

To: BLM_UT_All[blm_ut_all@blm.gov]; Megan Crandall[mcrandal@blm.gov]; Edwin Roberson[eroberso@blm.gov]; Anita Bilbao[abilbao@blm.gov]
From: Sutherland, Ryan
Sent: 2017-06-13T12:48:33-04:00
Importance: Normal
Subject: Fwd: Public Lands News Bulletin: Zinke would trim monument; new sage-grouse policy; LWCF/infrastructure bill
Received: 2017-06-13T12:49:22-04:00
[PLNBulletinJune13.pdf](#)
[PLNBulletinJune13.docx](#)

PUBLIC LANDS NEWS BULLETIN #10: June 13, 2017

Dear Subscriber:

The attached bulletin from *Public Lands News* newsletter reports on the following:

- * Zinke recommends smaller Bears Ears monument**
- * Zinke sage-grouse policy would defer to states**
- * Simpson would pair LWCF, fed maintenance in one law**

NOTE: This bulletin is a supplement to your regular edition of *Public Lands News*. It is NOT your regular issue. The next issue will be published June 16.

The Editors

Public Lands News is published by Resources Publishing Co., P.O. Box 41320, Arlington, VA 22204. EIN 52-1363538. Phone (703) 553-0552. FAX (703) 553-0558. E-mail james@resourcespublishing.com. Website: <http://www.plnfpr.com>.

PUBLIC LANDS NEWS BULLETIN #10: June 13, 2017

Dear Subscriber:

This bulletin from Public Lands News newsletter reports on the following:

- * Zinke recommends smaller Bears Ears monument**
- * Zinke sage-grouse policy would defer to states**
- * Simpson would pair LWCF, fed maintenance in one law**

NOTE: This bulletin is a supplement to your regular edition of Public Lands News. It is NOT your regular issue. The next issue will be published June 16.

The Editors

Zinke tells Trump Bears Ears monument is too large

Secretary of Interior Ryan Zinke June 12 recommended that President Trump reduce the size of the Bears Ears National Monument in southern Utah, touching off a political firestorm.

As part of an administration-wide review of the designation of 27 large national monuments, Zinke told the President, "I've submitted my 45-day interim report to President Trump expressing my belief that the monument needs to be right-sized and that it is absolutely critical that an appropriate part be co-managed by the Tribal nations. I also recommend that Congress take action to protect some areas."

Zinke did not say how much land should be trimmed from Bears Ears, saying he needs time to figure that out.

The recommendation was met with applause by the all-Republican Utah Congressional delegation, which has been championing for either a reduction in size of Bears Ears or a revocation of the Dec. 28, 2016, designation of the 1.35 million-acre monument by President Obama.

Said House Natural Resources Committee Chairman Rob Bishop (R-Utah, "This is positive news for the State of Utah and local communities affected by the Bears Ears monument designation. Anyone with honest intentions recognizes that local input should matter when the federal executive makes a decision of this magnitude. I commend Secretary Zinke for actually listening to local voices on the issue and conducting a thoughtful and deliberative review to help inform the President's ultimate decision."

If President Trump accepts Zinke's recommendation, a likelihood, it raises the possibility of a lawsuit under the Antiquities Act of 1906. That law authorizes a President to designate national monuments, but some experts question whether it authorizes the de-designation of monuments, or significant portions of monuments.

The environmental group The Wilderness Society promised all-out war. "The Trump administration's announcement today on Bears Ears is nothing less than an attack on the future of all American monuments, parks and public lands," said Jamie Williams, society president.

The Society said that if Trump follows through on Zinke's recommendation, "The Wilderness Society will take all steps necessary to defend Bears Ears and the Antiquities Act against these attacks - including legal action."

President Trump started the ball rolling April 26 when he signed an executive order directing the Interior Department to review the designation of national monuments of more than 100,000 acres made since 1996. Trump did not take the ultimate step and say he had the authority to revoke those designations.

