

# Winning the West

by David J. Hayes

Progressives have been quietly mounting impressive electoral gains in the American West—territory that conservatives have called their own for some time. With little help from the top of the ticket in 2004, Colorado Democrats won races for the U.S. Senate and a rural congressional district, and took back the state Legislature for the first time in 44 years. Montana, meanwhile, elected a new Democratic governor and a Democratic-controlled Legislature. Popular Democrats also hold the governorships of Arizona, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

Although Western states still deliver some of the nation's biggest Republican margins of victory in presidential races, moderate Democrats are rapidly gaining ground down the ballot. If progressives play it right, more gains are just around the corner—with clear implications for future presidential contests. The West has six of the nation's 10 fastest-growing states, led by Nevada and Arizona.<sup>1</sup> As one commentator recently noted: "When they say now how you've got to win Ohio and Michigan, [you soon will] have to say how you've have to win Arizona, too. Nevada will be [just as important as] Connecticut. ..."<sup>2</sup>

For progressives, winning the West must begin with understanding the West. Progressives need to recognize that the region's history, culture, and personality have been shaped by unique influences. For example, the federal footprint here is far larger than anywhere else in the nation. The U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and

Park Service lands account for more than half of the total land mass of Arizona, Colorado, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The management of these lands and their resources is vitally important to Westerners.

The West also is a place of great physical beauty. Long-time Westerners are proud of the wilderness and wildlife that surrounds them and newcomers are drawn in part by the region's quality of life. Much of the west is dry, however, making water use and development—a non-issue in most of the country—one of the region's top concerns.

Progressives also need to respect the "live and let live" ethic that courses through the blood of long-time Westerners and newcomers alike. As Rep. Mark Udall (D-Colo.) explains: "Westerners want their privacy to be respected and value the right to be left alone."

If more progressives weave these themes into their vision for the West, if they

*“One person with a belief is a social power equal to ninety-nine who have only interests.”*

—John Stuart Mill

## The Progressive Policy Institute

The Progressive Policy Institute is a catalyst for political change and renewal. Its mission is to modernize progressive politics and governance for the 21st century. Moving beyond the left-right debates of the last century, PPI is a prolific source of the Third Way thinking that is reshaping politics both in the United States and around the world.

The PPI invents new ways to advance enduring progressive principles: equal opportunity, mutual responsibility, civic enterprise, public sector reform, national strength, and collective security. Its “progressive market strategy” embraces economic innovation, fiscal discipline, and open markets, while also equipping working families with new tools for success. Its signature policy blueprints include national service, community policing, and a social compact that requires and rewards work; new public schools based on accountability, choice, and customization; a networked government that uses information technology to break down bureaucratic barriers; pollution trading markets and other steps toward a clean energy economy; a citizen-centered approach to universal health care; and a progressive internationalism that commits America’s strength to the defense of liberal democracy.



[www.ppionline.org](http://www.ppionline.org)

Rejecting tired dogmas, PPI brings a spirit of radical pragmatism and experimentation to the challenge of restoring our collective problem-solving capacities—and thereby reviving public confidence in what progressive governance can accomplish.

*The Progressive Policy Institute is a project of the Third Way Foundation.*

demonstrate that they really understand core Western values, then more electoral victories are sure to follow. As other progressives have already shown, they need to stand for sensible development of Western natural resources that respects local values, meets straightforward economic and environmental tests, and protects the interests of future generations. If they do, they will expose the false promise of conservative calls for unbridled resource exploitation and at the same time gain a hearing for their broader agenda of health care, education, jobs, and other quality-of-life issues.

### **The Conservative Appeal to Western Stereotypes**

The conservative political agenda in the West is grounded in hoary stereotypes about the region and its people. In their world view, the West’s natural resources are inexhaustible, exploiting them will produce a bonanza of dollars and jobs (never mind the West’s sad history of “boom and bust” cycles), and federal bureaucrats with title to the land are the only thing blocking that utopian vision from becoming reality. Out of this conservative

world view emerges the stereotypical Western man (and it is unquestionably a “he”)—a rugged, gun-toting individualist who fiercely guards every man’s right to drill, mine, log, or do whatever he damn well pleases on the land; he hates government, taxes, regulations, environmentalists, and anyone or anything else that tries to tell him what to do (provided, of course, that federal subsidies for mining, logging, grazing, and the like continue unabated).

