

**Docket No. 09-1968**

In The

***United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit***

***Brief for Appellants***

---

DEBRA RUBIN and THE HORSE PEOPLE,  
Appellants,

vs.

KEN SALAZAR and ROBERT ABBEY,  
In their Official Capacities of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and the Director of  
the Bureau of Land Management, Respectively,  
Appellees.

---

***On Appeal from the United States District Court,  
Sacramento Division***

***Brief for Appellants***

**Team No. 16**

**Questions Presented**

- I. Whether the District Court properly dismissed a claim under the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act for failure to demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits of the claim.**
- II. Whether the District Court properly dimissed a claim under the National Environmental Policy Act for failure to demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits of the claim.**
- III. Whether the District Court erred in finding the balance of hardships did not favor the Appellants.**

## **Table of Contents**

Questions Presented.....	ii
Table of Contents .....	iii
Table of Authorities.....	vi
Opinions Below.....	1
Applicable Jurisdiction and Standard of Review.....	1
Statement of the Case.....	1
Summary of the Argument.....	2
Argument.....	4
I. THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN RULING AGAINST THE APPELLANTS, EVEN THOUGH THEY DEMONSTRATED A LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON THE MERITS OF THEIR CLAIM UNDER THE HORSE ACT .....	4
A. The BLM’s Actions Were Beyond the Scope of Authority Granted to it Under the Act and the Code of Federal Regulations.....	4
i. The BLM’s actions were contrary to the intent of Congress to protect horses as an integral part of nature.....	4
ii. The Secretary’s actions contradicted its granted powers to manage wild horses with minimal intrusion and maintain a horse inventory.....	6
iii. The use of LRAD, ADS, and rubber bullets violate the humane treatment of horses mandated by the Act and the BLM’s regulations.....	7
B. The BLM’s Actions Were Arbitrary and Capricious due to its Clear Error in Judgment, Failure to Consider Relevant Factors, and the <i>Chevron</i> Test.....	8
i. The BLM’s actions were arbitrary and capricious due to its clear error in judgment and failure to consider relevant factors.....	9
ii. The BLM’s actions were arbitrary and capricious under the <i>Chevron</i> test because Congressional intent was clear and unambiguous, and the BLM impermissibly construed the Act.....	10
a. Clear Congressional articulation of the BLM’s role in wild horse management and the Secretary’s management authority.....	10
b. The BLM’s interpretation and application of the Act is an impermissible construction.....	11

II. THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN RULING AGAINST APPELLANTS BECAUSE THEY DEMONSTRATED A LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON THE MERITS OF THEIR CLAIM UNDER NEPA.....	11
A. The BLM Violated NEPA When it Provided a Faulty FONSI in Lieu of an EIS Due to its Inadequate EA.....	12
i. The BLM’s FONSI and EA were inadequate because the BLM incorrectly assessed the “unique risk” and “highly controversial” intensity factors.....	13
a. Removal without contraception defeats the purpose of population management and raises scientific controversy.....	13
b. The LRAD, ADS, and rubber bullet gather techniques have uncertain danger and scientific controversy.....	14
ii. The BLM’s FONSI and EA were inadequate because the BLM did not explore an adequate range of alternatives.....	16
a. The BLM improperly rejected a viable and relevant alternative.....	16
b. Containment facilities were not referenced and four relevant factors were ignored. ....	17
iii. BLM’s FONSI and EA were inadequate because the BLM failed to adequately complete compliance, consultation, and coordination.....	19
B. The BLMs Actions Were Arbitrary and Capricious for Ignoring the Numerous Relevant Aspects of the Problem and Making a Decision Contrary to Policy, Purpose, and Evidence.....	20
i. The BLM’s decision to issue a FONSI was arbitrary and capricious because it failed to consider the safety of the roundup methods and the environmental impacts of the confinement facilities.....	21
ii. The BLM’s decision to issue a FONSI was arbitrary and capricious because it gave explanations for its decision that were contrary to the purpose, policy, and evidence before the BLM.....	22
III. THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED WHEN HOLDING THE BALANCE OF HARSHIPS DOES NOT FAVOR THE APPELLANTS.....	23
A. The BLM Gather Plan Will Cause Irreparable Harms to the Horses, People, and Environment.....	24

B. The BLM Has Minimal Hardship for Postponing the Gather Plan Until the Irreparable Harm Potential is Significantly Reduced and/or Mitigated.....	25
Conclusion.....	25

## Table of Authorities

### CASES

#### United States Supreme Court Cases

<i>Amoco Prod. Co. v. Vill. of Gambell, AK,</i> 480 U.S. 531 (1987) .....	23
<i>Chevron v. NLRB,</i> 467 U.S. 837 (1984).....	9, 10, 11
<i>Citizens to Pres. Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe,</i> 401 U.S. 402 (1971).....	8
<i>Kleppe v. Sierra Club,</i> 427 U.S. 390 (1976).....	21
<i>Marsh v. Or. Natural Res. Council,</i> 490 U.S. 360 (1989).....	21
<i>Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Assn. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.,</i> 463 U.S. 29 (1983).....	9, 21, 22
<i>Pierce v. Underwood,</i> 487 U.S. 552 (1988).....	1
<i>Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.,</i> 129 S. Ct. 365 (2008) .....	23

#### Circuit Court Cases

<i>Am. Horse Prot. Ass'n v. Watt</i> 694 F.2d 1310 (D.C. Cir. 1982).....	9
<i>Am. Motorcyclist Ass'n v. Watt</i> 714 F.2d 962 (9th Cir. 1983) .....	24
<i>Asarco, Inc. v. EPA</i> 616 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1980) .....	21
<i>Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project v. Blackwood</i> 161 F.3d 1208 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	13, 14, 15
<i>Cal. Energy Comm'n v. Dept. of Energy</i> 585 F.3d 1143 (9th Cir. 2009). .....	9

