



SUMMIT 2020 – CODY, WYOMING

OUTCOMES REPORT

10/8/2020

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations have been compiled from participant feedback and discussion with the FREES Network Steering Committee:

FUTURE SUMMIT CONSIDERATIONS

- Next FREES event – collaborative meeting in Grand Junction, next Spring was proposed
- Next Summit in 18 months, location to be decided

AGENDA CONSIDERATIONS

- In order to support the desire for more robust discussions and opportunities for collaboration, the next Summit should provide more frequent, longer breakout groups. Considerations include:
 - Ensure adequate facilitation support so that breakout groups can be less than twenty people per group, particularly for the virtual breakout groups where participation is sometimes harder.
 - Ensure there is adequate time built into breakout sessions that participants have time to transition between rooms/zoom links; have time to digest information and ask clarifying questions; and participate in a full and meaningful discussion.
 - Reduce number of presentations in favor of more time for participants to ask and respond to questions and comments.
 - Encourage additional engagement through polling and survey questions throughout the Summit.
- In order to encourage networking and relationship building among participants, additional opportunities should be built into the Summit Framework for mingling and discussions. Ideas include:
 - Build longer, more frequent breaks into the agenda that allow participants the opportunity to both debrief but also connect and discuss observations from recent presentations and breakout group discussions.
 - Convene a field tour where participants are able to not only examine local, on the ground conditions but also spend time outside together building shared understanding around the issues and needs.

- Provide color-coded dots on name tags for the lunch breaks. Ask participants to sit with others with the same color coding and discuss a question or prompt. Capture take aways from these discussions.
- Host a Summit “happy hour” that provides a casual opportunity for presenters and participants to relax and build rapport with one another.
- In order to demonstrate agency interest and commitment, as well as ensure that regulatory side boards are fully understood and integrated into solution development, the FREES Network should actively work to engage key BLM representatives in the development of the agenda as well as at the Summit. This engagement should occur at multiple levels within the agency and include decisionmakers as well as program staff.
- In order to support forward momentum that builds off the work accomplished at each Summit, ensure that guiding Network documents are revisited and used to guide work efforts. Identify opportunities for sharing Work Group Accomplishments and Updates to the full Network more frequently.
- If convening another hybrid in-person/virtual meeting, ensure that there is adequate manpower to support the facilitation and tech support needs. Provider virtual presenters with advance tech support so that they are comfortable and competent is using the chosen platform.
- Start the Summit with a presentation about common frameworks for conflict resolution.
- Start the Summit with case studies of successful multi-stakeholder groups tackling a tough issue and their lessons learned.
 - This could also be accomplished through bringing in other stakeholders from similar natural resource issues and learning how they overcame some of the common issues related to Wild Horse and Burro. This could include agencies and their experience which might be helpful to BLM.
- Presentation Quality: Have expectation that presenters will have excellent visual elements to their presentations (video, graphics, photos) and very clear presentation objectives. The presentation objective should directly tie to the overall Summit objective and be explicitly stated.

FREES NETWORK CONSIDERATIONS

- Many participants through the survey and in the breakout groups indicated that they were not clear on who convenes FREES and its intentions. Though there has been discussion of this at each of the Summits, there still is a lot of work to do.
- In order to create a coalition in support of the FREES mission/objective, it needs to be clearly communicated who the convening (steering committee) members are and how it hopes to move forward.
- There needs to be greater time and consideration given to collaborative processes to involve all interested stakeholders in creating solutions. The working groups are a good start but there is still a lot of work to do to get everyone to the table.
- There needs to be greater engagement of diverse stakeholder groups – making it clear how each stakeholder can be involved.

