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PROCEEDINGS

SENATOR ROUNDS: Good morning, everyone. One bit of housekeeping, I would remind all of the witnesses that are going to be testifying today that the mics that are there in front of them are hot all the time and they are very sensitive, so just be aware of that.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Management and Regulatory Oversight is meeting today to conduct a field hearing entitled "Oversight of the Impact of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Fish and Wildlife Service Regulations on Citizens' Private Property Rights."

I would like to thank our witnesses for being with us today, and I look forward to hearing your testimony.

Throughout this Congress, this subcommittee has conducted systematic oversight of the federal regulatory process to make certain federal regulations are promulgated in a transparent, open process with adequate public participation. We have held hearings conducting oversight on various aspects of the rule-making process including the
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adequacy of the science the agencies rely on when promulgating regulations, the increasing number of unfunded mandates agencies impose on state and local governments, and the impacts these regulations have on small businesses and state and local governments.

Today we will continue our oversight and hear testimony about how the Environmental Protection Agency and Fish \& Wildlife Service regulations affect citizens' private property rights. We will hear about how increasing regulations affect citizens' ability to use, develop and prosper while working their land. We will also hear from the agencies as to how they work with the public to assist the public in understanding regulations, as well as offering suggestions as to how this relationship between the agencies and the public can be improved, and how the regulatory process can be improved to minimize the impact of regulations on private land.

According to the American Action Forum, since taking office the Obama Administration has finalized 2,865 regulations. These regulations have cost the American people nearly $\$ 810$ billion since 2009. Of these finalized regulations, 168 of them have come from the Environmental Protection Agency and have
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cost American taxpayers $\$ 312$ billion, nearly half of the total cost of all regulations finalized by this Administration.

Not only are the costs of these regulations passed on to all citizens, but landowners who bear the burden of complying with many of these regulations have limited resources to comply with these costly and complicated regulations.

In 2015, the EPA moved forward with finalizing the Waters of the U.S. Rule, or WOTUS, broadly expanding the Clean Water Act, which would give the EPA unprecedented authority over significant land masses not currently subject to EPA jurisdiction.

This rule creates significant hurdles to normal agricultural operations. And despite EPA's claims that the rule will have minimal economic impact, the final rule is contrary to the comments of agricultural groups, the Small Business Administration and numerous state governors and attorneys general.

Although the Sixth Circuit issued a nationwide stay on the rule, we have heard evidence that the U.S. Army Corps may be moving forward with implementing the WOTUS rule. However, the U.S. Court system should not be the primary backstop
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against overly burdensome rules.
If the EPA worked more closely with landowners, states and agricultural groups throughout the rule-making process, the end result would be better rules that minimize the impact and costs on private landowners and American businesses while still achieving the goal of environmental protection.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is responsible for implementing and enforcing the Endangered Species Act. The Endangered Species Act, or ESA, was enacted by Congress in 1973 with the goal of protecting and recovering endangered and threatened species and their habitats. There are currently 1,226 species listed as endangered and 367 listed as threatened in the United States under the Endangered Species Act, and approximately half of the listed species have 80 percent of their habitat on private land. While the Fish and Wildlife Service attempts to work with landowners to encourage voluntary species management and conservation, the ESA continues to impede landowners' ability to utilize and develop their land by imposing significant restrictions on what landowners can do on their own land.

Adding to the regulatory maze that landowners
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face is the confusion caused by the myriad of lawsuits that can change or stop a regulation from being implemented based on a court's ruling. These lawsuits simply add more confusion to an already complex regulatory process. While lawsuits challenging the WOTUS rule resulted in a nationwide injunction, it was also a lawsuit that has led the Fish and Wildlife Service to review the potential listing of more than 250 species for consideration on the Endangered Species List.

It is landowners, not the Federal Government, who are the best stewards of their land. However, more often than not, federal agencies impose burdensome, complicated regulations and dictate to landowners what they believe is the best way to conserve our land and our resources.

Rather than creating an adversarial relationship, agencies should strive to work in cooperation with landowners towards the shared goal of environmental conservation.

Again, I'd like to thank our witnesses for being with us here today, and I look forward to hearing your testimony.

Our witnesses joining us on the first panel for today's hearing are Mr. Shaun McGrath, Region 8
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Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; and Ms. Noreen Walsh, Regional Director, Mountain-Prairie Region, Fish and Wildlife Service. Welcome to both of you, and thank you for being here.

We will now turn to our witnesses, Administrator Shaun McGrath, for five minutes.

And, Administrator McGrath, you may begin.
MR. SHAUN McGRATH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to testify today on how the EPA helps stakeholders understand federal environmental laws and regulations, including opportunities for public input, feedback and education.

As the Regional Administrator for EPA Region 8, I will be focusing my remarks on how the EPA engages stakeholders in the region regarding current and proposed environmental regulations.