<i>City of Davis v. Coleman</i> 521 F.2d 661 (9th Cir. 1975) .....	16
<i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Forest Serv.</i> 349 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	16, 17
<i>Envt'l Prot. Info. Center v. U.S. Forest Serv.</i> 234 F. App'x 440 (9th Cir. 2007) .....	17, 23
<i>Forelaws on Bd. v. Johnson</i> 743 F.2d 677 (9th Cir. 1984) .....	24
<i>Greenpeace Action v. Franklin</i> 14 F.3d 1324 (9th Cir. 1993) .....	13
<i>Idaho Sporting Cong. v. Thomas</i> 137 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	15
<i>Lara v. Sec'y of the Interior of the U.S.</i> 820 F.2d 1535 (9th Cir. 1987) .....	8
<i>Nat'l Parks &amp; Conservation Ass'n v. Babbitt</i> 241 F.3d 722 (9th Cir. 2001) .....	14, 15
<i>Native Ecosystems Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.</i> 428 F.3d 1233 (9th Cir. 2005) .....	13
<i>People of Gambell v. Hodel</i> 774 F.2d 1414 (9th Cir. 1985) .....	24
<i>Portela v. Pierce</i> 650 F.2d 210 (9th Cir. 1981) .....	17, 20, 23
<b>District Court Cases</b>	
<i>Anglers of the Au Sable v. U.S. Forest Serv.</i> 565 F. Supp. 2d 812 (E.D. Mich. 2008) .....	14, 21
<i>Colo. Wild Horse and Burro Coal., Inc. v. Salazar</i> 639 F. Supp. 2d 87 (D.D.C. 2009) .....	5, 11
<i>Nat'l Park Concessions, Inc. v. Kennedy</i> No. A-93-CA-628 JN, 1996 WL 560310, at *10 (W.D. Tex., Sept. 26, 1996) .....	21
<b>STATUTES</b>	
5 U.S.C. § 706 (2009) .....	8, 20

16 U.S.C. § 1331 (2009) .....	4, 10
16 U.S.C. § 1332 (2009) .....	4
16 U.S.C. § 1333 (2009) .....	5, 6, 7
16 U.S.C. § 1334 (2009) .....	5
28 U.S.C. § 1331 (2009) .....	1
42 U.S.C. § 4321 (2009) .....	12, 17
42 U.S.C. § 4331 (2009) .....	12
42 U.S.C. § 4332 (2009) .....	12, 13, 19, 20

## **REGULATIONS**

40 C.F.R. § 1501.4 (2009) .....	13, 19
40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 (2009).....	19
40 C.F.R. § 1508.7 (2009).....	13
40 C.F.R. § 1508.8 (2009).....	12
40 C.F.R. § 1508.9 (2009).....	13, 16, 19
40 C.F.R. § 1508.14 (2009).....	12
40 C.F.R. § 1508.18 (2009).....	12
40 C.F.R. § 1508.25 (2009).....	12
40 C.F.R. § 1508.27 (2009).....	12, 13
43 C.F.R. § 4700.0-5 (2009) .....	7

## **OTHER AUTHORITY**

American Technology Corporation- <i>Wildlife Preservation</i> , <a href="http://www.atcsd.com/site/content/view/268/110">http://www.atcsd.com/site/content/view/268/110</a> (last visited Jan. 2, 2010).....	24
---	----

Anna Sorin, <i>Equus caballus</i> , Animal Diversity Web, <a href="http://animaldiversity.ummz.umich.edu/site/accounts/information/Equus_caballus.html">http://animaldiversity.ummz.umich.edu/site/accounts/information/Equus_caballus.html</a> (last visited Jan. 2, 2010).....	15
Bureau of Land Mgmt., Dept. of the Interior, Envtl. Assessment Dev. Guidance, Form EA-GEN (2/98), <i>available at</i> <a href="http://www.fws.gov/r9esnepa/checklists/ea_form.gen.pdf">http://www.fws.gov/r9esnepa/checklists/ea_form.gen.pdf</a> .....	19
Bureau of Land Mgmt., Dept. of the Interior, Nat'l Env'tl. Policy Act Handbook, H-1790-1 (2008).....	19, 20
Jane E. Gross, <i>A dynamic simulation model for evaluating effects of removal and contraception on genetic variation and demography of Pryor Mountain wild horses</i> . 96 Biological Conservation 913 (2000) .....	14, 22
Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Program, <i>Active Denial System</i> , <a href="https://www.jnlwp.com/ads.asp">https://www.jnlwp.com/ads.asp</a> (last visited Dec. 20, 2009).....	8
Memorandum from CEQ on Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations to Federal Agencies (March 23, 1981) <i>available at</i> <a href="http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/regs/40/40p3.htm">http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/regs/40/40p3.htm</a> .....	16
<i>Restoring our American Mustangs Act: Hearings on H.R. 1018 Before Subcomm. On Natural Parks, Forests and Public Lands, 111th Cong. (2009) (statement by D.J. Schubert Wildlife Biologist Animal Welfare Institute)</i> .....	5
Sarah Joseph, <i>Equine Responses to Fear-Provoking Stimuli: Implications for Feral Horse Management</i> (2007) (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Queensland).....	7
Susan Levine, Ctr. for Tech. and Nat'l Sec. Policy, Nat'l Def. Univ., The Active Denial System: A Revolutionary, Non-Lethal Weapon for Today's Battlefield (2009), <i>available at</i> <a href="https://www.jnlwp.com/public_affairs/adspaper.pdf">https://www.jnlwp.com/public_affairs/adspaper.pdf</a> .....	14