financial reason. With the thousands and thousands of acres on the ASNF I would believe there is plenty of room for all the wildlife including cattle.

In your plan what determines the animal is excess?

I require that any NEPA analysis of this proposed action include but not be limited to a thorough consideration of the following significant impacts of this action:?

(1?) ?impacts on the genetic viability of the Heber wild horse population,?

(2?) ?the social,? ?behavioral and physiological impacts of the stress of capture and captivity on wild horses,?

(3) Require the Forest Service to provide scientific data that shows there is an overpopulation of horses in the Heber herd.

Is the following included in your study and plan

An EA/EIS must include the research and monitoring data? ?and the scientific methods used to differentiate between wild horses versus wildlife versus livestock.? ?This monitoring research and its subsequent report data and summary must include all information on all? ?methods used by the USFS to determine and differentiate between wild horse usage and wildlife usage and livestock usage of forage and water usage in at least the past ten years.? ?Details:

Water usage designation:?

Foraging wildlife including wild horses

Domestic livestock

Forage usage designation:?

Foraging wildlife including wild horses

Domestic livestock

I require that any NEPA analysis of this proposed action include but not be limited to a thorough consideration of the following significant impacts of this action:

(1)economic impacts of requiring taxpayers to absorb the astronomical cost of these captures and maintaining any additional wild horses at USFS or BLM holding facilities,? ?and?

(2?) ?the ethical impacts of a wild horse management program that takes wild horses out of the forest and dooms them to a lifetime on USFS or BLM feedlots and/or being sold with no restrictions or oversight.? I require that any NEPA analysis of this proposed action include but not be limited to a thorough consideration of the following significant impacts of this action:?

1) The impacts of helicopter drive trapping on the wild horses and Mexican Gray Wolves, and other wildlife?;

2) The impacts of water/feed trapping on the wild horses and other wildlife

I require that any NEPA analysis of this proposed action include but not be limited to a thorough consideration of the following significant impacts of this action:

(1) the social,? ?behavioral and physiological impacts of population growth control measures on wild horses,?

(2?) ?the ecosystem impacts of removing wild horses from public grazing land,? ?in comparison to the

ecosystem impacts of allowing and? ?removing and reducing grazing by cows and sheep,

Thank you for the opportunity to leave comments. Please take the time to consider the impact your plan has on these beautiful creatures.