Like Ronald Reagan before him, President Bush has embraced the Western stereotype to the point of adopting some of its affectations—the boots, brush-clearing, and get-the-government-off-our-backs bravado. Indeed, the Bush administration has pushed the conservative agenda in the West harder than many of its strongest supporters ever dreamed. It has worked relentlessly to remove constraints on logging, mining, drilling, and grazing by erasing federal wilderness area designations;<sup>3</sup> broken its promise to maintain protections for roadless areas in national forests;<sup>4</sup> short-circuited environmental reviews that can impede unbridled development of public lands; refused to let conservation groups buy grazing permits to retire overly

stressed public lands;<sup>5</sup> and cut acquisition to add pristine lands to the public estate.<sup>6</sup> Simultaneously, the administration has approved permits for new oil and gas drilling, mining, and grazing at a record pace, often over local objections.<sup>7</sup>

### **Progressives' Alternative Agenda: Taking on Western Issues First**

Westerners resent this paternalistic conservative Republican push to open their lands to intrusive development. They increasingly recognize that their unspoiled mountains, streams, and forests are driving job growth not just in tourism and recreation, but in other service sectors and manufacturing as well.<sup>8</sup> They also recognize that extractive industries that employed large numbers of Westerners in the past are mechanizing their operations and hiring fewer and fewer employees.<sup>9</sup>

At the same time, Westerners resent equally paternalistic liberal Democratic attempts to lock up their lands in perpetuity. In the absence of a credible, non-radical, non-environmentalist Democratic alternative, many can be expected to keep voting Republican, even if they do so unenthusiastically.

Fortunately, moderate Democrats in the West are beginning to develop a platform that can trump the narrow resource-exploitation agenda that conservative Republicans have been riding to success for so long in the region.

In his race for governor of Montana, for example, Brian Schweitzer embraced the state's huge hunting, fishing, and wildlife-watching constituency (an estimated 723,000 of the state's 970,000 residents) and promised to fight to preserve and expand public access to prime hunting lands and fishing streams.<sup>10</sup> He vowed to keep public lands in government hands, to spend more money to maintain them for hunters and anglers, and to buy easements from private

property owners to facilitate public access. Schweitzer had the courage to buck conservative ideology and commit to *public* stewardship of the state's resources.

Other Democrats who have courageously rejected conservative natural resource policies have been rewarded at the ballot box. In Colorado, Ken Salazar successfully ran for the U.S. Senate as a resource pragmatist. As the state's attorney general, he worked with the Clinton administration to create Great Sand Dunes National Park, a move that helped prevent the private export of precious water from his native San Luis Valley, which would have destroyed the area's way of life. It was heresy for conservatives but a good result for Coloradans. Likewise, Salazar worked closely with the Clinton Interior Department to break the deadlock on the over-sized Animas la Plata water project that had bitterly divided Coloradans for decades. Their solution was to shrink the project's scope to fit the needs of local communities in the Four Corners area, while honoring the water rights of the Ute Mountain Ute and Southern Ute Tribes.

Democratic Gov. Bill Richardson of New Mexico has adopted a similar winning approach to energy development on public lands. Like his New Mexican colleagues Sen. Jeff Bingaman and Rep. Tom Udall, Richardson supports expanded oil and gas development on productive federal leases in New Mexico. But when the Bush administration's Bureau of Land Management announced plans to open up the sensitive Otero Mesa to oil and gas drilling, Richardson refused. Some public lands, he said, are simply too sensitive and too important for future generations to be exploited for today's marginal gains. His balanced view of resource development remains true to Western traditions and values.<sup>11</sup>

