

Congressional Testimony Questionnaire Endangered Species Act (ESA)

Honorable _____
US House of Representatives

Below are my concerns and testimony regarding the Endangered Species Act. Please take note of my responses to the statements and include them in any Hearings scheduled before the House Resources Committee regarding the ESA. Please consider a photocopy of this document as valid as the original.

I have signed my name below.

Dear Landowner, Rancher or Multiple-Use Advocate:

The House Resources Committee will be holding a hearing Monday, June 6 in Clarkston, Washington. This is the first in a process of reviewing the Endangered Species Act for possible changes. You can get your concerns on the record by filling out this Testimony Questionnaire and writing your Representative's name in the appropriate place. You need to sign the document at the bottom. Please return it in the enclosed envelope. It will be hand delivered to your Representative and delivered to the hearing itself. It is important that you mail this document by Monday, June 20th.

This is #1 of 2 Testimony Questionnaires. Please fill out both and mail them back. There is some overlap between the two documents. Please note that American Land Rights has carefully examined the type of language that most of America is willing to accept when considering possible changes to the Endangered Species Act. We're trying to use a softer tone without losing sight of your goals.

The struggle has been to write about the ESA in a way that vastly upgrades our chances of winning. As we work to develop language to do that, some of our supporters have suffered a degree of anxiety because they think that softer language means we may be letting down. Nothing could be further from the truth. **Don't confuse where we want to go with how we get there.**

The Endangered Species Act has not been successful at recovering species at risk over the past 31 years. With a success rate of less than one percent, the ESA is not effective in saving threatened and endangered species.

At the same time, the corresponding rules and regulations have, in many cases, strangled local economies, hurt ranchers, landowners and Federal land users causing severe repercussions that impact everything from school funding to jobs to economic development — even hampering important environmental protections.

Please note that multiple-use and private property advocates AGREE with all the statements below but you don't have to. You may also edit the following statements. These are supposed to be your comments.

Please circle your answer – You may write additional comments by each question or in the comment section on the back. Your personal comments make this document more valuable.

1. The Endangered Species Act should require a plan to help a species recover before it is listed. The current Act does not require such a plan.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

2. Landowners and ranchers who lose property rights under the Endangered Species Act should be properly compensated.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

3. We must do a better job of recovering endangered species without endangering the jobs and livelihoods of American families.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

4. It's been over 30 years since the Endangered Species Act became law. I agree with its goal of recovering endangered species but the Act needs updating and modernizing after thirty years. Now's the time to update and improve how we recover and save endangered species.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

5. Only 10 species in North America have been recovered out of more than 1300 that were listed in the last 30 years. That is less than 1%. A 99 percent failure rate is unacceptable.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

6. Landowners and Federal land users who participate in efforts to recover species should be compensated for those efforts.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

7. The future of conservation lies in establishing an entirely new foundation for the conservation of endangered species - one based on the truism that if you want more of something you reward people for it, not punish them. Throughout American history, if the government wanted more of something, providing incentives to achieve those goals worked most effectively.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

8. Protecting habitat should require an economic impact statement that accounts for the impact on landowners and communities.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

9. We must allow the use of land, as well as provide habitat, when land use is determined to not threaten endangered species.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

10. Allowing active management of both land and habitat is important, especially when it can prevent or manage forest fires.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

11. It's time to bring balance into protecting and saving our species. It must protect landowners and Federal land users as we seek a way to make the ESA really recover endangered species.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

12. To assure effectiveness, independent scientific review is needed when listing species as endangered and developing recovery plans.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

13. Independent scientific review of recovery plans will help assure that the plans are effective or necessary.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

14. Species recovery plans must be flexible and allow for local input and involvement to be truly effective.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

15. We must make the Act friendlier to state and local conservation efforts.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

(Your written comments here will make this document more valuable)

(If needed, use additional sheets or attach a personal letter)

To validate your comments please fill in completely (PRINT or TYPE) and be sure to sign.

Signature _____ Name _____

E-Mail _____ Fax _____ Phone _____

Address _____ Town _____ State _____ Zip _____

Please do not fail to send this testimony questionnaire even if you receive it late.

