June 27, 2017

Monument Review
MS-1530
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240

RE: Comment Submission in Response to Review of Certain National Monuments Established Since 1996; specifically regarding the Ironwood Forest National Monument; DOI-2017-0002-0001; submitted electronically

The Pima Natural Resource Conservation District (District) appreciates President Trump’s Executive Order to review National Monuments created since 2000. Herein, we provide comment specifically regarding the Ironwood Forest National Monument (IFNM).

In summary, the District believes Proclamation 7320 is illegal and must be repealed. We also request a full restoration of pre-IFNM grazing allotment preferences and classifications, and full restoration of the Tejon Pass and Morningstar Allotments to their pre-1991 perennial-ephemeral grazing preference classification. We further request that the BLM immediately allow District cooperators in the IFNM to implement EQIP-funded improvements and other conservation projects.

The District believes that some areas of the IFNM are worthy of consideration for reasonable protections of nature and habitat, but since Proclamation 7320 is illegal, it must be repealed.
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About the Pima Natural Resource Conservation District

In 1942, the Arizona State Legislature created 32 Natural Resource Conservation Districts, including the Pima Natural Resource Conservation District. The Districts continue to be governed under Chapter 6 of Title 37 of the Arizona Revised Statutes.
Each District is structured as a hybrid of a state agency funded under the State Lands Natural Resources Division and as an independent local unit of Arizona government. Each District’s Board of Supervisors consists of both elected and Governor-appointed Supervisors. The expertise of Pima NRCD and all other Natural Resource Conservation Districts in Arizona, is recognized by Arizona statute 37-1054 (A) as follows:

“This state recognizes the special expertise of the districts in the fields of land, soil, water and natural resources management within the boundaries of the district.”

The District works together with and represents “cooperators” who are persons having natural resources under their control and who have each voluntarily signed an agreement to pursue soil and water conservation efforts in cooperation with the District.

The District’s geographical boundaries roughly encompass all areas of Pima County excluding the Tohono O’Odham Nation’s reservation lands. The District covers 2.14 million acres of land covering the eastern half of Pima County and a small area of land in extreme southern Pinal County between the western edge of the Los Robles Archaeological District and Interstate 10.

The District overlaps 92,752 acres of BLM lands within IFNM and a total 148,939 acres and under any surface ownership within the monument. (Personal communication with Francisco Mendoza, BLM TFO See: Attachment 1, surface management map for the District).

Response to Executive Order 13792 as it Applies to the Ironwood Forest National Monument

The Ironwood Forest National Monument is Eligible for Review under EO 13792

We are exceptionally grateful for the national monument review and the opportunity to submit comments with full confidence that these comments will be thoughtfully considered.

Section 2 of Executive Order 13792 (EO 13792) expresses three preliminary criteria for a national monument to be eligible for review under the EO.

1. Presidential designations or expansions of designations under the Antiquities Act were made since January 1, 1996.

The Ironwood Forest National Monument (IFNM) is eligible for Secretarial review under the post-1996 time constraint because it was designated by President Clinton on June 9, 2000. (Presidential Proclamation 7320, June 9, 2000).

2. The designation covers more than 100,000 acres, or where the designation after expansion covers more than 100,000 acres.
The IFNM is eligible for review under the minimum size constraint because it consists of 128,917 or 128,068 (depending on source) acres of federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management. In addition to federal lands, the outer perimeter of the IFNM encompasses 54,697 acres of Arizona State School Trust lands and 6,012 acres of private lands for a total of 189,731 acres. (Presidential Proclamation 7320, June 9, 2000; Tersey et al. 2001, IFNM Pre-plan analysis)

3. Where the Secretary determines that the designation or expansion was made without adequate public outreach and coordination with relevant stakeholders,

Under the third criteria, the IFNM is absolutely eligible for Secretarial review. In 2000, the District had at least four or five cooperators who owned private land inholdings and/or State grazing leases within the IFNM.

None of the District’s cooperators received any notification concerning a proposed monument designation prior to March 21, 2000. The local news media kept the monument plan secret until after Interior Secretary Babbitt attended the Pima County Board of Supervisors earlier that morning and witnessed, by his signature, their resolution to request President Clinton designate a national monument (See: Attachment 2).

The request was noncompliant with the Antiquities Act because 95 percent of the area Pima County requested for a national monument contains no historical, archaeological or paleontological objects.

Nonetheless, their request included only Ragged Top Mountain, which covers an area of about ten square miles in the Silverbell Mountains— roughly 1/30th of the area now enclosed within the perimeter of the IFNM.

The news media photographers had obviously known the County would make such a request a day or more earlier when reporters photographed Secretary Babbitt secretly meeting and hiking areas of the IFNM with lobbyists for the local chapters of tax-exempt environmentalist NGOs.

Google searches conducted immediately following the March 21 request revealed the mainstream news media had neither printed nor broadcast a single word of the secret national monument proposal before March 21.

The District, to the contrary, received no prior notification whatsoever of the County’s plan to request a national monument. In fact, some Pima NRCD supervisors at that time were also serving on Pima County’s Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan Steering Committee, and yet none were informed prior to March 21, 2000 of the plan that was underway to request a national monument.

Claims in the news media and NGO press releases afterward, stating that “the ranchers” had previously supported the monument designation, were false. The environmentalist
NGOs used an environmentalist inholder, who had no cattle or grazing permit, as their alleged “rancher” who supported the monument designation.

Public notice simply did not exist, other than perhaps its burial amidst the minimum legally required Board of Supervisors agenda that was posted 24 hours before the meeting.

Neither the Department of Interior nor the Pima County Board of Supervisors made any prior effort whatsoever to inform any of the people who were most likely to be harmed, that a monument designation was being discussed. The vested stakeholders included State and private inholders of more than 60,000 acres of land; ten cattle ranches including at least four Pima NRCD cooperators and the ASARCO Silverbell copper mine.

The Bureau of Land Management made no effort whatsoever to coordinate with the Pima NRCD with regard to the proposed monument. To the contrary, during the later planning period when the Pima NRCD approached the BLM about formal coordination on IFNM, we were given a negative response in violation of NEPA and FLPMA.

4. Each designation or expansion must conform to the policy set forth in section 1 of the Executive order. (EO 13792 Section 2 (a))

Proclamation 7320 is illegal and must be repealed.