The 100,000-acre limit applies to 21 national monuments in the West, plus an 87,500-acre Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument in Maine and five huge marine monuments. That's 27 total.

Zinke announced June 9 that he will go to Maine tomorrow (June 14) to meet with critics and supporters of the Katahdin national monument, which is managed by the Park Service.

Zinke has suggested that he is more interested in reducing the size of monuments than the outright revocation of them. As he said after Trump kicked off the review, "Historically, the Act calls for the President to designate the 'smallest area compatible with proper care and management of the objects to be protected.' Despite this clear directive 'smallest area' has become the exception and not the rule."

The public comment period on Bears Ears ended May 26. Trump's executive order asked for a recommendation from Zinke by June 10. The recommendation was submitted June 12. The comment period for the other 26 monuments runs through July 9. At press time more than 150,000 comments had been submitted on Bears Ears. However, the Sierra Club counts more than 685,000 comments opposing any change to Bears Ears.

Sportsmen also criticized Zinke's plan. Backcountry Hunters and Anglers President Land Tawney said, "An attack on one monument is an attack on them all. Public lands sportsmen will not stand idly by while these attacks unfold. Backcountry Hunters & Anglers will continue to stand up for our national monuments, the opportunities they represent and the legacy they protect and sustain."

The liberal Center for American Progress attacked Zinke personally for advocating retention of federal lands in the public domain while at the same time moving to mar those lands with commercial activities.

Said Jenny Rowland, research and advocacy manager for the Public Lands Project at the Center, "Zinke has attempted to draw a fine line between advocacy for the wholesale sell-off of public lands and the sell-out of public lands to the fossil fuel industry. As much as Zinke has tried to distance himself from the former, he has been consistently clear that he is willing to bend the rules for the oil and gas industry."

Democratic leaders wrote Zinke May 25 asking him not to recommend major monument changes. "As public servants, we have a moral obligation to protect America's natural places - our outdoor heritage - and important cultural and historic landmarks for our children and grandchildren to enjoy," they wrote. "For these reasons, we urge you to reject any attempt to diminish or eliminate national monuments in carrying out the President's executive order."

Signing the letter were House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi (Calif.), House Democratic Whip Steny H. Hoyer (Md.), Senate Democratic Leader Charles E. Schumer (N.Y.), and Senate Democratic Whip Dick Durbin (Ill.)

Utah Republican Sens. Mike Lee and Orrin Hatch, who prodded Trump to begin the review as soon as he was elected, are all in. They wrote Trump last month, "No president has seriously revisited the modern, expansive use of the Antiquities Act (of 1906). We urge you to keep all remedies on the table as you consider how to correct past abuses of the Antiquities Act and work with Congress to ensure a more measure approach is taken and required in the future."

Zinke says sage-grouse policy will defer to states

Secretary of Interior Ryan Zinke June 8 began a substantive new sage-grouse policy that would give states significant leeway in managing the bird.

Although the policy - in the form of a Secretarial Order - has been painted as merely a procedural review, it would have real meat, if BLM and the Forest Service revised grouse plans in accordance with Zinke's direction.

As Zinke told the House subcommittee on Interior appropriations June 8, "It opens up a state's ability to formulate a plan shaped to that state rather than just us."

"So we incorporated things like if a state feels comfortable about going on numbers vis-à-vis habitat, captive breeding, or predator control we allow states more flexibility on how they approach it," he said.

But Zinke said the policy will not begin from ground zero. "What the Secretarial Order did not do is stop, or manage (sic), a review of the work that had already been done. There has been a lot of really good work on the sage-grouse so we didn't want to reinvent the wheel. We just wanted to give states a more innovative approach if they wanted according to their data."

The Secretarial Order 3353 itself indicates that Zinke has made up his mind about giving states new and different authority to manage sage-grouse.

