

**To:** BLM\_CA\_LeadershipTeam\_StateWide[blm\_ca\_leadershipteam\_statewide@blm.gov]; BLM\_CA\_PAO[blm\_ca\_pao@blm.gov]; BLM\_CA\_SO\_EA[blm\_ca\_so\_ea@blm.gov]; Niebauer, Erica[erica.niebauer@sol.doi.gov]; Martha Maciel[mmaciel@blm.gov]  
**From:** Webster, Sarah  
**Sent:** 2017-04-25T13:54:30-04:00  
**Importance:** Normal  
**Subject:** BLM-CA in the News, April 25  
**Received:** 2017-04-25T13:55:03-04:00  
[New Clips 4 25 LONG.pdf](#)

## CALIFORNIA

[Connelly: Trump to sign 'review' order aimed at axing America's new national monuments](#)

*Seattle pi*, April 24

President Trump is set to sign an executive order on Wednesday that will order a "review" of national monuments protected by his predecessors, with the aim of eliminating two big monuments in southern Utah. While the new Bears Ears National Monument, and 1.7 million-acre Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monuments may be the direct target, Presidents Obama and Clinton used the 1906 Antiquities Act to preserve public lands in Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Idaho, Montana and New Mexico.

[Sierra Designs Expands Packing It Out Partnership](#)

*SGB Media*, April 24

Between 2015 and 2016, the Packing It Out crew thru-hiked the Appalachian and Pacific Crest Trails, removing more than 1,820 pounds of trash while encouraging those they met to take greater responsibility for the wild places we all enjoy...Along the way, they will be hosting speaking engagements and clean-ups in National Parks and scenic areas, eventually wrapping up on Washington's Olympic Peninsula this fall.

[Groups Submit Comments to BLM's Request for Public Review of Oil and Gas Leasing and Development on Federal Lands](#)

*Indybay.org*, April 24

On April 6, the Center for Biological Diversity (CBD) and Sierra Club submitted nearly 100 pages of comments (see PDF) on the Draft Resource Management Plan Amendment/Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("RMP"/"DEIS") for the Bureau of Land Management ("BLM") Central Coast Field Office in Hollister.

## NATIONAL

[Judge declares mistrial in Bundy Ranch standoff case](#)

*Las Vegas Review-Journal*, April 24

A federal judge declared a mistrial Monday in the first Bunkerville standoff case, which targeted six men accused of conspiring with rancher Cliven Bundy to derail a court-ordered cattle seizure in 2014. The mistrial — an anticlimactic end to a highly anticipated trial — was declared hours after the jury convicted two men of some of the 10 counts in the superseding indictment.

In returning the guilty verdicts, which still stand, jurors informed the court they were “hopelessly deadlocked” on the remaining counts and defendants. U.S. District Judge Gloria Navarro sent them back to the deliberation room in a last-ditch effort to encourage them to reach a more complete verdict.

#### First Nevada Standoff Trial Ends in Partial Mistrial

*Courthouse News Service, April 24*

After 27 days of trial and several more of deliberations, a hung jury forced a mistrial in the first of three federal trials involving rancher Cliven Bundy and his supporters. Federal prosecutors scored only partial success Monday as a jury convicted two of six defendants on several counts of conspiring to intimidate federal law enforcement during an armed standoff in April 2014. Co-defendants Richard Burleson and Todd Engel face lengthy prison sentences. They also face potential convictions on other counts during an upcoming retrial. Each of six defendants currently on trial is accused of 10 felony counts of conspiring to intimidate the Bureau of Land Management and federal law enforcement into releasing about 400 head of cattle owned Nevada rancher Cliven Bundy on April 12, 2014.

#### Zinke stands against land transfers ahead of Trump order

*E&E News, April 25*

Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke reiterated his support for public lands this morning, the day before President Trump is expected to order the department to reconsider protections for millions of acres set aside by his White House predecessors. "I'm adamantly opposed to the sale or transfer of public lands," Zinke said to boisterous cheers and applause from members of the Outdoor Industry Association. "And so's my boss," he added when the noise died down. The comment prompted nervous laughter from the crowd, which had gathered at the National Press Club to celebrate the public rollout of OIA's third comprehensive assessment of the \$887 billion outdoor recreation economy. *See PDF for full story.*