Section 1 of EO 13792 states,

Section 1. Policy. Designations of national monuments under the Antiquities ... are a means of stewarding America's natural resources, protecting America's natural beauty, and preserving America's historic places. ...

The Antiquities Act specifies that the President of the United States may declare, by proclamation, “historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest.

Nowhere in the original Antiquities Act is the intent or purpose of the Act described as, “a means of stewarding America's natural resources” or “protecting America's natural beauty.” Certain laws can achieve such goals, but the Antiquities Act is not among them. As shown in attachment, the Antiquities Act as stated in Chapter 3060, Session I of the 59th Congress is,

“An Act for the preservation of American antiquities.”

Therefore, it is outside the intent of the 59th Congress to apply the Antiquities Act for any purpose other than the preservation and protection of historic and prehistoric antiquities.

The Act specifically protects,

“... any historic or prehistoric ruin or monument, or any object of antiquity;” and,
“... historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, or other objects of historic or scientific interest.” (See: Attachment 3. Chapter 3060 of the 59th Congress, Antiquities Act of 1906)

In the context of the Antiquities Act, its stated purpose, and the intent of the 59th Congress, the word, “scientific” must be interpreted to include objects of historical, archaeological, or paleontological scientific interest. The purpose of the Act does not, however, suggest so broad a definition as to include “biodiversity,” common geological or biological features that can be found all over the Southwest, and least of all, “quintessential views.”

If that is what the 59th Congress had intended, the original Lacey bill for the preservation of antiquities—first introduced in 1900 and reintroduced in 1904—would have passed. The fact is that Congress rejected the nature conservation authorities that were written into both bills. Not until Senator Lacey introduced a much narrower antiquities protection bill in 1906—with the earlier nature conservation clauses stripped out of it—did the Antiquities Act of 1906 become law. (See: pp. 290-293 in Attachment 4: Sellars, Richard W., A Very Large Array: Early Federal Historic Preservation—The Antiquities Act, Mesa Verde, and the National Park Service Act” Natural Resources Journal, Spring 2007; pp. 268-328) Proclamation 7320 seeks to protect and conserve nature, but the Antiquities Act was the wrong vehicle for that purpose because it does not grant such authority.

Moreover, no law authorizes the Secretary of the Interior or the Pima County Board of Supervisors to encourage the President of the United States to violate the intent of Congress when invoking the Antiquities Act or any other law.

Under the “arbitrary and capricious” standard set out by the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. § 706. Aluminum Co. of America v. Bonneville Power Admin., 175 F.3d 1156, 1160 (9th Cir.1999), a court shall “hold unlawful and set aside agency action … found to be … arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” 5 U.S.C. 706(2)(A); see also Center for Biological Diversity v. Kempthorne, 466 F.3d 1098, 1103 (9th Cir.2006). “An agency decision will be found to be arbitrary or capricious if the agency has relied on factors which Congress had not intended it to consider, entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence before the agency, or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or the product of agency expertise.”

In short, Proclamation 7320 is illegal and must be repealed.

Re: EO 13792 Section (2)(i)—The IFNM exceeds, by 115,537 acres, authority of the Antiquities Act.

The Ironwood Forest National Monument consists of 128,917 acres of BLM land, but its official boundary encloses more than 54,000 additional acres of State land and more
than 6,000 acres of additional private inholdings, for a total of more than 189,000 acres enclosed within the outer perimeter of the monument. In contrast, the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the identified objects that are eligible for protection under the Antiquities Act is three separate parcels totaling 13,380 acres, of which a mere 80 acres are on federal land.

These areas include the following:

- The Los Robles Archaeological District—13,000 acres; and
- The Cocoraque Butte Archaeological District—300 acres; and
- The Mission Santa Ana del Chiquiburitac (cheeky-bur-r–EE-talk)—80 acres.

The first two antiquities above are on State and private lands. All three were previously protected under the National Historic Preservation Act and listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Re: EO 13792 Section (2)(ii)—Proclamation 7320 protects objects that are ineligible under the Antiquities Act.

Objects apparently identified for protection in Proclamation 7320 include the following:

1. Stands of ironwood trees, palo verde trees, and saguaro cacti
2. The Monument floor
3. Rugged mountain ranges
4. The Silverbell Mountains
5. Ragged Top Mountain, described as “a crown jewel”
6. Depositional plains
7. A quintessential view of the Sonoran Desert
8. Ancient legume and cactus forests
9. Geologic and topologic variability
10. Ironwood trees that allegedly can live to be more than 800 years old (See Arizona Sonora Desert Museum [https://www.desertmuseum.org/programs/ifnm_ironwoodtree.php]). The wood is so dense and hard, second only to ebony, that standard tree ring counting is precluded by the inability to drill cores (pers. Communication with University of Arizona tree ring laboratory).
11. An understory of plants beneath the ironwood trees
12. The highest density of ironwood trees recorded in the Sonoran desert
   (Note: This is not true for the entire monument. There are areas within
   the monument with very low ironwood density.)
13. Roosting sites for hawks and owls
14. Forage for desert bighorn sheep
15. Flowers
16. Dense canopy
17. White winged doves
18. Other birds
19. Night blooming cereus cactus
20. Ironwood-bursage habitat
21. “674 species including 64 mammals and 57 birds.” [Note: The last figure
   is inaccurate. 176 bird species have been documented where Sasco Lane
   crosses the Santa Cruz River-(See Cornell Laboratory of Ornithology
   “hotspots” at ebird.org).]
22. Nichol’s Turks’ head cactus, listed as an endangered species (found on
   private land)
23. One lone lesser long-nose bat (a dubiously listed “endangered” species)
   that had been documented in the Monument prior to the Proclamation
24. One lone cactus-ferruginous pygmy owl that had been documented in the
   Monument prior to the Proclamation (CFPO, a dubiously listed
   “endangered” species that was later delisted by court order. The species
   is abundant from northern Mexico to Venezuela). From the description of
   that lone owl’s extremely unusual flight pattern, however, it could be
   reasonably suspected that this particular owl specimen may have been
   sitting inside a moving aircraft when its presence in IFNM was first
   recorded.
25. “The desert bighorn sheep in the monument may be the last viable population
   indigenous to the Tucson basin.” (Since 2000, however, a thriving population
   of bighorn sheep has been translocated and recovered in the Catalina
   Mountains; and the Silverbell herd of bighorn sheep has expanded southward
   into the Tucson Mountains and Coyote Hills.)
26. 200 sites from the prehistoric Hohokam period (600 A.D. to 1450 A.D.) “in
    the area.” [Note: The most significant of these occur on State and private
lands. Proclamation 7320 fails to define what constitutes a “site.” For all we know, a “site” could be the location of a single chipped stone or potsherd. Apparently none of these 200 “sites” was important enough to describe.