- Working groups
- Summit presentations
- Collaborative groups
- If the objective of FREES is going to succeed, it needs to allow for collaboration, so each solution comes from the group as a whole and people take ownership in the action items.
- Partnership of BLM and FREES. We need to find a way to have continual coordination with BLM at all levels of the agency with FREES. There is an inherent disconnect in BLM (or any federal agency) between their executive leadership down to the range staff. FREES needs to have regular and continual relationships at all levels of the BLM in the WHB program. FREES and BLM need to develop this relationship and strategy separate from the annual Summit. This effort should help FREES and BLM to have a clear understanding of how FREES brings benefit and value to the monumental task BLM has of implementing the WHB Act.
- Learn from the example of [American Wind Wildlife Institute](#) and U.S. Department of Energy. How did they establish their partnership and relationships so effectively?

MEETING EVALUATIONS

PRE-SUMMIT EVALUATIONS

32 participants filled out the Pre-Summit survey. This survey asked participants about their expectations for the Summit. Summarized results are as follows:

What are the top three things you are excited to learn from the Summit?

1. Open and honest dialogue
2. Engaging diverse groups and policy makers
3. Exposure to the latest science
4. New information regarding policy
5. Discovering new tools to support this issue
6. Developing partnerships
7. New advances in population growth methods
8. Face-to-Face introductions to organizational leadership
9. Review the results of the survey results
10. Helping bring the diverse groups together to get past biases
11. Learning about Wyoming specific issues
12. Communication strategies
13. Understanding the demands on the BLM
14. Hear updates from the various agencies involved
15. Learn about how FREES is organized and how to be involved

The objective of this Summit is to develop stakeholder-based comprehensive communication strategies and processes to manage free-roaming equids in concert with other public lands multiple-use objectives

to achieve western rangeland ecosystem sustainability. How are you hoping to accomplish this objective at the Summit?

1. Being informed and engaged
2. Provide empirical data that will inform decisions
3. Transparent dialogue
4. Interacting with others in attendance
5. Listening to presentations
6. Listening to all sides of the issue

DAY 1 EVALUATIONS

13 participants filled out the Day 1 survey. This survey asked participants about their experiences on the first day of the Summit and asked them for improvements. Here are the summarized results:

What could be done to help accomplish the objective of the Summit?

1. Do a meet and greet – ice breaker so those that are new can meet people
2. Keep people in the same Zoom room – not have a separate link for breakout groups
3. More opportunities for dialogue and breakout sessions
4. In breakout sessions – ask for introductions so people know who is in the room
5. More question and answer time

How engaging were the presenters?

1. There were quite a few presenters that were hard to follow and not engaging – this could be improved upon.
2. Make sure all presenters know how to use the technology

How effective were the breakout groups?

1. Need to be longer
2. Using polling to gauge people's involvement
3. It was confusing for virtual attendees to know how to enter the breakout rooms – use one zoom room instead of multiple.
4. There needs to be more time for breakouts and discussion – less on the presentations

Were you given adequate opportunity to provide input and was your input heard and understood?

1. There was not enough time to provide input and fully engage in the topics

We will be discussing specific action items/ideas for how to accomplish the Summit's objective. Do you have any ideas you would like us to consider?

1. Clearly define who the stakeholders are in the process
2. Invite stakeholders to indicate how they would like to be engaged in the process

3. What tools exist to improve consensus and reduce conflict on challenging topics?

What could be done to improve the quality of the next Summit?

1. Send out materials for review a week in advance, so participants can be prepared
2. Allow time for introductions and encourage mixing of groups
3. Longer time given to discussions
4. Keep to the agenda – virtual attendees were confused when things would begin and end
5. Keep hybrid version – virtual and in person
6. Presentations from gather contractors
7. Presentations from holding facility contractors
8. More presentations from BLM
9. Get more on-the-ground people here
10. For presentations – give better introductions so people know who each presenter is

DAY 2 EVALUATIONS

20 participants filled out the Day 2 survey. This survey asked participants about their experiences on the second day of the Summit and asked them for improvements. Summarized results are as follows:

How effective has the Summit format been?

1. The virtual/in-person hybrid has not been effective – too many technology hiccups
2. Entering new zoom rooms for breakouts was confusing and ineffective – wasted time

How effective were the breakout groups?