#### Ex-Koch operative tapped to lead rule-cutting task force

*E&E News, April 24*

Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke has selected Daniel Jorjani, an adviser to various Koch brothers organizations, and veteran government official James Cason to lead a task force for cutting regulations. Jorjani, a conservative attorney and holdover from the Trump landing team at Interior, will serve as the policy officer, while Cason, current

associate deputy secretary, will take the reform officer post, according to an Interior spokeswoman. *See PDF for full story.*

Trump: Border wall funding could wait until September

The Washington Times, *The Associated Press*, April 24

President Trump appears to be backing off his demand that funding for his Southern border wall be included in a bill to prevent a government shutdown at the end of the week. Trump told a gathering of around 20 conservative media reporters Monday evening that he would be willing to return to the funding issue in September. That's according to two people who were in the room.

The government will run out of money this coming Saturday unless lawmakers pass legislation financing federal agencies.

Trump acts fast to strike rules but what's the long-term impact?

*E&E News*, April 25

Almost 100 days in office and President Trump has taken a number of steps to make good on his promise to roll back regulations that conservatives say are choking the American economy. Trump has issued a number of executive orders prompting federal agencies to limit regulatory actions and focus more on deregulation. And he's deployed the formerly rare Congressional Review Act to overturn a dozen Obama-era rules, many of which were intended to protect the environment and make energy production cleaner. Though Trump's deregulatory agenda is clear, the question is whether the measures will have a lasting impact, experts say. *See PDF for full story.*

Agencies to review 2 less-controversial drilling rules

*GREENWIRE*, April 25

The Trump administration is reconsidering a pair of relatively uncontroversial Interior Department oil and gas rules the Obama administration put into effect during its final days in office. The regulations each years in the making mainly increased oversight of new oil and gas drilling in national wildlife refuges and of existing operations in national parks. After they were proposed, both received far more comments in favor than in opposition, and neither was the subject of a congressional oversight hearing. *See PDF for full story.*

*Sarah K. Webster*

Lead Public Affairs Specialist  
Office of Communications  
Bureau of Land Management California State Office  
Office: (916) 978 4622



## NATIONAL

### Zinke stands against land transfers ahead of Trump order

*E&E News*, April 25

Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke reiterated his support for public lands this morning, the day before President Trump is expected to order the department to reconsider protections for millions of acres set aside by his White House predecessors.

"I'm adamantly opposed to the sale or transfer of public lands," Zinke said to boisterous cheers and applause from members of the Outdoor Industry Association.

"And so's my boss," he added when the noise died down. The comment prompted nervous laughter from the crowd, which had gathered at the National Press Club to celebrate the public rollout of OIA's third comprehensive assessment of the \$887 billion outdoor recreation economy (see related story).

The rest of the secretary's 12-minute speech touched on his concerns about armed Interior officers and plans to reorganize the department.

But Zinke never specifically addressed the executive order, which is expected to call for a review of at least 50 national monuments established by presidents under the Antiquities Act to determine whether their existing boundaries protect too much land or water (Greenwire, April 24).

Soon after he left, conversation in the room turned to the order.

"I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the reports that you've all heard that tomorrow the administration might issue an executive order concerning the Antiquities Act and national monuments looking backwards," said Eric Artz, REI's chief operating officer.

"We obviously don't know what is in the order at this stage. But whatever the order may be, we believe strongly that the value of national monuments and public lands must consider the huge economic impact of the outdoors and the health of our local communities," he said, prompting another round of applause.

After the speakers left the stage, apparel makers, retailers and sportsmen discussed among themselves the potential impact and scope of the order. They included Rep. Mike Simpson (R-Idaho), the co-chairman of the newly formed Outdoor Recreation Caucus (Greenwire, April 20).

Trump could undo dozens of monuments, "but that's not going to happen," Simpson told E&E News. "What you find with most national monuments is, once they've been put into place — even those where there was a lot of controversy when you first put it into place — as time goes on, people start to like them. Kind of like the Grand Canyon."

The House Appropriations Committee member said the forthcoming order seemed to be a response to the outcry over President Obama's designation of Bears Ears National Monument in Utah despite the unified opposition of the state's congressional delegation (Greenwire, Dec. 28, 2016).

"Let's see what they do there," Simpson said before noting that "if the Utah delegation wants to, they could pass a bill" undoing the monument.

Simpson added, "I don't have any problem with the Antiquities Act."

### **Zinke on law enforcement, reorganization**

The secretary spent most of his speech focused on issues of concern to him, such as improving the department's relationship with local communities by taking a less confrontational approach.