Proclamation 7320 fails to mention whether these 200 “sites” are included within the three sites in the National Register of Historic Places or if they are mentioned in addition to them. The 200 “sites” therefore cannot be considered covered antiquities because none are specifically identified, described or measured.]

27. The 13,000-acre Los Robles Archeological District [on Arizona State School Trust lands.]

28. The 300-acre Cocoraque Butte Archeological District [on private land].

29. The remnants of the 80-acre Mission Santa Ana del Chiquiburitaq, [allegedly] the last mission constructed in Pimeria Alta. [The mission site was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1975. The mission site is on federal land.

As shown in Figures 1 and 2, the “remnants” are nothing but a piece of ground with flat rubble outlines of completely dissolved adobe buildings, dozens of miles away from any safe or minimally maintained road.

The mission site is in an extremely remote area where motorists have become fatally stranded and desperate calls to 9-1-1 could not be triangulated to their location, even after 18 hours. (personal experience of the writer as former Search and Rescue volunteer)].

Figure 1. Remnants of Mission Santa Ana del Chiquiburitaq, looking South
Of the 29 “objects” listed above, only the three areas previously listed on the National Register of Historic Places, measuring a total of 13,380 acres, can be considered legitimate antiquities consistent with the intent of the 57th Congress in passing the Act in 1906. Of those, only the Santa Ana mission site is on federal land.

The omission of numerous objects that are eligible for protection under Proclamation 7320 is revealing.

Proclamation 7320 ironically omits mention of any and all legitimate antiquities connected with American history, Arizona history, mining history, ranching history, or any significant historical person of European, African or Asian ancestry.

• The Silverbell Mine has been operating since 1858 and many related historic artifacts, ghost towns and other sites in the Silverbell District remain, but Proclamation 7320 ignores them.

• The SASCO (Southern Arizona Smelting Company) ghost mill town, once home to 5,000 residents, the mill town of Peltonville, and the old Southern Pacific railway bed from Red Rock to the Silverbell Mine (1906-1932)–all are entirely ignored in the Proclamation. Three historic cemeteries likewise are unmentioned.

• Iconic working historic cattle ranches originally founded by one of the Tucson Rodeo founders, Jack Kinney, and others founded by the pioneering Aguirre family, the Samaniego family, and the Robles family–all of which are within the Ironwood Forest National Monument–are all unmentioned in Proclamation 7320.
• A Civil War Buffalo soldier troop encampment site inside the monument is unmentioned.

• Proclamation 7320 entirely ignores the De Anza trail that is either adjacent to or within the monument boundaries. On that trail, in 1774, Juan Batista De Anza successfully led—without a single life lost—some 240 men, women, and children on an epic 1,200-mile journey to establish the first Spanish settlement at San Francisco Bay. He also led, over that trail, the California cattle industry’s first livestock herd. The Proclamation entirely ignores this historic event.

• The historic Aguirre mule cargo trail from Red Rock to the Silverbell mine also is ignored.

The aforementioned omissions provide evidence of what appears to be a deliberate effort to abuse the Antiquities Act for the explicit and ironic purpose of forgetting, diluting and even erasing America’s and Arizona’s heritage; to dilute and marginalize American history by protecting countless landscapes and objects having no historical significance; to curtail and destroy the legitimate livelihoods and personal heritage of law-abiding citizens; to prohibit or substantially curtail sustainable economic activities on private, state and federal lands; and to create a new excuse to nationalize private properties and valuable State lands that could otherwise fund Arizona’s K-12 education and the School for the Deaf and Blind. (See: Attachment 5. Map of Arizona State School Trust fund beneficiaries by parcel.)

The forgotten vested stakeholders, ironically, are the living legacy and vested stewards of Arizona’s rich history and “5-Cs” heritage.

Bottom line, the Antiquities Act must be reserved exclusively for the most significant historical sites. Otherwise, such sites and the heritage they preserve will lose the prominence they deserve.

EO 13792 Section (2)(iii): Negative economic impacts of Proclamation 7320 on available uses of federal lands inside and outside the Monument boundaries

Negative economic impacts of the Proclamation 7320 on federal lands include the following:

1. Withdrawal of unclaimed minerals from federal lands within the Monument boundaries. Proclamation 7320 significantly reduced the life expectancy of the Silverbell mine. The District is unaware, however, of any objective, scientific estimate of the economic losses. In 2000, the mine had recently completed a multi-million-dollar renovation, however, an investment decision that was made without foreknowledge of Proclamation 7320.
2. Loss of access to the federal surface overlying valuable patented private and State-owned minerals extending beneath the federal surface. Inability to disturb the federal surface for mining precludes access to those minerals. Nobody was compensated for his or her mineral losses due to precluded access. Any such private properties that were patented after 1984 are additionally zoned “Government Reserve” by Pima County and cannot be developed at all.

3. Two IFNM grazing allotments were arbitrarily subjected to unjustified season-only use restrictions in the IFNM Resource Management Plan (RMP). The BLM has published guidelines for the conditions under which a grazing allotment will be restricted to ephemeral season use. Ephemeral status allows zero year-round AUMs. As shown in attachment, the ephemeral classification is reserved for allotments with poor soils, poor plant productivity, and rainfall less than 8” per year. (See: Attachment 6. Appendix F of IFNM September 2011 PRMP/FEIS. The final Appendix F was not found due to many former links on the BLM website now being broken)

The IFNM RMP made permanent the apparently illegal October 15, 1991 downgrades of the Tejon Pass and Morningstar grazing allotments from perennial to ephemeral preference, in opposition to the BLM’s own guidelines and allotment range health evaluations. (See: Special Ephemeral Rule (Federal Register, Vol. 33, No. 238, December 7, 1968)

As shown in Attachment 6, the BLM admits the Morningstar and Tejon pass allotments “no longer” qualify for the downgrades. The BLM stated that dishonestly because the allotments never qualified as ephemeral per the BLM’s own published criteria.