Democratic Gov. Janet Napolitano of Arizona, meanwhile, intends to focus on the

connection between progressive environmental stewardship and economic growth during her tenure as chair of the Western Governors Association. “My goal over the next year is to convene some of the best and brightest minds to educate and inform Western decisionmakers from the public, private, and nonprofit sectors on steps we can take to ensure that our region’s economic vitality and environmental health are protected and improved,” she noted. “We will examine case studies of successful strategies from around the nation and the world that have helped foster sustainable local economies and a healthy environment.”<sup>12</sup>

## **Promoting a Coherent, Progressive Vision for the West**

As these examples suggest, progressives can break the conservative lock on the West if they adopt an informed, rational, and balanced approach to managing the region’s natural resources. They should not be afraid to say “yes” to resource development when it makes sense and to say “no” when it does not. They should favor the development of domestic energy supplies on public lands on the condition that it proceeds in an environmentally and economically disciplined way. They also should invite more local input in resource management decisions that traditionally have been handled by the federal government alone. Indeed, progressives would go a long way toward enhancing their credibility on Western issues if they fostered a non-adversarial relationship between the federal government and private landowners.

Adhering to the following four common-sense principles would be a good start:

1. Decisions to allow private development on public lands should be guided by the same type of economic considerations that private landowners typically employ.

Simply, parties who seek to lease public lands for private uses or development should be required to show that their proposed activities will generate value for the citizens and taxpayers who own those lands.

2. The federal government should be quicker to allow private development on public lands that have a track record of prudent development and that already have associated infrastructure. In addition, decisions on whether to allow private development on pristine public lands should be subject to a higher standard. Such decisions should be guided by a disciplined analysis of long-term environmental and economic values and informed by public input.
3. Decisions regarding the prudent use of our public lands should be made with broad input, including strong state and local involvement. Progressives should embrace local involvement in public land management rather than recoil from it.
4. Federal authorities should be as flexible as possible when dealing with private landowners and focus on market-based tools and other incentives to maintain wildlife habitat and working landscapes.

By following these principles, progressives can regain the trust and support of the vast majority of Western voters who love the land and want it managed responsibly for their own benefit as well as that of generations to come.

## **Demand Value for Private Use of Public Land**

Most of America’s public land has always been available for grazing, logging, mining, and other economic uses. In the early days

of the Republic, we virtually handed it over to railroads and other private enterprises to encourage settlement and investment in the then-frontier West. The Mining Act of 1872 exemplified this early give-away mentality. It encouraged private parties to make mineral claims on public lands with minimal investment and allowed them to extract valuable resources without paying any royalties to taxpayers. The federal government similarly allowed ranchers to use public lands for cattle grazing, demanding little or nothing in return.

The policies worked well in attracting early settlers to the forbidding frontier. Yet these 19th century practices persist today, when Americans flock to the fast-growing western states to enjoy its amenities—not to take advantage of anachronistic government give-aways.

It is time to bring our federal land-use policies into the 21st century. The taxpayers who own our public land are entitled to returns from those who would use it for private gain. Proposed uses of public land should not be allowed if they cannot generate value for citizens and taxpayers.

Private logging in our national forests is a prime example. The U.S. Forest Service now spends so much to maintain roads for private logging operations that we are actually subsidizing logging in our forests. This money-losing proposition makes no sense. Future contracts for timber cuts in our national forests should take account of road maintenance and other real administrative costs of private logging activities. The contracts should also reflect the value of the extracted public resource.

Likewise, it makes no sense in this day and age to allow hard rock mining on federal lands that provides taxpayers with no financial return for extracted resources. The Mining Act of 1872 should be amended to provide taxpayers with a fair return and to require leasees to address the environmental damage that their mining activity causes.

Similarly, federal land managers should make parties who are taking federally provided water and power supplies, or who are leasing federal lands, fully accountable for those activities' true costs. Taxpayers should not be presumed simply to foot the bill for such subsidized benefits, much less for damages caused by such activities.<sup>13</sup> When subsidized power contracts come up for renewal or when new public power deals are struck, the starting assumption should be that use of public resources should return market rates to the government. Progressives also should ask whether we should continue to subsidize federal water supplies in the face of a developing water market that commands much higher prices.