"I think we're too heavy-handed in the face of law enforcement," he said. Zinke then told about a startling encounter he and a group of Duke University students had with a flak-jacketed Fish and Wildlife Service ranger in the U.S. Virgin Islands when they tried to take a group photo on a beach used by tortoises.

"That's the face of Fish and Wildlife on a refuge in the middle of nowhere for tortoises, and when you go out West, that's the same face," he said. "I don't want to see Smokey the Bear armed. I want to be the happy department."

Zinke's comments come the day after federal prosecutors failed to secure convictions for four of the men involved in a 2014 armed standoff with Bureau of Land Management officials over more than \$1 million in unpaid grazing fees (E&E News PM, April 24).

The secretary also elaborated on his plans to reorganize the department, with a focus on reducing overcapacity at parks and increasing communication between land management agencies.

With Yosemite, Glacier and Yellowstone national parks "at capacity ... how do we maintain the culture [and] the experience of our parks?" he asked. "There's only one way to do it. Look at the public lands around the parks and make sure that the watersheds make sense, make sure the

wildlife corridors connect, make sure the trail systems work, make sure the sewer systems are connected. So our reorganization is going to look at ecosystems."

That broader management approach will also require tearing down management silos, he said.

"Everyone reports to different regions" now, he said. "We're looking at doing it jointly for an ecosystem [where] everyone reports to a joint management area, so that we can talk to each other."

Zinke explained that in such a system, every land manager in Alaska, for instance, would report to the same joint management command, which could then look across the ecosystem with an eye to the future.

"This is a grand reorganization," he said. "The challenges are clear. There's no doubt that next year we're going to have more recreation out there. No doubt. But we want to make sure we preserve the experience for all Americans so 100 years from now your kids' kids can look back and say, 'You know what, we did it right.'"

Ex-Koch operative tapped to lead rule-cutting task force

*E&E News*, April 24

Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke has selected Daniel Jorjani, an adviser to various Koch brothers organizations, and veteran government official James Cason to lead a task force for cutting regulations.

Jorjani, a conservative attorney and holdover from the Trump landing team at Interior, will serve as the policy officer, while Cason, current associate deputy secretary, will take the reform officer post, according to an Interior spokeswoman.

A former general counsel to Freedom Partners, Jorjani was one of the highest-paid employees at both the Charles Koch Institute and the Charles Koch Foundation, according to a 2011 IRS filing obtained by the Center for Media and Democracy.

Cason is a George W. Bush-era official who served as Interior associate deputy secretary from 2001 to 2009. He also served stints at Interior under Republican Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush.

He has previously received pushback from environmental groups and Democrats. In 1989, President George H.W. Bush sought to elevate Cason to assistant secretary of Agriculture for natural resources and environment, but his nomination was withdrawn in the face of objections from the Senate and environmental groups (Greenwire, Jan. 23).

The panel follows President Trump's February executive order on regulations, which requires agencies to set up deregulatory bodies with members who include a designated policy officer and separate regulatory reform officer. Today is the deadline for federal agencies to form their respective task forces.

Four other Interior staff members will serve on the task force: Amy Holley, principal deputy assistant secretary of policy management and budget; Katharine MacGregor, deputy assistant secretary for land and minerals management and former senior staffer of the House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources; Scott Cameron, a landing team holdover who served as deputy assistant Interior secretary for performance, accountability and human resources during the Bush administration; and Virginia Johnson, who is serving as acting secretary for fish and wildlife and parks, according to an internal email E&E News obtained earlier this year. But her background is not known (Greenwire, March 30).

The task force, as laid out in Trump's order, is charged with identifying regulations that should be repealed, replaced or modified. The panel is part of Trump's broader deregulatory agenda and is intended to expand on a previous executive order, which requires agencies to identify two rules for repeal before issuing a new one.

U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt announced his agency's task force earlier this month. Clean Power Plan foe Samantha Dravis is leading the charge (Greenwire, April 4).

Despite today's deadline, Secretary of Energy Rick Perry and his staff did not confirm by press time whether his agency has established a task force or chosen its members.

The Department of Agriculture also could not be reached for comment by press time.

Pruitt set a May 15 deadline for a number of EPA divisions to recommend rules to toss out or alter, including the offices of Air and Radiation, Land and Emergency Management, Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention, Water, Environmental Information, Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, and Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.