It says: "Consistent with governing laws, regulations, and policies, the Department will implement a multifaceted strategy to enhance cooperation with the Eleven Western States primarily responsible for the management and conservation of Sage-Grouse. The strategy will include supporting a partnership that allows the Department and the Eleven Western States to maintain healthy populations of Sage-Grouse and improve collaboration and integration of State and local concerns and approaches into sagebrush management and conservation on Federal lands."

Zinke told the press the day before he started the review that he had heard complaints from governors that the plans "have been heavy-handed. The complaints have been that the federal government is dictating terms too much."

But on May 26 two western governors - Wyoming Gov. Matt Mead (R-Wyo.) and Colorado Gov. John Hickenlooper (D-Colo.) - wrote Zinke and asked him NOT to change course.

"We understand that you are considering changing the Department's approach to sage-grouse, moving from a habitat management model to one

that sets population objectives for the states,” they wrote. “We are concerned that this is not the right decision.”

They added, “Wholesale changes to the land use plans are likely not necessary at this time.”

Oppositely, eight Republican members of the House Public Lands Caucus endorsed the proposal and said they anticipated substantive changes.

Said Rep. Paul Cook (R-Calif.), “I welcome Secretary Zinke’s much-needed call to review Sage-Grouse policies. The bird is not endangered and we need to stop putting the supposed needs of this bird ahead of the real needs of people, our local economies, and our national security.”

Environmentalists said they would contest the Zinke policy, implying that the Trump administration should not give early deference to states. Said Earthjustice Attorney Ted Zukoski, “To make any revisions, Interior will have to involve the public, biologists, the states and all stakeholders. As Interior moves forward, we’ll be there to defend the existing plans that benefit not only the grouse but the many communities, ranchers and sportsmen who rely on healthy sagebrush ecosystems across the West.”

As *PLN* reported in the last issue the Trump administration signaled May 23 that it would back off from full implementation of the 98 BLM and Forest Service sage-grouse management plans. The signal came in the form of a proposal to reduce spending on the plans in fiscal year 2018.

That would undoubtedly give states more say in managing the sage-grouse and, inferentially, give commodity users greater access to the public lands.

The Trump signal came in a BLM budget request that would slash \$11.5 million from BLM’s budget for sage-grouse management. The budget says the reduction would lead to “a revised implementation timeline of the Sagebrush Conservation Implementation Strategy and more limited habitat restoration work.” The fiscal 2017 BLM appropriation for sage-grouse management was \$68.9 million.

The Obama administration sage-grouse policy, issued on Sept. 22, 2015, did not list the greater sage-grouse as an endangered or threatened species as western states had feared. Instead, it directed BLM and the Forest Service to implement 98 records of decisions to protect the bird. The plans apply to 67 million acres across 10 western states.

To revise or replace those plans might take years. But to slow their implementation could be executed with simple budget reductions.

As part of the Obama policy, the Interior Department on Sept. 24, 2015, withdrew 10 million acres of public lands from hard rock mining claims for two years – or until September 24th of this year. The Obama Interior Department proposed on Dec. 29, 2016, a 20-year withdrawal of the 10 million acres. The National Mining Association June 9 said it welcomed the Zinke review, perhaps with an eye to a cancellation of that withdrawal.

Said association president Hal Quinn, “These plans now impose significant restrictions on valuable resource development – including mineral and mining-related activities – on 67 million acres of federal lands in a half-dozen states. Nor did the environmental assessment accompanying these plans provide any justification for a proposal to ban new mineral exploration from 10 million acres with potentially valuable mineral reserves.”

Now the hard rock mining industry, the oil and gas industry, some western states and some western local governments are pushing all buttons to do away with the Obama policy and let state plans govern the imperiled bird.

Zinke’s Secretarial Order is available at:
https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/uploads/so_3353.pdf.

Simpson would put LWCF, maintenance in one pot

Rep. Mike Simpson (R-Idaho) launched a novel campaign June 8 that, in one bill (HR 2863), would guarantee money for both the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and federal land management agency maintenance.