Such policies will inject badly needed economic discipline into land-use decisions. They will also expose the hypocrisy of many conservatives who claim they want to "get government off our backs" yet balk at eliminating government giveaways to private interests.

## Set Higher Standards for Developing Pristine Lands

There is a heated debate in the West today about opening up untouched public lands for private uses. The Bush administration, for example, is pushing hard to allow oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It also has awarded oil and gas leases in many pristine parts of the intermountain West and reversed the Clinton administration's protection of roadless areas in national forests.<sup>14</sup> Conservatives justify such steps by repeating their standard mantra that more drilling, logging, mining, and the like on public lands is better than letting the land sit idle. Bush administration officials defend their actions by saying that they are simply doing what the law allows.

A "just following the rules" excuse cannot justify irresponsible behavior. Conservatives

assume that leasing is always the best option because the government will, at minimum, get lease payments and even heftier royalty payments in addition if production ensues. But today, three-quarters of the land that has been leased for oil and gas exploration is not in production.<sup>15</sup> The RAND Corporation recently concluded that only a small percentage of oil and gas supplies from environmentally sensitive areas in the intermountain West can be marketed profitably due to the costs associated with energy production and transportation.<sup>16</sup> It cautioned that many of the public lands being eyed for oil and gas leasing in this region may lack the infrastructure needed to make oil and gas extraction worthwhile.<sup>17</sup>

Environmental concerns about opening up remote, untouched lands for oil and gas drilling also get short shrift under current leasing procedures. They are often addressed in connection with the updating of land management plans that can occur years apart from leasing decisions. As a result of this mismatch, public input on the environmental consequences of leasing is minimal or nonexistent. For example, the U.S. Forest Service recently approved a plan to lease 157,000 acres of the Bridger-Teton National Forest, including 92,000 acres of roadless land, for oil and gas drilling “without any public comments, relying on an environmental analysis and a forest plan that were both more than a decade out of date.”<sup>18</sup>

Progressives can seize the high ground in this debate by demanding a higher standard of review for proposed development in environmentally sensitive areas. Such reviews should weigh the environmental effects of development against leasing’s potential economic returns to the government. They should also examine the land’s characteristics (e.g., roaded or unroaded, the presence of wilderness, proximity to existing oil and gas operations, etc.) and

spell out exactly what sort of new infrastructure will be needed to develop the resource. The reviews should be published in a clear, straightforward manner to facilitate public input and, ultimately, a well-reasoned outcome. And where leasing is appropriate, sensible conditions should be attached to the privilege to use the public lands, including commitments to address environmental damage to federal lands through investments in mitigation—to clean up abandoned mines, for example.<sup>19</sup>

By insisting on a more rigorous, common-sense standard, progressives can show Westerners that they value our most environmentally sensitive lands deeply and yet can support their development, provided it makes sense economically, environmentally, and from the point of view of the citizens closest to the issue.

Progressives should also adopt a corollary principle, namely, that some public lands that are so special that it is appropriate to “just say no” to their development.

Today, for instance, we are all grateful that the Marble Canyon and Bridge Canyon Dams were never built in the middle of the Grand Canyon and that Yosemite Valley was never flooded. Likewise, no one today questions the decision to protect Yellowstone National Park rather than develop its prodigious geothermal resources. The same holds true for Montana’s Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, which was targeted for oil and gas drilling in the early 1980s, and, yes, the sensitive coastal plain in the remote and untouched Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

No amount of economic gain can justify the exploitation of such special places. It is appropriate, of course, to have a national debate on which of our public lands fall into this special category. But there should be no doubt that not all of God’s creation should be subject to short-term economic gain at the expense of the timeless values found in magnificent wild landscapes.

## Embrace Local Input Into Land Management Decisions

Conservatives claim they favor more local input in Western land-use decisions. Yet, in practice, they welcome such involvement only when it serves their purposes.