Fax and Email Deadline Monday, June 20, 2005

1A

Congressional Testimony Questionnaire

Endangered Species Act (ESA)

Honorable _____
US House of Representatives

Below are my concerns and testimony regarding the Endangered Species Act. Please take note of my responses to the statements and include them in any Hearings scheduled before the House Resources Committee regarding the ESA. Please consider a photocopy of this document as valid as the original.

I have signed my name below.

Dear Landowner, Rancher or Multiple-Use Advocate:

The House Resources Committee will be holding a hearing Monday, June 6 in Clarkston, Washington. This is the first in a process of reviewing the Endangered Species Act for possible changes. You can get your concerns on the record by filling out this Testimony Questionnaire and writing your Representative's name in the appropriate place. You need to sign the document at the bottom. Please return it in the enclosed envelope. It will be hand delivered to your Representative and delivered to the hearing itself. It is important that you mail this document by Monday, June 20.

This is #1 of 2 Testimony Questionnaires. Please fill out both and mail them back. There is some overlap between the two documents. Please note that American Land Rights has carefully examined the type of language that most of America is willing to accept when considering possible changes to the Endangered Species Act. We're trying to use a softer tone without losing sight of your goals.

The struggle has been to write about the ESA in a way that vastly upgrades our chances of winning. As we work to develop language to do that, some of our supporters have suffered a degree of anxiety because they think that softer language means we may be letting down. Nothing could be further from the truth. **Don't confuse where we want to go with how we get there.**

The Endangered Species Act has not been successful at recovering species at risk over the past 31 years. With a success rate of less than one percent, the ESA is not effective in saving threatened and endangered species.

At the same time, the corresponding rules and regulations have, in many cases, strangled local economies, hurt ranchers, landowners and Federal land users causing severe repercussions that impact everything from school funding to jobs to economic development — even hampering important environmental protections.

Please note that multiple-use and private property advocates AGREE with all the statements below but you don't have to. You may also edit the following statements. These are supposed to be your comments.

Please circle your answer – You may write additional comments by each question or in the comment section on the back. Your personal comments make this document more valuable.

1. The Endangered Species Act should require a plan to help a species recover before it is listed. The current Act does not require such a plan.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

2. Landowners and ranchers who lose property rights under the Endangered Species Act should be properly compensated.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

3. We must do a better job of recovering endangered species without endangering the jobs and livelihoods of American families.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

4. It's been over 30 years since the Endangered Species Act became law. I agree with its goal of recovering endangered species but the Act needs updating and modernizing after thirty years. Now's the time to update and improve how we recover and save endangered species.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

5. Only 10 species in North America have been recovered out of more than 1300 that were listed in the last 30 years. That is less than 1%. A 99 percent failure rate is unacceptable.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

6. Landowners and Federal land users who participate in efforts to recover species should be compensated for those efforts.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

7. The future of conservation lies in establishing an entirely new foundation for the conservation of endangered species - one based on the truism that if you want more of something you reward people for it, not punish them. Throughout American history, if the government wanted more of something, providing incentives to achieve those goals worked most effectively.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

8. Protecting habitat should require an economic impact statement that accounts for the impact on landowners and communities.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

9. We must allow the use of land, as well as provide habitat, when land use is determined to not threaten endangered species.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

10. Local and state authorities need to be involved in helping save our species.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

11. We need to allow state and local authorities more flexibility in designing recovery plans.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

12. Allowing local and state involvement in land management decision making is important to adapting policy to local needs and issues.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

13. We cannot protect species at the expense of our fellow Americans and their jobs. We can and must protect both endangered species and people.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

14. It is not enough to merely list a species as "threatened" or "endangered." We want to help species recover so they can be removed from the list.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

15. Our goal is to repair and confirm the Act's ability to actually recover species.

AGREE

DISAGREE

NO OPINION

(Your written comments here will make this document more valuable)

(If needed, use additional sheets or attach a personal letter)

To validate your comments please fill in completely (PRINT or TYPE) and be sure to sign.

Signature _____ Name _____

E-Mail _____ Fax _____ Phone _____

Address _____ Town _____ State _____ Zip _____

Please do not fail to send this testimony questionnaire even if you receive it late.

Fax and Email Deadline Monday, June 20, 2005

1B