In fact, the Morningstar allotment contains most of Ragged Top Mountain, the biodiversity of which is, according to Proclamation 7320, the “crown jewel” of the entire monument. According to the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum,

“The flora of Ragged Top (including Wolcott Peak) in 9.9 mi² (Wiens 2000, this study) includes 401 taxa, 71.6% of the total IFNM flora. The steep rugged, shady canyons on Ragged Top support a remarkably diverse flora. A rocky wash on the northwest base of Ragged Top with 153 species is another diversity hotspot. A total of 76 IFNM taxa were found only on Ragged Top.” (emphasis added)

BLM documents further state the two allotments support more game species than any other area in Southern Arizona. The ephemeral rating of the Morningstar and Tejon allotments has no documented scientific justification. The BLM has never published any justification whatsoever for regulating these two allotments in a manner contrary to its own Special Ephemeral Rule of 1968. The ephemeral status of both allotments is therefore arbitrary, capricious and illegal.
During the planning process, the desired correction was inserted into the Preferred Alternative. In the final RMP, however, the IFNM management reversed its position and permanently imposed the ephemeral status on both allotments, citing a lack of scientific data as its excuse. The permittee protested the plan, but to no avail.

In the final IFNM RMP, the BLM stated that more data and analysis was needed to justify reversing the arbitrary and capricious, scientifically unsupported October 1991 ephemeral downgrade of the Morningstar and Tejon Pass Allotments. (See: Attachment 6, IFNM PRMP Appendix F). This message was repeated by BLM agents in the June 26, 2012 Pima NRCD meeting. (See Attachment 7, page 2, Pima NRCD Minutes for June 26, 2012 (annotations in red were added for clarification.)

Such an excuse is absurd. The BLM conducted no study and presented no data whatsoever supporting its arbitrary and capricious decision, in the final IFNM RMP, to downgrade the allowed carrying capacities on nine additional grazing allotments. That decision, likewise, was arbitrary and capricious.

The Arizona-Sonoran Desert Museum’s peer-reviewed biological survey of the IFNM, (Dimmit, Van Devender and Wiens, 2003) alone ought to have sufficiently informed the BLM that at least the Morningstar Allotment by no means represents “poor plant productivity,” a critical criteria for invoking the Ephemeral Rule. The BLM knows the corrals on the private lands inholdings on the Morningstar Allotment receive 10” average annual rainfall, because a District cooperator had annually emailed monthly rain gage data to Darrell Tersey for more than a decade. (See: Dimmit, Van Devender and Wiens, 2003, Biological Survey of the Ironwood Forest National Monument. https://www.desertmuseum.org/programs/ifnm_ironwoodtree.php, accessed July 10, 2017 at 12:18 PM MST)

In addition, the BLM had NRCS monitoring data for prior years on both allotments. The agency claims to have lost the documentation.

The District was further informed by the BLM at the October 26, 2013 District meeting, that the paperwork required to authorize correction of the classifications of the two allotments was complete and awaiting signatures. All that was necessary was to wait for the final Record of Decision for the IFNM RMP to be published, and then the two allotment classifications could be corrected. Despite 44 months having passed since that meeting, the District has yet to be informed of any progress BLM has made on the promised corrections.

4. Nine grazing allotments were arbitrarily downgraded to prohibit seasonal increases in carrying capacity. Ephemeral-season allowances for stocking increases on the Cocoraque, Agua Dulce, Blanco Wash, Silverbell, King Ranch, Claflin, and Agua
Blanca allotments were terminated. These allotments were downgraded from perennial-ephemeral to strict perennial preference. No scientific study or data was presented to justify this decision in the final IFNM RMP. The decision was arbitrary and capricious.

5. **Allowable year-round carrying capacities on nine grazing allotments were arbitrarily reduced without scientific justification.** When the Resource Management Plan (RMP) for IFNM was being written, and during one of the worst drought years of the last two decades (some allotments received only 2-3” rain that year where 10.5” is normal), the IFNM grazing management agent asked the grazing permittees on the Cocoraque, Agua Dulce, Blanco Wash, King Ranch, Claflin, Silverbell, and Agua Blanca allotments how many heads of cattle he or she was stocking in response to the drought. (Personal communication with several IFNM grazing permittees).

According to several of those permittees, the answers those ranchers gave the BLM agent became the permanent maximum perennial carrying capacities allowed in the final IFNM RMP. No scientific study or data was presented in the IFNM RMP planning process to justify this decision.

The decision violates the clear directive of Proclamation 7320:

> “Laws, regulations, and policies followed by the Bureau of Land Management in issuing and administering grazing permits or leases on all lands under its jurisdiction shall continue to apply with regard to the lands in the monument.”

The permanent reduction in grazing preferences was therefore arbitrary and capricious.

6. **Ranch market values declined within the Monument boundaries.** (Personal communication with local ranch appraiser and broker.) Ranches in National Monuments tend to be forced out of business by insidious and creeping overregulation that usually ends in prohibition of all livestock use. Prospective buyers discount their offers accordingly.

Ranch appraisals are generally based on the number of cattle the ranch can carry year-round. Therefore, by downgrading the allowable year-round carrying capacities of the aforementioned allotments, the IFNM RMP imposed measurable reductions in the market values of IFNM ranches, without compensation.

The regulatory devaluation of a ranch’s market value also reduces the grazing permittee’s ability to borrow working capital against his or her ranch.
7. **The IFNM closed roads that provided direct access to vital existing ranch infrastructure.**

The IFNM RMP closed two roads on the Tejon Pass and Morningstar allotments, apparently in an effort to re-create a prehistoric “untrammeled” area that is large enough to qualify for a National Wilderness Designation. Presently, no un-fragmented area within IFNM meets the 5,000-acre minimum size to qualify for a National Wilderness Act designation.

The two roads directly connect the two main shipping corrals on the Tejon Pass allotment to each other, a well, and a storage tank, and both roads have EQIP-funded water lines running underneath. The westernmost of the two roads is adjacent to an area under a new designation the IFNM management plan created, “to be protected for wilderness characteristics.”

Summer monsoon storms typically damage the underground water lines because they cross numerous washes. If the permittee is not allowed to use the roads for access, he will be unable to repair the water lines and could lose whatever rights he may have to the water he will lose access to use.

The grazing permittee, fortunately, was able to work with Arizona Game and Fish Department to install a new water line to serve those two corrals from the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal instead of the perfectly good well he had been using.