1. These were effective in giving voice to all present
2. More specific action items
3. More time for breakout discussions

Were you given adequate opportunity to provide input and was your input heard and understood?

1. Far too little time spent on the breakout discussions

We will be discussing specific action items/ideas for how to accomplish the Summit's objective. Do you have any ideas you would like us to consider?

1. More time for working group discussions
2. More clear assignments and expectations
3. How to engage the BLM
4. Who is FREES? Are their objectives already pre-concluded or can we provide input?

What could be done to improve the quality of the next Summit?

1. Include groups like Audubon, Center for Biological Diversity, and Sierra Club

2. More coordination on the technology and up-front work done to work out the kinks
3. More time for discussion and brainstorming
4. More time to interact with other attendees
5. Present the vision of a sustainable free-roaming horse and burro program that has the funding to follow the laws and because it does so can completely adopt out all excess animals (with or without financial incentives if needed). Present this in terms of economics, ecological sustainability, and Equid health and happiness.

BREAKOUT GROUP REPORTS

OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION GROUPS

Breakout groups provided feedback on the following two topics:

1. Healthy Horses on Healthy Rangelands Business Plan
2. National Survey Results and Future Messaging

IN PERSON BREAKOUT – BUSINESS/IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

- BLM advisory board – needs to include local voice and include public outreach
 - County resource management plans
 - State wildlife agencies
- We need to express an opinion – government needs to listen to us
 - Follow-up with government officials, make sure the message receives its target (every month or 6 months)
- Local input: Eureka Conservation District and other conservation districts (for bottom-up approach)
- Get more county commissioners and supervisors involved and hold them accountable and responsible
- Identify one person in each state who is THE designated person for WHB issue
- Get more diversity of groups to care – sportsman, recreationists, and all other multiple use groups
- Streamline the adoption process
- Funding through tax credits – motivate congress (get enough people to make congress listen)
- Support each other in multiple-use groups
- Ad campaign (think Smokey the Bear)
- Encourage communication between field stations and local stakeholders – yearly/biyearly updates
- Convene a county government working group; develop coordination process under FLPMA; county members should invite officials
- More flexibility by the BLM (talk to state BLM director) – every HMA is different

VIRTUAL BREAKOUT – BUSINESS/IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

- Learning and figuring out the implementation part is where we are stuck...

- How do we take ideas and get them to work together?
- How do you get things going at once?
- How do you implement fertility programs with limited funding?
- How do you work with local government?
- Sometimes we forget objectivity
- There are limited resources so how do we get the engine moving?
 - How do you prioritize?
 - What are the most critical resources?
 - Look at scenarios. What gets us the furthest.
- Have a plan that stands changes to elected officials
- Show things in the plan that are really solid. It will come down to economics. Have things that are measurable and calculable.
- Help funders to feel more inclined to want to invest
- Look to local collaboratives for help
- Wildlife Services has held back because they wanted robust NEPA to then drive the federal action. Most organizations are in the same place as Wildlife Services.
 - Will there be a national NEPA document? Will it be by state?
 - Lots of communication needed
 - Start on a small scale and build trust and then help it grow
 - How are we going to cooperate on NEPA
 - More communication
 - Get the federal agencies in the same room and talk about all of the things they will need to move funding and support forward
 - Develop site specific EA's
- Have indication of broad agreement in the plan so that those who might be resistant to support will do so
- Seek voicing about disagreement with suggestions about how to fix those words in the plan
- Paul Griffin talked about the programmatic NEPA for WHB. They are already doing a lot of the things listed in the business plan as currently written.
- Legislative Sessions... How did you spend what we gave you last session? How have we spent the money that has been given? How do we spend the money wisely? Figure out how the money has been used before you ask for more?