For example, the Bush administration reversed popular rules that protected roadless areas in national forests from further development partly on the grounds that governors should have more control over how those forests are managed. It then established complex procedures that have discouraged governors from providing input, while also making it clear that the administration reserves the right to reject any recommendations they might make.<sup>20</sup> This is part of the administration's pattern of paying lip service to local interests and then ignoring them when they do not match up with the administration's objectives.<sup>21</sup>

Many progressives, meanwhile, tend to believe that federal authorities should make all decisions regarding the use of public lands because they are owned by all Americans. They go through the motions of soliciting local opinion but in the end take the course that they think is best, regardless of what the locals say.

Progressives will never win the West if they continue on this path. They need to have enough confidence in their beliefs to open them up to true collaborative decision-making.<sup>22</sup>

Progressives should welcome rather than resist state and local participation in the management of public lands. Ranchers, anglers, hunters, hikers, and others close to the land know it better than anyone else. They need to be part of the process, not bystanders. Federal register announcements and requests for comment do not cut it. The Interior and Agriculture Departments should take advantage of their decentralized structures and empower their Western

representatives to engage in dialogue with interested parties rather than continuing their top-down management style that has rankled Westerners for so long.

Clearly, progressives should not abdicate decision-making to local power brokers who may have their own economically motivated agendas.<sup>23</sup> But it is equally inexcusable for progressives to cling to a Washington-is-always-right model. Sen. Harry Reid (D-Nev.) and Rep. Udall showed the way by championing the passage of legislation last year that reaffirmed the primary role that states have in regulating wildlife hunting and fishing within their borders. Progressives need to lean more in this direction in the future, rather than retreating to the comfort of a federally biased perspective on resource issues.

## Be as Flexible with Private Landowners as Possible

Conservatives perpetuate the myth that the federal government has no respect for property rights and constantly cooks up new ways to restrict how Westerners use their land. They say it introduces wolves that destroy livestock, uses the Endangered Species Act to render ranching and other uses of private property illegal, and takes private land for national parks or monuments. This myth has taken hold in the West, and progressives need to take it head on.

They can do so by celebrating the role that private landowners play in the West's culture and in preserving its wildlife habitat. Rather than pick fights with landowners, progressives should reach out to maintain their landscapes. Yes, some disagreements over wetlands, endangered species, and water quality may be unavoidable. But it is counterproductive to approach these issues from an enforcement-first perspective.

Reforming how we achieve the Endangered Species Act's goals is a good place

to start. The Clinton administration demonstrated that many private landowners will embrace voluntary species-preservation plans that allow them to continue working their land.<sup>24</sup> Similarly, many farmers and ranchers are preserving wetlands with grants from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and with related assistance from the federal farm bill.<sup>25</sup> And just around the corner, the need to address global climate change will likely give landowners opportunities to earn money by sequestering carbon through sound farming, ranching, and forest management practices.<sup>26</sup>

Progressives need to lead the way toward win-win solutions that satisfy environmental

imperatives and meet landowner needs. They have a shared interest with Westerners in conserving landscapes and protecting water supplies. This is a sensible path that will lead to success at the polls.<sup>27</sup>

## **Conclusion**

If progressives follow these four principles, they will find allies among Western voters who want sensible resource management and are troubled by the Bush administration's over-the-top pursuit of more logging, drilling, mining, and the like. To win the West, they must reclaim the mantle of pragmatic, principled leadership.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> “Six of the top 10 states forecast to have the fastest-growing populations on a percentage basis through 2030 are in the West. Census Bureau projections released Thursday predict that between 2000 and 2030, Nevada’s population will grow 114 percent to 4.3 million, Arizona will grow 108 percent to 10.7 million, Utah will grow 56 percent to 3.5 million, Idaho will grow 52 percent to 2 million, Washington will grow 46 percent to 8.6 million and Oregon will grow 41 percent to 4.8 million.” (Smith, Christopher, “Water Worries Won’t Slow Western Growth,” *Associated Press*, April 22, 2005.)

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Here, Christopher Smith, quotes Robert Lang, director of the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech and author of *Edgeless Cities*.