Fortunately, the grazing permittee was able to install the new water line on Arizona State School Trust land. That was lucky, because...

8. **IFNM prohibits ranchers from installing new water lines on federal land.**

The BLM’s refusal to allow new water lines to cross federal land have prevented the same grazing permittee from connecting CAP water to a large area of his grazing allotment that presently has no water supply. This IFNM policy directly prohibits the rancher from achieving a much better balanced and ecologically desirable distribution of grazing pressure across his ranch.

The same issue exists on another IFNM grazing permittee’s allotment, where an entire pasture has no water supply. That in itself prohibits the pasture’s use for livestock grazing.

9. **Conservation funding opportunities were lost.** Since March 21, 2000, IFNM managers have consistently and stubbornly blocked the IFNM ranchers’ ability to proceed with range health improvement projects for which they can anticipate EQIP reimbursement or any available conservation grants.
In early March of 2000, conservation projects had been planned or were in the planning process on several ranches, in coordination with the USDA-NRCS, to enhance forage and wildlife habitat through scientific pasture management, pasture fencing designed around soils and vegetation types, and new water improvements.

Such plans are called Coordinated Resource Management Plans and involve the BLM, the District, the NRCS, Arizona State Lands Department, Arizona Game and Fish Department, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the grazing permittee, who voluntarily applies for such assistance.

The entire Agua Blanca Allotment, for example, had only one fenced pasture in 2000. The lack of fencing precludes pasture rotations and results in various parts of a pasture being over-used while other areas are under-used.

Prior to Proclamation 7320, that permittee had expressed his desire to implement a Coordinated Resource Management Plan on his allotment and install fencing to improve livestock forage management. His ultimate goal was to improve the carrying capacity of the allotment by promoting native forage growth. The allotment, 17 years later, still has only one fenced pasture. The allotment has since changed hands.

BLM’s disinterest in cooperative conservation projects with the IFNM ranchers, the District and NRCS makes grazing and forage management, and associated soil and water conservation, virtually impossible to improve. It also precludes establishing a scientific and Administrative record of sound grazing management in the IFNM that would protect the grazing permittees and the BLM from malicious third party litigation.

BLM’s failure to allow any projects to move forward that could potentially benefit the grazing permittees’ ability to improve their forage management has cost the IFNM grazing permittees tens of thousands of dollars in lost conservation grant and reimbursement opportunities.

The available EQIP reimbursement funding they missed out on could have been used to improve the land’s productivity, the carrying capacity of livestock and wildlife, forage quality, wildlife habitat, and the ultimate market values of those ranches—all while serving the published goals of the IFNM’s resource management plan.

The IFNM’s stubborn resistance to grazing management improvements also cost the local economy the benefit of potentially large conservation funding inflows with cascading economic benefits—and during the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression.
10. IFNM’s careless recordkeeping exposes the law-abiding grazing permittees to increased risk of losing their livelihoods as a result of malicious third-party litigation.

Regular scientific range monitoring with careful maintenance of such records and other related data would significantly help to protect the grazing permittees from malicious third-party lawsuits that could be filed against the BLM for the sole purpose of harming the law-abiding IFNM grazing permittees.

During the Monument planning process, however, the BLM published false claims that the grazing allotments in IFNM had never been monitored. In reality, the NRCS and BLM had been monitoring some of those grazing allotments for years prior to 2000.

**FOIA findings: BLM lost important IFNM grazing allotment documents and scientific data.** In 2013, the Pima NRCD submitted a FOIA request to the BLM, requesting all documentation on three IFNM allotments (Silverbell, Tejon Pass, and Morningstar). The BLM’s response was missing a substantial number of significant documents and data that we knew the agency previously possessed.

The missing information included numerous important NRCS/BLM grazing allotment monitoring records and precipitation records. Also missing were any documents that might reveal any justification for the still-unexplained October 15, 1991 downgrade of the Morningstar and Tejon Pass allotments from perennial-ephemeral grazing preference to ephemeral season only.

When asked about the missing records, the BLM failed to provide any legitimate explanation why such records were missing from the FOIA response. *(See: Attachment 7, Pima NRCD minutes for June 26, 2012).*

The BLM, through failure to properly maintain grazing allotment monitoring records, is setting itself up to lose a future anti-ranching NGO lawsuit. The law-abiding grazing permittees could end up forced off their allotments without compensation.

**Monitoring of IFNM grazing allotments could be improved-- if the BLM is willing.** In 2015, the BLM asked the Pima NRCD for suggestions for what things to monitor in the IFNM.

The Pima NRCD turned to University of Arizona Range Management Extension agent Dr. George Ruyle for his direction on monitoring the IFNM grazing allotments. *(See: Attachment 9. Noelle and Ruyle, 2015, Ironwood Forest National Monument Rangeland Monitoring Program University of Arizona Recommendation.)*
11. He recommended expanding existing monitoring practices in IFNM to include all grazing allotments, and to increase the number of “key areas,” where monitoring occurs, in the allotments that were already being monitored.

   In early 2016, Dr. Ruyle attempted to move his proposal forward. Obtaining sufficient manpower for the proposed monitoring program seemed to be an obstacle. About mid-year, Dr. Ruyle told us that the BLM had agreed to monitor all the IFNM allotments before the year ended. Since then, if any monitoring at all was conducted in IFNM, the District has not been informed of it.

12. **Eco-crimes increased.** Prior to March 21, 2000, eco-terrorism in the Silverbell, Waterman and Roskruge Mountains was unheard of. Soon after June 9, 2000, however, eco-vandals focused their attention on IFNM grazing permittees and inholders.

   New fences were cut into hundreds of small pieces over long distances on an inholding of private property and on one grazing allotment several miles away. Cattle were discovered surgically mutilated on another IFNM allotment. Yet another grazing permittee received implied poaching threats against his cattle through the U.S. mail.

   Another wave of eco-vandalism occurred soon after the IFNM prohibited target shooting. (Two of the grazing permittees located near the urban boundary had been particularly vocal in supporting the ban.)

   Vandals cut fences into little pieces and defaced numerous government signs.