Pruitt noted that Trump's order requires task force officials to gather input from "entities significantly affected" by EPA rules, directing offices to consult with state, local and tribal governments; small businesses; and other stakeholders before making recommendations.

EPA officials today conducted two teleconferences on the order: The Office of Air and Radiation held a call for members of the public to recommend air and radiation rules to rescind, and the Office of International and Tribal Affairs hosted a call with tribal representatives.



On both calls, many voiced opposition to repealing any rules intended to protect the environment and human health.

The EPA Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization is planning to hold a public meeting on the order tomorrow at EPA headquarters in Washington.

Trump acts fast to strike rules — but what's the long-term impact?

*E&E News*, April 25

Almost 100 days in office and President Trump has taken a number of steps to make good on his promise to roll back regulations that conservatives say are choking the American economy.

Trump has issued a number of executive orders prompting federal agencies to limit regulatory actions and focus more on deregulation. And he's deployed the formerly rare Congressional Review Act to overturn a dozen Obama-era rules, many of which were intended to protect the environment and make energy production cleaner.

Though Trump's deregulatory agenda is clear, the question is whether the measures will have a lasting impact, experts say.

"Hard to tell what these [deregulatory efforts] will amount to," H.W. Brands, a historian at the University of Texas, Austin, wrote in an email.

Still, deregulating the energy sector is one area where Trump has been very "consistent" and "clear-eyed," according to Meg Jacobs, energy policy expert at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School.

"Trump came into office with a clear agenda on energy and environment," she said. "Rather than defining 100 days by legislative success, he's hoping to have success in deregulating in the areas of energy and environment."

Appointing U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt and Secretary of State Rex Tillerson sent a message early on, Jacobs said.

"He hopes to undo a lot of the regulatory rules under President Obama, like scaling back the Clean Power Plan; and if not to do away with it, then to gut it from the inside," she said.

The trouble with executive orders, Jacobs pointed out, is they can easily be reversed by subsequent administrations.

James Goodwin, senior policy analyst with the Center for Progressive Reform, said the first 100 days has seemed to him more like an extension of Trump's campaign trail rhetoric.

"Attacking regulations, attacking safeguards, attacking agencies, attacking the process by which safeguards are enforced and implemented," he said. "Underlying all that campaign rhetoric is the challenge they're facing in coming to grips with translating that rhetoric into action and quickly finding these issues are not as simple as a tweet or stump speech."

He added: "The first 100 days have been a slow coming to grips with a big dose of reality in trying to translate their ideas about the regulatory system into actionable policy, and it's going to be a rude awakening over the several months."

Still, agency operations and judicial review of related actions will likely have dramatic consequences, according to William Buzbee, environmental law professor at Georgetown University.

For example, Trump's executive order requiring agencies to toss at least two rules for every new one could spur a number of lawsuits.

"All regulations have to surmount cost-benefit analysis and found to not be arbitrary and capricious," Buzbee said. "The courts may be very skeptical of such regulatory reversals."

The process to repeal rules can take years, as it requires a full notice and comment process. Agency heads are required to put forth strong evidence that a rule should be repealed, which means making a compelling argument rooted in science and facts, he said.

"Agencies are going to find themselves in a very tough position because they don't want to go to court and be rejected, and on the other hand the president has asked these political appointees to take actions that are vulnerable to challenge," Buzbee said.

"This will set in motion big heated regulatory battles."

Trump has been criticized for not passing any major legislation in his first 100 days. But the White House is stressing the passage of Congressional Review Act resolutions as a major legislative accomplishment (Greenwire, April 5).

White House press secretary Sean Spicer last week reiterated the point.

"As I've mentioned here, we're now at a dozen Congressional Review Act pieces of legislation that have been signed that have had, I think, a very positive impact and will have a very positive impact on job creation," he said at a daily briefing with reporters.

"When you — and I've noted before to you that only one had ever been signed in history before — that's a pretty significant achievement for this president."

'Keep things in perspective'

Jerry Ellig, a senior research fellow with the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, praised Trump's use of the CRA and his regulatory executive orders but questioned the extent of their impact.

"On the other hand, these aren't the things that really fundamentally change the way the regulatory system works, that would require changes to the Administrative Procedure Act," he said.

"The people who love these developments and the people who hate them should both keep things in perspective."

Ellig said he judges a presidential action as significant or important if it affects the entire regulatory system rather than a few regulations and whether the action will last.