<sup>3</sup> In a friendly settlement with the State of Utah, Secretary Norton unilaterally revoked the designation of large segments of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands as having wilderness quality. The Interior Department subsequently removed this designation from other BLM lands and included some of these lands in lease sales. (Jenkins, Matt, “Wilderness Takes a Massive Hit,” *High Country News*, April 28, 2003, [http://www.hcn.org/servlets/hcn.Article?article\\_id=13907](http://www.hcn.org/servlets/hcn.Article?article_id=13907).)

<sup>4</sup> Reese, April, “Western Governors Wary of Roadless Forest Mess,” *High Country News*, July 25, 2005, [http://www.hcn.org/servlets/hcn.Article?article\\_id=15653](http://www.hcn.org/servlets/hcn.Article?article_id=15653).

<sup>5</sup> As *New York Times* columnist John Tierney points out, the administration purports to favor market-based environmental policies, but apparently not when powerful supporters want continued, low-cost access to public lands. (Tierney, John, “Let the Lovers of the Land Decide Its Uses,” reprinted from *The New York Times* in *The Arizona Republic*, August 3, 2005.)

<sup>6</sup> Rogers, Paul, “Bush Takes Heat for Conservation Record,” *San Jose Mercury News*, April 22, 2004.

<sup>7</sup> “Several cases over the past few years suggest that the administration is taking a selective approach to weighing public comment on issues ranging from forest management to wildlife protections to energy development, critics say. ... In rejecting a popular plan that called for drilling near the base of the [Roan] plateau [near Rifle, Colorado] and leaving the top development-free, BLM ignored the will of residents and local officials, [Clare Bastable] said ... Similar charges have been levied against the administration for pursuing a plan to drill thousand of new gas wells in the Powder River Basin in Montana and Wyoming [where ranchers are opposed to such drilling].” (“Despite ‘Four C’s’, Interior gives public opinion short shrift, critics charge,” *Greenwire*, October 2, 2003.)

<sup>8</sup> For example: “Prosperity in the 21st Century West: The Role of Protected Public Lands,” The Sonoran Institute, July 2004, <http://www.sonoran.org>.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* Power, Thomas Michael, “The Changing Economic Role of Natural Landscapes in the West: Moving Beyond an Extractive and Tourist Perspective, 31 *Envtl. L. Rep.* 10438, April 2001. (“The current role of these natural resource industries in the Mountain West economics is actually quite small and declining ... farming, ranching, mining and metal processing, and forest products directly provide less than 4% of total employment in the Mountain West states.”)

<sup>10</sup> Sirota, David, “Top Billings,” *The Washington Monthly*, December 2004.

<sup>11</sup> Gov. Bill Richardson said: “This administration’s energy priorities are all wrong. Although Westerners support energy development, and provide this Nation with most of its domestic energy, the administration is running roughshod over the locals again. These are places that should be protected for other values such as groundwater, hunting and fishing, and ranching. We will fight this proposal.” (Gov. Bill Richardson, quoted in Capitol Reports “News Link,” June 9, 2005.)

<sup>12</sup> “Western Governors Elect Napolitano Chair, Rounds Vice Chair and Adopt Policy Resolutions,” press release, Western Governors Association, June 14, 2003, <http://www.westgov.org/wga/press/resos05.htm>.

<sup>13</sup> It may not be appropriate to put renewals of all grazing leases to a straight economic test. Many ranchers have made investments over the years based on an assumption that they would continue to have low cost access to public lands; leasing cost adjustments need to take into account the equities of these traditional understandings. In addition, however, Congress should adopt legislation that provides ranchers with the option of having their leases bought out, so that damaged rangelands can be retired from grazing with minimal disruption, through the operation of the marketplace and private philanthropy. The administration’s resistance to this market-based approach provides another example of its preference for currying political support from the large ranchers who benefit most from the status quo, rather than taking a more open, market-based approach to managing public resources that it espouses, hypocritically, in other contexts.