   ![Image of fences and signs being defaced](image_url)

   An angry target-shooting enthusiast published a libelous anti-rancher op-ed in the local newspaper. All fences enclosing the Morningstar allotment (the pasture containing Ragged Top, shown in the photo above) were cut to the ground on both sides of T-posts for up to a quarter mile, so that the permittee’s cattle could become...
lost and potentially die of thirst in an unfamiliar expanded area more than 50 miles long. (Ironically, the ’s owner of Morningstar allotment grazing permit had not stated any position when the target-shooting ban was proposed.)

*BLM considered using this vandalism as an excuse to declare an allotment boundary fence abandoned.* The IFNM RMP calls for removal of abandoned ranching infrastructure.

The IFNM managers discovered the aforementioned fence was down when the evidence of malicious vandalism could not be more obvious. Ten-foot strands of barbed wire lying all over the ground. The metal T-posts were all bent down to the ground and the cedar fence posts had all been stolen.

Rather than notify the affected grazing permittees of the vandalism, however, the IFNM managers decided that since the fence was down, it was officially abandoned. They made plans to remove the allotment boundary from official IFNM maps (personal communication with Laura Olais and Francisco Mendoza). After much protest, the BLM eventually backed off. Despite an offer from BLM to supply new T-posts, the fences were all repaired at private expense.

**EO 13792 Section (2)(iii):** Proclamation 7320 has produced neutral and positive results but these results do not justify the illegal means.

- **Tourist traffic through the IFNM appears to have decreased since 2000.**

  The District is unaware of any objective, scientific peer-reviewed study of the IFNM’s impacts on tourism or the local tourist economy. During periods of economic downturns, and since target shooting was banned in the IFNM, visitor traffic seems actually to have decreased since 2000, according to one 22-year resident inholder.

- **The Monument has protected amenities that cannot be measured in dollars, as follow:**

  One can use the Monument to experience quietness and solitude in places that are not a long drive from the city, where no trace of human presence can be seen. Many such areas exist within the monument and in prettier areas than those unnecessarily designated in the RMP for “preserving for wilderness characteristics.”

  There are times and places in the IFNM when all is silent except for the singing of birds.

  There are times and places in the IFNM that are so quiet that a person can be still and hear their own blood circulating. At such times a heartbeat
can sound very loud.

In March 1996, the full 80-degree tail of the comet Hayakutake was brightly visible from the areas that would later be designated as the IFNM. It was visible for several weeks, whereas just over the opposite side of Gates Pass, it could not be seen at all for the city lights. The IFNM protects the ability to enjoy future such once-in-a-lifetime experiences.

- The monument protects several southern Arizona astronomical observatories from light pollution. Light pollution would threaten those observatories if the proposed I-11 CanaMex Corridor is allowed to skirt or cut through the present IFNM.

- The monument is currently protecting pristine desert from the proposed half-mile wide CanaMex Supercorridor a.k.a. Interstate 11, which otherwise could forever destroy beautiful, peaceful and serene recreational and livestock production areas, a significant bird migration corridor, and habitat for wildlife including the last relict population of Sonoran desert bighorn sheep, all of which are close to Tucson. It would also preclude potential mineral production that may be in its path.

- Monument status has protected cattle and wildlife from urban encroachment and all the loose, cattle-and-wildlife-chasing dogs, bird-bat-and-lizard-killing cats, criminal activity, air pollution, noise, and other damage that comes with it. In this sense, it has actually protected cattle ranches from unknown levels of economic losses.

- Due to monument status, Francisco Mendoza from the BLM Tucson Field Office has put forth a great deal of effort to help IFNM ranchers obtain and install cattle guards to replace barbed wire gates on the outer perimeters of their ranches. The IFNM shares a very long boundary with the Tohono O’Odham Reservation.

Remote gates are very costly to monitor due to the vast distances one must drive a vehicle. Some IFNM boundary gates and fences are inaccessible by motor vehicle. Cattle that stray through remote open gates onto the vast, open Reservation cannot be retrieved. Ranchers with lost cattle generally cannot obtain permission to enter the Reservation to look for them.

The cattleguards prevent economic losses from lost cattle, prevent the spread of deadly, epidemic bovine venereal diseases, and prevent cattle from dying of thirst in unfamiliar pastures. They also save the ranchers the labor costs of opening, closing, and maintaining the gates. Visitors
frequently leave gates open and sometimes cut them down, drive through them when closed (which can rip out $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of fence), or steal them. The economic benefit of the cattleguards is significant but would be difficult to estimate in dollars.

- **The IFNM protects important wildlife migration corridors.**

  Bighorn sheep use the major washes in the Monument to travel between the Coyote Hills south of State Route 86 to the Sawtooth Mountains near Casa Grande.

  Birding hotspots mapped on ebird.org (Cornell University of Ornithology), based on thousands of birding checklists, indicate that between 176 and more than 300 species of birds migrate through IFNM. Several accidental and extremely rare bird species have been documented in the IFNM on multiple occasions since 2000.

- **Monument status has protected livestock and wildlife from forage and habitat losses from open pit mining expansion.**

- **Monument status has helped protect vulnerable birthing ungulates (cattle and wildlife) from motorists driving in washes.** This prevents financial losses to the ranchers and improves hunting license revenues to AZGFD.

- **Monument status has protected petroglyph sites by curtailing off-road motorized travel and providing vastly improved law enforcement presence.**

- **Although it took BLM until 2007 to recruit adequate law enforcement staff,** *Monument status has vastly improved law enforcement staffing and support* that greatly benefits inholders and visitors. BLM rangers are credited with directly protecting two District cooperators from a violent crime in progress in the IFNM. Agent Kevin Andrews, a new-hire for IFNM, was shot twice in that incident but heroically prevailed in detaining the suspect.

- **The IFNM protects ranch forage and wildlife habitat from off-road motorized recreational destruction.** The soil structure in IFNM is so delicate that a single off-road pass by a motor vehicle typically results in a set of tire tracks that never fully revegetate. The Pima NRCD in previous years worked with Arizona Game and Fish Department to curtail off-road vehicle use statewide, for this reason.
• The target shooting ban resulted in significant protection of ecological and historical objects. Illegal off-road traffic declined following the ban, and direct vegetation damage significantly declined. Prior to the ban, entire hillsides had been stripped of vegetation by target shooters, some otherwise scenic areas of the Monument were turned into wildcat dumps by target shooters who used old TVs and appliances for targets, and two grazing permittees expressed grave concern for their personal safety due to reckless shooters using their corrals. Target shooters had also damaged rock art sites.