IN PERSON BREAKOUT – SURVEY RESULTS

- Photo comparison questions (instead of words, such as 'where do horses live?' a picture of the ecosystems might be less intellectual and more emotional)
- Be aware of connotations of words like "chemical" and "euthanasia." "Chemical" usually brings to mind harsh and/or unnatural-ness, and "euthanasia" feels hard to support. Are there other words that could be used instead? Or perhaps create two different questions that test if these words actually do make a difference
- Could include a question that asks how much the respondent cares about the issue – might help to sort out who knows about the issue and doesn't care and who just doesn't know
- Somehow filter based on common knowledge (for instance, on those Wyoming questions, do those people even know where Wyoming is?)
- Public education needs to start young
- Misconceptions exist even in rural communities – further proof of greater education needed

- Is it possible that people are not supportive of suggested management actions, or paying for research and other actions, because the public doesn't even understand there is a problem to be fixed – is it too hypothetical for them to make real decisions?
- We need to understand our own biases, particularly in our messaging
 - We are biased to thinking that nature needs management, but there are people who think it doesn't – how do we compliment their perspective?
- People support helping something in peril (i.e. the question that asks about an injured or ill horse), so we can create an ad campaign that pulls at these kinds of heartstrings
- Nationwide 4H and Ag in the classroom curriculum about WHBs
- Reframe the message. Most successful natural resource campaigns say something like SAVE (save the turtles, save the polar bears, save the whales, etc...), but save the rangelands doesn't sound impressive, we need a more charismatic program

VIRTUAL BREAKOUT – SURVEY RESULTS

POPULATION MANAGEMENT GROUPS

These breakout groups were given this prompt:

Problem Statement:

Managing wild equine populations is complicated and difficult, often resulting in conflicts that can stifle management actions. As wild equine populations continue to grow, there is an increasing need to find common ground and build consensus on population management options. The purpose of this exercise is to review two different scenarios based upon two hypothetical Herd Management Areas. These HMAs are in similar locations but differ in specific characteristics that may impact implementations of population management strategies. Information presented in the previous session has informed participants on what types of population control strategies are available and what the limitations of those methods are. Our goal is to have participants work through the different contraception and gather/removal options and how they may be used in each scenario to provide adequate population control.

Objectives:

1. Help participants understand the complexities of managing wild horse populations and how they differ from HMA to HMA.
2. Identify potential population management approaches that are more palatable to broader audiences.

IN-PERSON GROUP DISCUSS SCENARIO – MODEL MOUNTAIN HMA SCENARIO

This group outlined these steps to help the HMA:

- Start with NEPA (may take a long time) and for ex-closures and off-site water to use as water bait traps

- Programmatic EIS for the entire area to speed up the process for individual projects (wouldn't include permanent structures)
- Separate NEPA for administration of contraceptives (potentially)
- Faster, shorter NEPA plan if a previous plan has already been put in place and can just be updated (? May not be adequate for our purposes)
- 2-3 years before current NEPA expires, get started on the next NEPA
- Get interdisciplinary team ready to get NEPA done within a year
- Include restoration objectives within the NEPA
- Need BLM members at the next summit to answer our questions (like these NEPA questions) that we have and help us understand what their constraints are
- Identify holding facilities and capacity
- Fertility control EIS sooner; prioritize population control – because herd is accessible - bring down growth rate early on
- Get volunteers to outreach while waiting on NEPA so the public is aware and educated and can be involved (because this herd is close by human populations)
- One good sized gather (150 horses) may be all that is needed, and then focus on fertility control
- Community meetings to educate the public on what is going to happen and why – decreasing horse populations to increase wildlife habitat
- Educational poster at kiosk around land (if USFS or BLM land)
- Have a well-defined schedule laid out before-hand, so time isn't wasted between steps
- Concentrated darting program may be effective quickly (because they herd is habituated to people)
- What kind of gather are we going to do?
 - Helicopter (could be good because of terrain)
 - Bring in off-site water to trap (little water on the land, water will easily bring them in, also the riparian areas are where all animals will gather both horses and wildlife, so we need to be urgent in getting the horses off the land before usable forage is decimated for wildlife)
- Identify who is in charge, who is making the decisions, and who can help
- Drone usage? Perhaps when it is authorized
- Private land doesn't require the NEPA process
- Plan your gather time (around gather black-out dates) around times when other multiple-uses may be lower: like when recreationists aren't using the land (fall time?)
- Monitoring program established particularly for the plants in the low and moderate resistance categories
- Restoration projects may already be needed, or may be needed in the next couple of years
 - Do something with the information that you get from your monitoring
- Reach out to county officials and have them help with the NEPA (can speed up the process and provide some funding) and potentially help with placement of horses after the gather
- Some federal and state agencies are willing to help fund NEPA
- Target mares in removals – although with this small of an AML you will probably need to create a population viability model to ensure the population will persist