Simpson said he has not yet identified a source of money for the bill – always the hang-up in such campaigns. But he said President Trump’s trillion-dollar infrastructure program might do the trick.

Before introducing HR 2863 Simpson said at a June 8 hearing of the House subcommittee on Interior appropriations, “We still have to find the offset for it, but we’re hoping that maybe we can work that into the infrastructure package because it is infrastructure, the backlog is.” The subcommittee was holding a hearing on the Interior Department’s fiscal year 2018 budget request with Secretary Ryan Zinke.

Simpson said his bill would guarantee \$900 million per year total. "The lands bill is going to reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund for seven year under mandatory funding, with half of it going to (LWCF) split between the state and federal sides and half to be used for backlog maintenance for our parks and other land management agencies, \$450 million per year. Hopefully, that would address maintenance backlog in these various agencies."

Secretary of Interior Ryan Zinke at the subcommittee hearing said the Trump administration budget would address the maintenance backlog but would not authorize new land acquisition under LWCF.

"When it comes to infrastructure we plan on taking care of what we have. A reduction in LWCF simply (means) no more acquisitions," he said. "But we're going to take care of what we have. I'm concerned as you are about infrastructure."

He singled out the Arlington National Cemetery. "If you want to look at an example of our infrastructure, I invite you to go to Arlington, to hallowed ground. It is a national disgrace. The shutters need to be replaced. The foundation is leaning. The gardens are inappropriate and that reflects where we are (overall) in infrastructure."

Zinke said that despite a tight budget request (i.e. an overall 13 percent reduction for the Interior Department), the Trump administration does propose a \$35 million increase for Park Service infrastructure.

However, the Forest Service budget tells a different story. It proposes a decrease of \$264 million for infrastructure, dropping from \$364 million in fiscal 2017 to \$100 million. (However, the administration suggests some of that might be made up in the \$1 trillion Trump infrastructure program.)

The American Lands Rights Association rang the alarm on LWCF funding among its members the same day HR 2863 was introduced. "The LWCF must not be permanently renewed (Simpson would only extend it for seven years). That is a major step toward a huge billion dollar per year land acquisition trust fund," the association said in a bulletin to its members.

Sen. Jon Tester (D-Mont.) for one supports LWCF and opposes blanket federal land transfers. On June 7 at a hearing of the Senate subcommittee on Interior Appropriations on the Forest Service he complained that in President Trump's fiscal year 2018 budget request, "LWCF is being zeroed out."

Then Tester tied the proposed 84 percent reduction in spending for infrastructure in the Forest Service budget request to the disposal of federal lands.

"I'm going to tell you there is a movement in this country to sell our public lands," he told Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell. "My concern with the budget is we don't have access to trails, our roads aren't being done, our facilities can't be kept up, the trees aren't being managed in a manner that makes sense for the next generation. It just gives more ammunition to the short-sighted people out there who want to sell our public land. They want to do away with our outdoor economy, and they want to make Montana into a different place."

The Trump administration in its fiscal year 2018 budget proposed virtually no new major federal land acquisitions. For instance the Forest Service budget request of May 23 calls for, "Reducing funding for lower priority activities in the National Forest System, such as new Federal land acquisitions; instead, the 2018 President's Budget focuses on maintaining existing forests and grasslands."

And the Interior Department budget request says, "The 2018 budget places a priority on Interior taking care of its current assets. Accordingly, the budget for land acquisition programs is \$54.0 million, \$129.1 million below 2017. A small amount of funding is maintained in each bureau for emergencies or acquisition of inholdings needed to improve management of established areas or to increase access."

At a hearing of the House subcommittee on Interior Appropriations May 25 Simpson said, "There's a movement to have the states take over all the federal lands. I don't see that happening either. It would not happen and I don't want it to happen because quite frankly we live in Idaho because we love our public lands."