"The administration has the opportunity for a much greater accomplishment if senators can agree on some type of a compromise on regulatory reform," he said.

While changes to the regulatory process are a top priority for many Republican lawmakers like Sens. James Lankford of Oklahoma and Rob Portman of Ohio, fewer Democrats focus on the issue — though moderate Sens. Heidi Heitkamp (D-N.D.) and Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.) are working to find a compromise (Greenwire, Feb. 21).

Ellig said the president who likely did the most to change the regulatory system in his first 100 days was Ronald Reagan.

"He required agencies to conduct regulatory impact analysis, analyze problems they're trying to solve, and look at the costs and benefits of alternatives," he said. "And that approach has been durable as evidenced by the fact that it was largely kept in place by Clinton."

Ellig called Trump's two-for-one order a "heck of a surprise." He said if it withstands the test of time, it would be "quite an accomplishment."

Patrick Maney, a professor of history at Boston College, said Trump has used executive orders to attempt to change the regulatory process more than many previous presidents. But he suggested Trump's executive orders pale in comparison to many of his predecessors'.

"Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase, Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, Truman's desegregation of armed forces, Roosevelt's 1942 Japanese internment camps — these were all done through executive orders," he said.

#### Agencies to review 2 less-controversial drilling rules

*GREENWIRE*, April 25

The Trump administration is reconsidering a pair of relatively uncontroversial Interior Department oil and gas rules the Obama administration put into effect during its final days in office.

The regulations — each years in the making — mainly increased oversight of new oil and gas drilling in national wildlife refuges and of existing operations in national parks. After they were proposed, both received far more comments in favor than in opposition, and neither was the subject of a congressional oversight hearing.

But the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service rules were specifically targeted last month in President Trump's executive order on energy, along with two hotly debated Bureau of Land Management regulations on hydraulically fractured wells and methane waste emissions. The Trump administration is already moving to rescind BLM's fracking rule, and a House-passed resolution to overturn the methane regulation is only a few votes short of clearing the Senate.

By contrast, the FWS and NPS rules were opposed mainly by the oil and gas industry, which generally objects to efforts to increase regulations on drilling. And although a pair of oil-friendly House lawmakers introduced resolutions that would roll back the regulations, those have failed to attract much support in either chamber.

Nevertheless, in response to the Trump's decree, an order from Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke gave the directors of FWS and NPS until last week to review the rules and inform the deputy secretary whether they promote energy independence and economic growth. Then by May 9, Zinke's No. 2 is supposed to provide him with a plan detailing how to comply with the energy executive order (E&E News PM, March 29).

The Democratic leaders of the GOP-controlled House Natural Resources Committee last week raised concerns in a letter to Zinke about "the wide-ranging and vague directives in both orders."

Ranking member Raúl Grijalva (D-Ariz.) and the top Democrats on all five of the Natural Resources subcommittees warned that the orders "have the potential to completely upend the way the Department of the Interior manages energy development on public lands, leading to a situation where the desires of fossil fuel developers to use our public lands to mine for coal or drill for oil and gas could dictate Departmental policy."

They requested by Thursday the reports that the FWS and NPS directors provided to the deputy secretary as well as other interim documents called for in the secretarial order. A Democratic spokesman said that, as of this morning, the committee hadn't received any response to the letter.

But a source familiar with the FWS report said it argued that the refuge rule is "in full compliance" with the orders. There is nothing in the rule that could be "construed as being an impediment to energy development and to business."

What the deputy secretary and Zinke do with that information remains to be seen.

### **Refuge rule**

FWS refuge managers have been concerned about the threat that oil and gas operations pose to natural resources since at least 1984, according to the General Accounting Office, a watchdog agency now known as the Government Accountability Office. Drilling can destroy the habitat and contaminate the groundwater that refuges were formed to protect for migratory birds, endangered species and other wildlife (Greenwire, June 12, 2015).

The draft rule FWS put forward sought to reduce those threats while also minimizing its impact on energy companies. It required companies that want to modify their wells or drill new ones to obtain permits from FWS and set new standards for all operations covering everything from waste management to unused infrastructure.

The rule was developed in coordination with NPS so that oil and gas operators would encounter similar standards in both refuges and parks. Unlike the Park Service, however, FWS didn't require operating permits for existing wells because it concluded that new drilling produces the greatest incremental impacts.

Otherwise, the FWS rule could have resulted "in significant administrative and operational costs ... on both the service and the operator," Fish and Wildlife said at the time. "These costs could be disproportional to the environmental benefits gained" (Greenwire, Dec. 10, 2015).