- Use short term contraception on the best genetics' mares, so their genes can be put back into the population within a year or two – and use other kinds of contraceptives with different time frames on other mares
- Inter-governmental agreement needed for NEPA (especially if they are funding it)
- Ranking process for the HMA's – how is this going to be possible when every single HMA is different – but ranking to know which HMAs need the most attention first

VIRTUAL GROUP DISCUSS SCENARIO – HOPE VALLEY HMA SCENARIO

- We need to consider a combination of tools to address these needs, including gathers and birth control options.

RANGELAND CONDITIONS GROUPS

These breakout groups were given this prompt:

- 1. Topic - Crossing ecological thresholds (hot spots) due to over use**
 - a. Problem Statement** - Identification and labeling of areas where ecological degradation has already occurred due to equid overuse is a relatively simple process. However, predictive models that will identify the probability of geospatial ecological degradation in HMAs and HAs have not been developed. Procedures are needed that will identify “hot spots” so that appropriate management techniques can be surgically applied specifically to those areas before ecological degradation takes place.
 - b. Expected Outcome from group discussion** – Populate a team responsible for collecting germane information and drafting recommendations for the working group. This may include, identification of current and needed research, and funding sources necessary for development.
- 2. Topic -How to determine concurrent utilization percentages by foraging species.**
 - a. Problem Statement** – Forage utilization can be determined among multiple foraging species when the timing and duration of foraging for each species is separated in time and/or space. When foraging by two or more species is concurrent in time and space, it is almost impossible to segregate the relative portions of the forage base utilized by each species, given our current suite of measurement tools and approaches.
 - b. Expected Outcome from group discussion** – Populate a team responsible for collecting germane information and drafting recommendations for the working group. This may include, identification of current and needed research, and funding sources necessary for development.

IN-PERSON GROUP DISCUSSION

Crossing Ecological Thresholds due to Overuse and determine Concurrent Utilization Percentages by Foraging Species Breakout Room:

- Look at water sources to help predict where horses are going to go once they have degraded the land they are supposed to be on

- There aren't currently any maps of where horses are going when their land is degraded
 - EA's talk about these areas, but there isn't an easy way to utilize this data
 - There currently is not a database
 - Look at areas that are extremely over AML and use those as a starting point
- Look at maps that already exist (BLM maps or whatever) that can be overlaid with HMA's to find range conditions
- Include more diverse conservation groups and scientists – how can we get them to want to be involved?
- Identify ecological thresholds for specific HMA's
 - Include many aspects such as the effect of livestock, fire, and wildlife
- Peer review process needs to be used for what we create
- This is a very scientifically based working group, and it can be difficult for the average person to understand – perhaps getting grad students to be involved would be more effective (although where does the funding for them come from?)
- Working group's purpose is to help establish what questions scientists should answer
- Science can only provide information – the working groups can use that scientific information to make decisions
- We don't have the scientific answers to all of our questions, but we can't wait forever to make decisions, so we have to use the best information we have
- Is it possible to manage horses the same way we do livestock? Where grazing is allowed in certain areas for certain amounts of time, and then cycled around different areas to decrease overgrazing and degradation - with utilization ceilings
- Would it be possible to completely zero out parts of the AML to allow restoration of the ecosystem?
 - Sometimes this happens for catastrophic events, such as severe drought or wildlife
- Satellite data could be used to track greenness if we are actively managing horses
- Is there a way to determine how much forage and where the forage is taken by horses versus livestock?
 - Fecal mapping can be very helpful in determining these things
- Look to other multiple-use groups for funding support
 - Also look to conservation groups and animal welfare groups
- Need a clear mission statement that other groups can easily identify with and want to support
- We need to get a point where the majority of people involved can agree on what we are trying to do and how we are going to do it
 - This takes a lot of time and work and requires a facilitated discussion
- Next spring: short 2-day working groups session where we establish a few objectives that everyone can get behind. 18 months from now spring: another summit like this one
- Populate the working group – we need people to actually do these action items – who is willing to do this work?
- Reasons why we haven't addressed some topics yet: too complex and too expensive
 - Working groups can create specific, attainable priorities
 - Consensus needs to be reached before funding can be sought or actions can be taken
 - Then FREES can continue to work with that and create continuity