In raw numbers the fiscal 2018 Trump budget request would slash the federal side of LWCF by \$138 million, from \$189 million in fiscal 2017 to \$51 million in fiscal 2018. The state side of LWCF would receive \$3 million, compared to \$110 million in fiscal 2017, but the budget would have Congress allocate an additional \$90 million from Gulf of Mexico offshore oil and gas royalties to the program, for a conditional total of \$93 million. That of course assumes Congress changes the law.

Public Lands News is published by Resources Publishing Co., P.O. Box 41320, Arlington, VA 22204. EIN 52-1363538. Phone (703) 553-0552. FAX (703) 553-0558. E-mail james@resourcespublishing.com. Website: <http://www.plnfpr.com>.

Public Lands News



Bulletin #10: June 13, 2017

Dear Subscriber:

This bulletin from Public Lands News newsletter reports on the following:

- * **Zinke recommends smaller Bears Ears monument**
- * **Zinke sage-grouse policy would defer to states**
- * **Simpson would pair LWCF, fed maintenance in one law**

NOTE: This bulletin is a supplement to your regular edition of Public Lands News. It is NOT your regular issue. The next issue will be published June 16.
The Editors

Zinke tells Trump Bears Ears monument is too large

Secretary of Interior Ryan Zinke June 12 recommended that President Trump reduce the size of the Bears Ears National Monument in southern Utah, touching off a political firestorm.

As part of an administration-wide review of the designation of 27 large national monuments, Zinke told the President, "I've submitted my 45-day interim report to President Trump expressing my belief that the monument needs to be right-sized and that it is absolutely critical that an appropriate part be co-managed by the Tribal nations. I also recommend that Congress take action to protect some areas."

Zinke did not say how much land should be trimmed from Bears Ears, saying he needs time to figure that out.

The recommendation was met with applause by the all-Republican Utah Congressional delegation, which has been championing for either a reduction in size of Bears Ears or a revocation of the Dec. 28, 2016, designation of the 1.35 million-acre monument by President Obama.

Public Land News is published by Resources Publishing Co.,

P.O. Box 41320 • Arlington, VA 22204

Phone: (703) 553 0552 • Fax: (703) 553 0558 • E Mail: james@resourcespublishing.com • www.publiclandnews.com

Said House Natural Resources Committee Chairman Rob Bishop (R-Utah, "This is positive news for the State of Utah and local communities affected by the Bears Ears monument designation. Anyone with honest intentions recognizes that local input should matter when the federal executive makes a decision of this magnitude. I commend Secretary Zinke for actually listening to local voices on the issue and conducting a thoughtful and deliberative review to help inform the President's ultimate decision."

If President Trump accepts Zinke's recommendation, a likelihood, it raises the possibility of a lawsuit under the Antiquities Act of 1906. That law authorizes a President to designate national monuments, but some experts question whether it authorizes the de-designation of monuments, or significant portions of monuments.

The environmental group The Wilderness Society promised all-out war. "The Trump administration's announcement today on Bears Ears is nothing less than an attack on the future of all American monuments, parks and public lands," said Jamie Williams, society president.

The Society said that if Trump follows through on Zinke's recommendation, "The Wilderness Society will take all steps necessary to defend Bears Ears and the Antiquities Act against these attacks - including legal action."

President Trump started the ball rolling April 26 when he signed an executive order directing the Interior Department to review the designation of national monuments of more than 100,000 acres made since 1996. Trump did not take the ultimate step and say he had the authority to revoke those designations.

The 100,000-acre limit applies to 21 national monuments in the West, plus an 87,500-acre Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument in Maine and five huge marine monuments. That's 27 total.

Zinke announced June 9 that he will go to Maine tomorrow (June 14) to meet with critics and supporters of the Katahdin national monument, which is managed by the Park Service.

Zinke has suggested that he is more interested in reducing the size of monuments than the outright revocation of them. As he said after Trump kicked off the review, "Historically, the Act calls for the President to designate the 'smallest area compatible with proper care and management of the objects to be protected.' Despite this clear directive 'smallest area' has become the exception and not the rule."