• Monument status has resulted in a safer and more pleasant area to visit, with greatly reduced levels of violent crime, litter, noise, and vegetation damage from not-so-gentle recreational uses. Since the soil structure and ecosystem vegetation are quite fragile, it only takes one inconsiderate–or ignorant–visitor to permanently destroy the monument’s amenities for everyone who ever follows them. For example, it takes 200 years to grow a saguaro to full size, and seconds to cut it down. The BLM has greatly improve signage and law enforcement because of the IFNM, and thereby significantly and effectively prevented pointless destruction.

Notwithstanding the significant benefits it delivers, the IFNM exists illegally and must be repealed to protect the credibility, social acceptance and respect for the rule of law.

EO 13792 Section (2)(iv) The IFNM has produced negative and positive effects on the use and enjoyment of non-Federal lands within or beyond monument boundaries.

Interstate 11. One of the most significant effects of the IFNM, positive for some people and negative for others, is the impact of the National Monument’s existence on the proposed routes for Interstate 11, also known as the CanaMex Transportation Corridor.

Were it not for the National Monument designation, the proposed corridor would cross the current IFNM instead of going around its boundaries, saving substantial costs for construction, maintenance, air pollution, accidents, etc.

This is simply a statement of fact. The District in fact opposes the potentially shorter route through unspoiled areas including the present IFNM because it would harm our cooperators and our mission to protect soil, water, agriculture and wildlife habitat.

a) The IFNM has produced negative effects on the use and enjoyment of non-Federal lands within or beyond monument boundaries


State School Trust Lands are not public lands. They belong to the beneficiaries of the fund. The State land fund K-12 education, some hospitals and the
Arizona School for the Deaf and Blind. Most State lands are in use for grazing. The mission of the Arizona State Lands Department, however, is to maximize income to the Trust from the State lands. The vast majority of that income is derived by selling lands of the highest value at the appropriate time.

The State lands within the Monument boundary contain a resource of mineral wealth that can no longer be extracted. Except for the National Monument designation, State lands could have been sold to a mining company or even sold for commercial development at very high value, considering the recent boom in the residential housing market. The Monument designation has therefore devalued Arizona State School Trust Lands inholdings.

2. **Many private lands inholdings interior to the Monument are 20-acre mining patents that may no longer be viable for mining due to the inaccessibility of adjacent federal lands.** Patented ore veins that run beneath BLM surface ownership may no longer be accessible due to the Monument designation.

3. **Grazing permittees are prohibited from pumping water from federal lands onto State lands.** This has stymied some conservation plans to use scientifically designed water and fencing placements to more evenly distribute grazing pressure across pastures and ranches.

Ranches in the IFNM consist of a combination of contiguous parcels of federal, state, and private lands. In this type of situation, the Monument designation sits in direct opposition to its own goal of enhancing and protecting forage and wildlife habitat.

**b) The IFNM has produced positive effects on the use and enjoyment of non-Federal lands within or beyond monument boundaries**

a. **Vastly improved rural law enforcement presence.** The Arizona State Lands Department lacks funding for law enforcement on State School Trust Lands. The BLM organized a federal/state/local multi-agency law enforcement task force to patrol and protect the entire IFNM, including private and State lands inholdings. In locations where the federal government has no jurisdiction, local and state law enforcement partner agencies do.

b. **Improved local quality of recreation on State lands inholdings.** Recreational enjoyment of State Lands and the quality of life for private inholders has been enhanced by IFNM protections of surrounding federal lands.
c. Improved scenery and overall quality of life for residents of nearby cities and towns. IFNM clearly has improved the quality of life for residents of nearby towns and cities by preserving scenery that is visible from 20 or more miles away and by providing a free, nearby outdoor recreational outlet.

d. IFNM reduces “over-use” pressures of nearby natural outdoor recreation areas. IFNM also relieves other nearby parks and forests from overcrowding and other recreational pressure. It also provides more solitude than other recreational areas closer to the urban boundary.

e. IFNM protects wildlife habitat and corridors on adjacent and intermingled State and private lands.

Benefits to urban real estate values. We believe the urban residents of southern Arizona generally enjoy and benefit from having the Monument lands protected, whether they actually use them or not. Much of the Monument is higher in elevation and directly visible from Marana and northwest Tucson so protection of the scenic vistas in the Monument makes the scenery more pleasant from nearby urban areas. Having protected scenery and recreational outlets near one’s home improves property values.

Benefits to southern Arizona astronomical observatories. Southern Arizona is famous for its dark starry skies. The Monument designation protects those dark skies, and the many observatories depending on them, from light pollution.

Benefits to private lands inholders. Residential monument inholders of private property never have to worry their views will be blocked by the next wave of commercial real estate development. They also have nearly unlimited outdoor recreational access literally connected to their properties. They enjoy the peace and tranquility of the monument, and the dark starry skies at night.

The BLM, so far, has been generally a good neighbor and has quickly provided law enforcement support whenever requested. The BLM is always a willing buyer of private inholdings but, so far, has never gotten pushy or attempted any corrupt shenanigans of which we are aware, to coerce private lands inholders are into becoming “so-called-willing” sellers. Private inholders also provide a benefit to the BLM by providing extra eyes and ears 24/7 that the BLM does not have to pay for.
At least one dude ranch exists in the Monument, so the Monument designation protects that business from urban encroachment and mining development that would spoil the scenery and degrade their customer’s experience.

The Monument’s ban on target shooting was a huge benefit to the ranchers and other residents who live close to the urban boundary within the Monument. Target shooting, in the early days of the Monument, was out of control and those particular inholders feared for their personal safety.

EO 13792 Section (2)(v) The District’s concerns of State, tribal, and local governments affected by a designation, including the economic development and fiscal condition of affected States, tribes, and localities;

1. As stated earlier, since IFNM was created the BLM has prohibited EQIP contracts from moving forward that would otherwise have allowed the District’s cooperators in the IFNM to improve their grazing range stewardship. Potential conservation grant and reimbursement funding opportunities were lost that would otherwise have been spent in, and multiplied through, the local economy during the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression.

2. Devalued State lands. The Arizona State School Trust Lands, which might otherwise have been sold to fund K-12 education and the Arizona Miner’s Hospital, were possibly devalued. Minerals beneath the surface of those lands may have been rendered inaccessible by the IFNM prohibition on surface disturbance on adjacent federal lands.