- If we aren't agreeing that the already outlined tasks in the program aren't what we want to work on, then what should our tasks be:
 - We can't get around the federal protections – so let's try and eliminate those federal protections – amend the WFRHBA Act - or perhaps the act doesn't actually restrict any of the actions we want to make, just regulations with governmental agencies – so speak with legislative representatives to change the way things are actually currently happening, since it currently may not even be illegal
- First and foremost we need to bring the horse population levels down, and then we can worry about the other little problems that arise

People who said they were willing to actively participate in the Rangeland Condition and Habitat Working Group:

1. Peggy Coleman Taylor
2. John Espy (Board of Carbon County Commissioners)
3. Holly Kennedy (Field Services and Federal Lands Associate, Laramie)
4. Doug Bussellman

VIRTUAL BREAKOUT SESSION

Crossing Ecological Thresholds due to Overuse and determine Concurrent Utilization Percentages by Foraging Species Breakout Room:

- We need to better understand the various thresholds and pressures. Maps and modeling can support this, but will we also need to make some assumptions. AMLs could be adjusted to meet on the ground conditions, but this probably doesn't matter if we are already so much higher than our existing AML.
- Funding is limited. We may need to consider prioritizing what issues or types of degradation we are going to address.
- Consider using the AIM data/framework that is used in sage grouse monitoring. Isolate thresholds specific to HMAs and then fine tune the data. This large-scale monitoring framework will help provide a better understanding of the entire landscape.
 - AIM data points are often lacking, but we could identify what data collection needs will help us better understand the landscape and build these into the framework. This would help us to build upon existing data sets.
- It will be pretty hard to develop management strategies at the local level, specifically as horses move around. With horses, we only have one management tool, and that is population control.

- FREES should connect with the sage grouse working groups and learn how they are working with private land owners.
- We need to prioritize and optimize our efforts. There may be parts of the landscape that need to be “written off.” While this would be unpopular, it would send a message to congress that the WHB program is underfunded.
- Need to think of these issues in relation to a short and long-term time scale. First cut should focus on areas above AML that may be better suited for management actions due to sufficient local capacity and data.
- We need to include state wildlife departments, Sage Grouse Initiative, tribes, conservation districts, and those around areas of high need. Bridge gap between land users, property owners, permittees, and stakeholders. Convene a smaller group of researchers to continue advancing the data collection and analysis.

How to determine concurrent utilization percentages by foraging species.

- The question is really about timing, as managed animals utilize the land during very specific time frames while horses and wildlife utilize the landscape sporadically.
- We need to develop clear metrics on cattle and horse movement and impacts, perhaps through exclosures. Need to be able to separate the two impacts.
- Could explore using tools such as gps tracking collars to develop models on how animals use the landscape.
- Ranchers do their own monitoring with caging. Should look to them for data.
- Could this be an effort tied to a larger exploration of health sage brush ecosteppes being conducted by state wildlife agencies?
- We need to engage agency biologists and rangeland staff. SGI and tribes would also be important partners.
- We need to frame and package this issue in a way that youth and educators can connect to.