The public comment period on Bears Ears ended May 26. Trump's executive order asked for a recommendation from Zinke by June 10. The recommendation was submitted June 12. The comment period for the other 26 monuments runs through July 9. At press time more than 150,000 comments had been submitted on Bears Ears. However, the Sierra Club counts more than 685,000 comments opposing any change to Bears Ears.

Sportsmen also criticized Zinke's plan. Backcountry Hunters and Anglers President Land Tawney said, "An attack on one monument is an attack on them all. Public lands sportsmen will not stand idly by while these attacks unfold. Backcountry Hunters & Anglers will continue to stand up for our national monuments, the opportunities they represent and the legacy they protect and sustain."

The liberal Center for American Progress attacked Zinke for advocating retention of federal lands in the public domain while at the same time moving to mar those lands with commercial activities.

Said Jenny Rowland, research and advocacy manager for the Public Lands Project at the Center, "Zinke has attempted to draw a fine line between advocacy for the wholesale sell-off of public lands and the sell-out of public lands to the fossil fuel industry. As much as Zinke has tried to distance himself from the former, he has been consistently clear that he is willing to bend the rules for the oil and gas industry."

Democratic leaders wrote Zinke May 25 asking him not to recommend major monument changes. "As public servants, we have a moral obligation to protect America's natural places - our outdoor heritage - and important cultural and historic landmarks for our children and grandchildren to enjoy," they wrote. "For these reasons, we urge you to reject any attempt to diminish or eliminate national monuments in carrying out the President's executive order."

Signing the letter were House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi (Calif.), House Democratic Whip Steny H. Hoyer (Md.), Senate Democratic Leader Charles E. Schumer (N.Y.), and Senate Democratic Whip Dick Durbin (Ill.)

Utah Republican Sens. Mike Lee and Orrin Hatch, who prodded Trump to begin the review as soon as he was elected, are all in. They wrote Trump last month, "No president has seriously revisited the modern, expansive use of the Antiquities Act (of 1906). We urge you to keep all remedies on the table as you consider how to correct past abuses of the Antiquities Act and work with Congress to ensure a more measure approach is taken and required in the future."

Zinke says new sage-grouse policy will defer to states

Secretary of Interior Ryan Zinke June 8 began a substantive new sage-grouse policy that would give states significant leeway in managing the bird.

Although the policy - in the form of a Secretarial Order - has been painted as merely a procedural review, it would have real meat, if BLM and the Forest Service revised grouse plans in accordance with Zinke's direction.

As Zinke told the House subcommittee on Interior appropriations June 8, "It opens up a state's ability to formulate a plan shaped to that state rather than just us."

"So we incorporated things like if a state feels comfortable about going on numbers vis-à-vis habitat, captive breeding, or predator control we allow states more flexibility on how they approach it," he said.

But Zinke said the policy will not begin from ground zero. "What the Secretarial Order did not do is stop, or manage (sic), a review of the work that had already been done. There has been a lot of really good work on the sage-grouse so we didn't want to reinvent the wheel. We just wanted to give states a more innovative approach if they wanted according to their data."

The Secretarial Order 3353 itself indicates that Zinke has made up his mind about giving states new and different authority to manage sage-grouse.

It says: "Consistent with governing laws, regulations, and policies, the Department will implement a multifaceted strategy to enhance cooperation with the Eleven Western States primarily responsible for the management and conservation of Sage-Grouse. The strategy will include supporting a partnership that allows the Department and the Eleven Western States to maintain healthy populations of Sage-Grouse and improve collaboration and integration of State and local concerns and approaches into sagebrush management and conservation on Federal lands."

Zinke told the press the day before he started the review that he had heard complaints from governors that the plans "have been heavy-handed. The complaints have been that the federal government is dictating terms too much."

But on May 26 two western governors - Wyoming Gov. Matt Mead (R-Wyo.) and Colorado Gov. John Hickenlooper (D-Colo.) - wrote Zinke and asked him NOT to change course.