The proposal prompted over 119,000 comments, most of which were form responses in favor of the regulation.

Nevertheless, the oil and gas industry opposed the draft rule, which was finalized the day after Trump's election victory with few substantive changes (Greenwire, Nov. 10, 2016).

In jointly filed comments nine months earlier, the American Petroleum Institute and Independent Petroleum Association of America claimed that the "stringent regulations ... are duplicative of, and inconsistent with, other federal and state laws."

Those arguments were echoed by Rep. Kevin Cramer (R-N.D.), who introduced a resolution mainly supported by fellow Congressional Western Caucus members that would roll back the refuge rule. H.J. Res. 45 is necessary, the caucus argued in an information sheet, because "the new regulations are duplicative and inconsistent with existing regulations that protect the environment."

But that resolution, introduced Jan. 30 with five Republican co-sponsors, has so far failed to gather additional support in the Senate or House. And lawmakers in the upper chamber only have until mid-May to reverse Obama-era rules under the Congressional Review Act (Greenwire, March 31).

Meanwhile, FWS officials have reported few complaints about the oil and gas rule from operators on the ground, where there are already more than 5,000 wells in over 100 refuges.

"The practical effect would be if we get new development," said Mary Maddux, a regional oil and gas specialist based out of Hagerman National Wildlife Refuge in northeastern Texas. "Then a permit and bonding is required. Those operators with existing operations are grandfathered in."

The lack of new development isn't due to the regulation, she added.

"It's mostly because of the price of oil," Maddux said. "Since the slump of last year, the price hasn't come up enough" to make additional drilling worthwhile.

Conservationists believe that, on the merits, the refuge rule should survive the scrutiny of the Trump administration and Congress.

The rule "doesn't unduly burden energy development, and it is necessary to protect and comply with laws passed by Congress to conserve refuge lands and resources," said Mark Salvo, the vice president of landscape conservation at Defenders of Wildlife.

### **Parks rule**

The NPS oil and gas regulation was issued to close a loophole that allowed 60 percent of operators to produce fuels inside the park system with limited agency oversight.

Under the prior standards, the Park Service couldn't regulate wells on the edges of parks or ones that predated its 1978 oil and gas rule. The agency was also limited in how much it could require producers to set aside in bonds to pay for the cleanup of spills.

As a result, pump jack engines in Tennessee's Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area "have caused notable noise at visitor overlooks that are 2 to 3 miles away," NPS said in the proposed rule. "Simple mitigation such as a corrugated steel fence would abate this impact, however, due to the well's grandfathered status; the NPS is unable to require this mitigation and forced to accept this unnecessary impact."

Furthermore, the park system had a bonding gap of over \$12 million, NPS concluded in a cost-benefit analysis that accompanied the draft rule (Greenwire, Oct. 26, 2015).

While the proposal was broadly supported by the public, the fossil fuel industry objected to it for some of the same reasons it fought the FWS proposal.

"The imposition of additional regulations on non-federal oil and gas development within the National Park System is unnecessary, and will only result in duplicative layers of regulatory oversight," the American Petroleum Institute, Independent Petroleum Association of America and two other trade groups said in a comment letter. "Overly burdensome restrictions on the rights of leaseholders to access or otherwise develop mineral rights could also constitute an unconstitutional taking of private property rights."

But the NPS rule was finalized and has since been targeted in the House by the Western caucus.

A resolution from caucus Chairman Paul Gosar (R-Ariz.) seeks to overturn it because "these wells are already subject to existing environmental regulations" and further regulation of them "could result in unconstitutional takings," the group said in an information sheet. But H.J. Res. 46 hasn't moved or picked up any additional co-sponsors since it was unveiled Jan. 30 with the support of six Republicans.

Although the congressional challenge to the update to NPS oil and gas regulations appears stalled, national park advocates are alarmed that the Trump administration is reconsidering it. There are currently fewer than 540 operations in a dozen parks, but 30 additional parks could see drilling if the price of oil increases.

"These commonsense rules do not prohibit development but simply ensure that national parks continue to receive the highest possible level of protection," Nicholas Lund, the National Parks Conservation Association's senior manager for landscape conservation, said in a statement. "We hope Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke, who is now tasked with reviewing the [NPS] rules, recognizes how important they are to the health of our national parks and their visitors and leaves these important measures in place."