ACTION ITEM BREAKOUT GROUPS

On the final day, all participants were broken into small groups (5 – 6 participants). Each group was tasked to create an action item (1 – 2 sentences) for research, implementation plan, and communication and outreach.

IN PERSON DISCUSSION

FURTHER RESEARCH NEEDED:

1. Repository for horse and range related peer review science for both sides of the argument
2. Legal precedence cases
 - a. Taylor Grazing Act
 - b. Wild Horse and Burro Act
3. Identify the context of how the public (nationally) view wild horses and their management

4. Use local working groups and science to analyze conditions on HMA's to determine departure from ecological potential, identify cause of disturbance, define, recommend and implement actionable solutions.
5. Define what a thriving ecological balance is
6. Inventory of monitoring for HMAs
 - a. Find where data is available
 - b. Identify data gaps
 - c. Map of HMA's – each area how many data points
7. Continue research on how all species use the rangeland

BUSINESS/IMPLEMENTATION PLAN:

1. Prioritize how Endowment funds are spent
2. FREES facilitate development of local working groups to deal with HMA management on the local level
3. Let Western States identify resource needs including holding facilities. Gather contractor or other needs for private Gov. partnerships.
4. Create a Healthy Horses on Healthy Rangelands Vision Statement
5. Develop transparency in Endowment funding and how the money is spent
6. Improve funding capacity overall

OUTREACH/COMMUNICATION:

1. Find consistent message (within FREES) that we can use to communicate the immediacy of the wild horse problem
2. Develop a congressional outreach/tour program to educate Congressional members and staff. Include professional staff from House and Senate Natural Resource Committees.
3. Put cost estimates against the communications to give context
4. Develop information on other cultures and their use of horse
5. Take findings from public knowledge survey and identify knowledge gaps (4-5 largest gaps)
 - a. Craft responses that will be understandable by urban residents – make recommendations for how to disseminate responses (social, press, etc)
6. Increase participation of diverse stakeholders and hold facilitated work groups

VIRTUAL DISCUSSION

RESEARCH

- Research focused on when and how to use different fertility control tools using multiple replicates, and how they affect equid behavior and social structure. Also need a better understanding of horse and native wildlife interactions, plus livestock, across a range of ecosystems and how this is affected by AML
- Create a riparian area and watering site disturbance metrics that work on a site-specific scale, rather than an AIM scale. We need upland too but riparian would be the priority.
- Collaborate with local groups to accomplish monitoring such as the 'cooperative monitoring agreement' programs that exist with BLM and NGOs.

- Comprehensive research that includes wildlife management, sustainable horse management, other uses and users, to better address the comprehensive analyses necessary for managing HMAs. Research should engage and communicate with stakeholders.

BUSINESS PLAN

- Create a "local network structure" wherein standing groups (that survive changes in leadership) work within regions & create a forum for discussion and share science = sound decisions
- population management: ensure objective sharing of fertility control options based on published research (perhaps create a repository?), publish current & upcoming fertility control options, collaborate with other groups (e.g., rangeland management) to inform recommendations

COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH

- Expand and contextualize Nicki Frey's survey, increasing a generational focus (sampling younger age groups)
- Build a stakeholder communication or engagement plan to identify and prioritize each group or individual that identifies as a stakeholder re: WHB management. FREES Network reaches out to each to ask how they would like to be involved in and communicate with the Network.
- Focus on public perception/education AND serve as "one voice" to provide info to federal government
- Take each question of the survey and make a youtube video/ channel that is available to all the public that explains the knowledge of the questions or the different aspects of the opinion questions. Use funding to create a Facebook promotion that addresses the Gen Y and BabyBoomers for each of these videos, post to Twitter to get the younger generations. Yes- we are calling out Nicki, but she agrees to lead this.
- Create an education promotion that we can present at state and county fair booths, and elementary schools that addresses key knowledge gaps