<sup>14</sup> For example: Warrick, Joby and Juliet Eilperin, "Oil and Gas Hold the Reins in the Wild West," *The Washington Post*, September 25, 2004, p. A01, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A48739-2004Sep24.html>.

<sup>15</sup> The BLM has reported that approximately 41 million acres of public lands are under lease for oil and gas development. Currently, only about one-fourth of those acres are in production, leaving approximately 30 million acres leased, but idle.

<sup>16</sup> "RAND: Economics—Not Federal Drilling Bans—Limit Western Oil, Gas Potential," *Energy Daily*, March 18, 2002.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Jenkins, Matt, "Energy Companies Rush the West," *High Country News*, September 27, 2004.

<sup>19</sup> Hayes, David, "Domestic Oil and Gas Production: Pursuing a Principles Approach," Progressive Policy Institute, June 2002, <http://ppionline.org>; Mazurek, Jan and Tom Mirga, "Four Ideas for the Next Four Years," Progressive Policy Institute, December 2004, pp. 21-22, <http://ppionline.org>.

<sup>20</sup> "Western Governors Wary of Roadless Forest Mess," *op. cit.*

<sup>21</sup> While the Bush administration frequently espouses the notion of locally driven decisionmaking when it comes to managing public lands, the administration has been quick to remove locals from the process when their aims do not mesh with the administration's desires. The Alaska Native Gwich'in Nation, for example, whose culture revolves around the Arctic caribou migration is dead set against oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, but the Bush administration conveniently chooses to address the oil drilling issue in the Refuge as a national—and not a local—issue. Likewise, strong local questioning of oil and gas drilling in the Otero Mesa region of New Mexico has received short shrift from the Bush administration because it does not mesh with the administration's relentless "more drilling" policy approach on the public lands. Reese, April, *op. cit.* Rogers, Paul, *op. cit.* "Prosperity in the 21st Century West," *op. cit.*

<sup>22</sup> Mazurek, Jan and Tom Mirga, *op. cit.*

<sup>23</sup> The *Salt Lake Tribune* editorialized on the point that local control of the National Forests is not appropriate: "The national forests are, after all, owned by all Americans, not merely those who stand to gain economically or politically from logging. Replacing the roadless rule with this policy would put wild, backcountry forests under control of local politicians who would be tirelessly pressured by commercial logging companies to turn their backs while the forests are turned into so many board-feet of lumber." ("America's Forests," editorial, *Salt Lake Tribune*, A12, July 14, 2004, <http://www.sltrib.com>.) Making a similar point from a historical perspective, Wallace Stegner, in his classic biography of John Wesley Powell described Powell's philosophy on the private use of public lands as follows: "He [Powell] would have said, undoubtedly, in 1953 as in 1889, that there are values too critical and resources too perishable to be entrusted entirely to private exploitation. ... He would have said that the future has a claim on us. He would have said that on the evidence of several generations of exploitative freedom no one could guarantee the future its share of the American earth except the American government." (Stenger, Wallace, "Beyond the Hundred Meridian," Penguin, 1992.)

<sup>24</sup> Mazurek, Jan and Tom Mirga, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.

<sup>25</sup> "Senators Look to Farm Bill Programs for Species Conservation," *Greenwire*, July 28, 2005.

<sup>26</sup> Hayes, David and Gertler, Nicholas, "The Role of Carbon Sequestration in the U.S. Response to Climate Change," *Environmental Law Reporter*, November 2002, <http://www.eli.org/pdf/32.11350.pdf>.

<sup>27</sup> Polls uniformly demonstrate that these values are, in fact, broadly shared across the west. Recent statewide polls in Idaho, for example, found that more Idahoans "want wolves in the backcountry than not (about 42% to 40%), 54% want action on air pollution, and 55% support restoration of salmon runs." (Ring, Ray, "Conservationist in a Conservative Land: A New Dialogue in Idaho," *High Country News*, November 22, 2004, [http://www.hcn.org/servlets/hcn.Article?article\\_id=15130](http://www.hcn.org/servlets/hcn.Article?article_id=15130).)