"We understand that you are considering changing the Department's approach to sage-grouse, moving from a habitat management model to one that sets population objectives for the states," they wrote. "We are concerned that this is not the right decision."

They added, "Wholesale changes to the land use plans are likely not necessary at this time."

Oppositely, eight Republican members of the House Public Lands Caucus endorsed the proposal and said they anticipated substantive changes.

Said Rep. Paul Cook (R-Calif.), "I welcome Secretary Zinke's much-needed call to review Sage-Grouse policies. The bird is not endangered and we need to stop putting the supposed needs of this bird ahead of the real needs of people, our local economies, and our national security."

Environmentalists said they would contest the Zinke policy, implying that the Trump administration should not give early deference to states. Said Earthjustice Attorney Ted Zukoski, "To make any revisions, Interior will have to involve the public,

biologists, the states and all stakeholders. As Interior moves forward, we'll be there to defend the existing plans that benefit not only the grouse but the many communities, ranchers and sportsmen who rely on healthy sagebrush ecosystems across the West."

As *PLN* reported in the last issue the Trump administration signaled May 23 that it would back off from full implementation of the 98 BLM and Forest Service sage-grouse management plans. The signal came in the form of a proposal to reduce spending on the plans in fiscal year 2018.

That would undoubtedly give states more say in managing the sage-grouse and, inferentially, give commodity users greater access to the public lands.

The Trump signal came in a BLM budget request that would slash \$11.5 million from BLM's budget for sage-grouse management. The budget says the reduction would lead to "a revised implementation timeline of the Sagebrush Conservation Implementation Strategy and more limited habitat restoration work." The fiscal 2017 BLM appropriation for sage-grouse management was \$68.9 million.

The Obama administration sage-grouse policy, issued on Sept. 22, 2015, did not list the greater sage-grouse as an endangered or threatened species as western states had feared. Instead, it directed BLM and the Forest Service to implement 98 records of decisions to protect the bird. The plans apply to 67 million acres across 10 western states.

To revise or replace those plans might take years. But to slow their implementation could be executed with simple budget reductions.

As part of the Obama policy, the Interior Department on Sept. 24, 2015, withdrew 10 million acres of public lands from hard rock mining claims for two years – or until September 24th of this year. The Obama Interior Department proposed on Dec. 29, 2016, a 20-year withdrawal of the 10 million acres. The National Mining Association June 9 said it welcomed the Zinke review, perhaps with an eye to a cancellation of that withdrawal.

Said association president Hal Quinn, "These plans now impose significant restrictions on valuable resource development – including mineral and mining-related activities – on 67 million acres of federal lands in a half-dozen states. Nor did the environmental assessment accompanying these plans provide any justification for a proposal to ban new mineral exploration from 10 million acres with potentially valuable mineral reserves."

Now the hard rock mining industry, the oil and gas industry, some western states and some western local governments are pushing all buttons to do away with the Obama policy and let state plans govern the imperiled bird.

Zinke's Secretarial Order is available at: https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/uploads/so_3353.pdf.

Rep. Simpson would put LWCF, fed maintenance in one pot

Rep. Mike Simpson (R-Idaho) launched a novel campaign June 8 that, in one bill (HR 2863), would guarantee money for both the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and federal land management agency maintenance.

Simpson said he has not yet identified a source of money for the bill – always the hang-up in such campaigns. But he said President Trump's trillion-dollar infrastructure program might do the trick.

Before introducing HR 2863 Simpson said at a June 8 hearing of the House subcommittee on Interior appropriations, "We still have to find the offset for it, but we're hoping that maybe we can work that into the infrastructure package because it is infrastructure, the backlog is." The subcommittee was holding a hearing on the Interior Department's fiscal year 2018 budget request with Secretary Ryan Zinke.