3. Loss of State and local tax revenues. BLM acquired a private inholding in the Waterman Mountains with the effect of burdening federal taxpayers with new maintenance costs and eliminating relevant County and State tax revenues. A land trust acquired a 640-acre private inholding and further reduced the State and County tax base.

Foregone mineral development and associated loss of corporate income taxes also impacted the State Treasury negatively, and perhaps severely. The District receives major funding through the State Legislature but is seeing funding cuts. Indirectly, therefore, the District’s income has been reduced by the harm done to the State tax base.

4. Arbitrary and capricious reductions of grazing preferences reduces the local, State and county tax base. The reduction in grazing preferences devalued the associated ranches. These ranches, in turn have reduced borrowing capability. The reduction in borrowing capability in turn reduced the amount of money each rancher may have otherwise spent. Most ranching purchases are made within a local community, so the reduction in grazing preference has a multiplier effect in the local economy and
reduces the tax revenues that can collected by local, county and State government.

The Pima County Board of Supervisors recently imposed a new sales tax, claiming that the county otherwise cannot afford to maintain roads or provide adequate police and fire protection. Property taxes in Pima County likewise rose to the highest levels in Arizona shortly following the creation of IFNM. These tax increases discourage economic activity in Pima County and may have been unnecessary but for the IFNM mineral withdrawals.

**EO 13792 Section (2)(vi) The availability of Federal resources to properly manage designated areas depends largely on the debt/GDP ratio of the United States.**

1. **Unsustainable U.S. and Arizona indebtedness.** The last time we checked, the United States government is unsustainably approaching $20 Trillion in debt. Federal spending is unsustainably up 127% since creation of the IFNM, and continues to rise.

2. **The federal government does not need more land.** The BLM already has too much inventory.
   The District recently passed the attached resolution opposing reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Rather than squander the fund to pointlessly acquire State and private National Monument inholdings and eliminate them from the tax base, we recommend the Secretary instead spend the fund to address the backlog of maintenance requirements for the lands the U.S. Government already owns. Locally, it should be spent for grazing allotment monitoring that has perpetually remained inadequate in scope and frequency in the IFNM since 2000. *(See: Attachment 10. Pima NRCD Resolution opposing LWCF reauthorization.)*

   We also recommend the Secretary assign a BLM employee to ensure all grazing allotment documents are properly updated, stored, maintained, archived and readily available for review at all times. This would be a superior use of funds than buying private lands. It would increase federal revenues by ensuring grazing permits continue producing revenues and by ensuring the ranchers and their chain of suppliers can continue paying state and federal income taxes.

3. **The Secretary should recognize the economic contribution of the IFNM grazing permittees and private lands inholders.** They provide, at their own expense, many valuable services toward the overall stewardship of the land.
   
   a. At their own expense, the grazing permittees and inholders provide free security surveillance of many areas of the Monument, 24/7/365.
b. At no expense to the taxpayers, grazing permittees provide and maintain vital water that is perhaps used by more wildlife than livestock, and has saved desperate humans as well. The vast majority of the water sources in IFNM are privately owned and maintained. The Arizona Game and Fish Department and Arizona Desert Bighorn Sheep Society maintain the rest.

The photographs below are a few examples of the numerous species of wildlife currently using just two water troughs that a rancher installed and maintains at private expense for the purpose of supporting the livestock that are using the same pasture.
c. Grazing permittees provide the BLM free services while funding their own salaries, health care, and vehicle and equipment maintenance.

d. Grazing permittees and private land inholders are frequently first responders to any emergencies that arise, from rescuing stranded motorists to providing first aid and other services, at no expense to the BLM.

4. Land and Water Conservation Fund monies should be directed to the following activities rather than squandered to acquire State and private lands.
   a. Coordinated Resource Management Plans, designed by NRCS and supported by the District and the grazing permittees, should be given top priority for BLM action. Related proposals for coordinated soil and water conservation projects with the District, the NRCS, and the BLM should be prioritized for action.

   b. We request the Secretary make Dr. Ruyle’s attached proposal to improve grazing allotment monitoring a high priority for action. (See: Attachment 9, Noelle and Ruyle Recommendation for IFNM allotment monitoring.)

   c. The Secretary should endeavor to retain, encourage and reward grazing permittees for their stewardship of the land as much as possible, rather than buying up their private inholdings or squeezing them out financially.

5. The Secretary should seek to improve cooperation and coordination with the NRCS and the District in working toward mutual soil, water, forage and habitat conservation goals.

6. Similar to a doctor’s Hippocratic oath, the Secretary should strictly avoid punishing or curtailing the very activities that produce desired results.

   The IFNM was created, by a proclamation that could be mistaken for a travel brochure; to protect the result of 120 years of continuous year-round livestock grazing with ephemeral increases as seasonal precipitation allowed. Ironically, however, the IFNM RMP foolishly seeks to “protect” that proven result by imposing heavy-handed, experimental management changes with unforeseeable consequences. The RMP in fact punishes the same activities that produced the original condition of the IFNM.

   The RMP ironically punishes the grazing permittee on whose allotment the greatest biodiversity and 71% of the flora in the entire IFNM was documented.

   The results of excellent range stewardship ought to be rewarded and encouraged, not punished.
In a nutshell, the IFNM RMP is the result of a bureaucracy’s attempt to fix what wasn't broken.

(vii) We recommend the Secretary consider the following additional factors:

1. Regardless whether our desire is to protect the environment, protect antiquities or protect our economic and personal liberty, the ends must be accomplished through legal means. Accordingly, the IFNM designation by Proclamation 7320 is illegal and must be repealed. There is a legal pathway through Congress to achieve society’s goals. It was not followed.

2. Simple repeal of the IFNM by Executive Order would likely produce unintended and undesirable consequences in the long term. A “quick-fix” approach would lead to repetitious and costly controversies and conflicts every time the political pendulum changes direction and new political leaders rise to power. A more permanent solution must be pursued through Congress.

3. We recommend that if the IFNM is altered without full repeal, then the Secretary should consider recognizing the aforementioned antiquities that Proclamation 7320 ignores.

4. Any decision about the future of the IFNM should be weighed against its probable impact on the future route of Interstate 11.

5. We recommend the pre-1991 grazing preferences on the Morninstar and Tejon Pass allotments and the pre-IFNM grazing preferences on all other allotments in IFNM be fully restored.