Simpson said his bill would guarantee \$900 million per year total. "The lands bill is going to reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund for seven year under mandatory funding, with half of it going to (LWCF) split between the state and federal sides and half to be used for backlog maintenance for our parks and other land management agencies, \$450 million per year. Hopefully, that would address maintenance backlog in these various agencies."

Secretary of Interior Ryan Zinke at the subcommittee hearing said the Trump administration budget would address the maintenance backlog but would not authorize new land acquisition under LWCF.

"When it comes to infrastructure we plan on taking care of what we have. A reduction in LWCF simply (means) no more acquisitions," he said. "But we're going to take care of what we have. I'm concerned as you are about infrastructure."

He singled out the Arlington National Cemetery. "If you want to look at an example of our infrastructure, I invite you to go to Arlington, to hallowed ground. It is a national disgrace. The shutters need to be replaced. The foundation is leaning. The gardens are inappropriate and that reflects where we are (overall) in infrastructure."

Zinke said that despite a tight budget request (i.e. an overall 13 percent reduction for the Interior Department), the Trump administration does propose a \$35 million increase for Park Service infrastructure.

However, the Forest Service budget tells a different story. It proposes a decrease of \$264 million for infrastructure, dropping from \$364 million in fiscal 2017 to \$100 million. (However, the administration suggests some of that might be made up in the \$1 trillion Trump infrastructure program.)

The American Lands Rights Association rang the alarm on LWCF funding among its members the same day HR 2863 was introduced. "The LWCF must not be permanently renewed (Simpson would only extend it for seven years). That is a major step toward a

huge billion dollar per year land acquisition trust fund," the association said in a bulletin to its members.

Sen. Jon Tester (D-Mont.) for one supports LWCF and opposes blanket federal land transfers. On June 7 at a hearing of the Senate subcommittee on Interior Appropriations on the Forest Service he complained that in President Trump's fiscal year 2018 budget request, "LWCF is being zeroed out."

Then Tester tied the proposed 84 percent reduction in spending for infrastructure in the Forest Service budget request to the disposal of federal lands.

"I'm going to tell you there is a movement in this country to sell our public lands," he told Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell. "My concern with the budget is we don't have access to trails, our roads aren't being done, our facilities can't be kept up, the trees aren't being managed in a manner that makes sense for the next generation. It just gives more ammunition to the short-sighted people out there who want to sell our public land. They want to do away with our outdoor economy, and they want to make Montana into a different place."

The Trump administration in its fiscal year 2018 budget proposed virtually no new major federal land acquisitions. For instance the Forest Service budget request of May 23 calls for, "Reducing funding for lower priority activities in the National Forest System, such as new Federal land acquisitions; instead, the 2018 President's Budget focuses on maintaining existing forests and grasslands."

And the Interior Department budget request says, "The 2018 budget places a priority on Interior taking care of its current assets. Accordingly, the budget for land acquisition programs is \$54.0 million, \$129.1 million below 2017. A small amount of funding is maintained in each bureau for emergencies or acquisition of inholdings needed to improve management of established areas or to increase access."

At a hearing of the House subcommittee on Interior Appropriations May 25 Simpson said, "There's a movement to have the states take over all the federal lands. I don't see that happening either. It would not happen and I don't want it to happen because quite frankly we live in Idaho because we love our public lands."

In raw numbers the fiscal 2018 Trump budget request would slash the federal side of LWCF by \$138 million, from \$189 million in fiscal 2017 to \$51 million in fiscal 2018. The state side of LWCF would receive \$3 million, compared to \$110 million in fiscal 2017, but the budget would have Congress allocate an additional \$90 million from Gulf of Mexico offshore oil and gas royalties to the program, for a conditional total of \$93 million. That of course assumes Congress changes the law.

Public Lands News is published by Resources Publishing Co., P.O. Box 41320, Arlington, VA 22204. EIN 52-1363538. Phone (703) 553-0552. FAX (703) 553-0558. E-mail james@resourcespublishing.com. Website: <http://www.plnfpr.com>.