The agency uses a variety of outreach tools to educate the public and to learn about specific questions and concerns from stakeholders. This information informs and greatly enhances the agency's rule-making process and outcomes by helping ensure that regulations comport with the public health and environmental priorities of local, state
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and tribal stakeholders.
As an example, the Clean Water Rule was developed jointly by the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers in response to several Supreme Court decisions regarding the scope of the Clean Water Act, Members of Congress, state and local officials, industry, agriculture and environmental groups, and the public asked for a rule-making.

In developing the Clean Water Rule, EPA, in conjunction with the Army Corps, conducted a multi-year engagement effort that included hundreds of meetings with stakeholders across the country and evaluated over 1 million public comments representing perspectives from all sides. Our regional office in Denver held over 50 meetings and calls with agricultural producers and leaders in all of the Region 8 states, including South Dakota. These discussions provided the agency with an understanding of the unique issues facing farmers, while providing producers with an understanding of how the scope of the Clean Water Act would and would not affect their operations.

As a result, the agency's final rule reflected the valuable input received from throughout the region and through similar efforts throughout the
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country.
EPA is fully complying with the order issued by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit by staying implementation of the Clean Water Rule and implementing the prior regulations consistent with the best science and the law.

The agency also conducts outreach on Clean Water Act issues to the agricultural community through our partnerships with states in the Clean Water Act Nonpoint Source Program. Currently, EPA is supporting the South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources in several efforts to provide outreach and information including: A project that is helping to educate ranchers across the state that result in sustainable management practices for grass resources and livestock operations; a small grants program through the South Dakota Discovery Center to support local nonpoint source information and education efforts; and six active watersheds projects across the state that are focused on watershed restoration and outreach to local landowners on conservation practices that can improve water quality and economic sustainability. Two of those projects, the Belle Fourche and the Spring Creek projects, are just down the road from
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us here in Rapid City.
Outreach to the agricultural community is a top priority for the region. Agriculture is a major industry in every EPA Region 8 state. And consequently, Region 8 partners with states, tribes and agricultural associations conducting annual meetings with the state agriculture commissioners, periodic joint meetings with state agriculture and environmental directors, annual meetings with State Agriculture Department and Tribal Pesticide Program Directors, and periodic Webinars.

We also work with interested states, legislative officials and agricultural associations to customize specific events. Recent examples include a one-week outreach tour on spill prevention, control and countermeasure requirements organized with the South Dakota Farm Bureau in which we conducted training, clarified misconceptions and answered producer questions in eight towns across South Dakota.

EPA's Water Security Division conducted a multi-stakeholder water preparedness and resiliency workshop in the City of Pierre in July of 2014. And additionally, beginning in 2014, EPA Region 8 initiated a replicable drought resilience project in
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the upper Missouri River Basin to demonstrate how to leverage federal and state resources in the development and implementation of watershed drought resiliency plans.

While my testimony provides just a snapshot of our public outreach activities, I hope that these examples of the engagement activities that the EPA delivers regionally and in South Dakota provide insight into our commitment to engage in meaningful outreach with all of our stakeholders.

I'd like to close by emphasizing that EPA's permitting and rule-making actions include important requirements for public participation to ensure meaningful feedback and input on agency actions, and we take these requirements seriously, not just because they're required but because they help us make more effective rules that more closely align with the priorities of the public and interested stakeholders.

And with that, I look forward to your questions, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Thank you, sir. And I would be remiss if I didn't thank you for being here, Shaun. We go back quite a ways back to western governor days. And I know that you were working
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with the State of South Dakota at that time as a liaison between western governors in South Dakota. So you know the West; you grew up out here. And you live in Colorado, Boulder. And I think you were mayor of Boulder, as a matter of fact.

MR. SHAUN McGRATH: Yes, sir.
SENATOR ROUNDS: And I appreciate you changing your travel plans to make this meeting out here as well. Thank you.

MR. SHAUN McGRATH: Sure.
SENATOR ROUNDS: We will now turn to our next witness, Regional Director Noreen Walsh, for five minutes.

Director Walsh, you may begin.
MS. NOREEN WALSH: Thank you. Good morning, Chairman, and thank you for the opportunity to provide this testimony here today.

The Service's mission is working with others to conserve fish, wildlife and their habitat for the continuing benefit of the American people. Collaboration with private landowners is integral to what we do, and our primary tool is the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program.

Since 1987, the Partners Program has offered voluntary habitat projects to benefit both wildlife
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and over 50,000 landowners. Every dollar invested through this program leverages over \$8 in total project funding and generates \$15 in economic returns.

But numbers and dollars don't tell the true story of the Partners Program. Our core values include open communication and building trust, and we place a high premium on streamline delivery and quick adaptation to landowner needs. For example, during the drought conditions of 2012 and '13, we expedited funding for over 200 new livestock water developments to help South Dakota landowners maintain healthy grasslands and their cows during that difficult time. Because the Partners Program is based on finding mutual interests, it often results in parties exploring additional voluntary conservation opportunities, including conservation easements.

The Dakotas are the heart of the most productive habitat for waterfowl in the United States, and voluntary easements are an important conservation tool. Under our easement terms, landowners are paid to keep wetlands and grasslands on their property, yet they are able to farm the wetlands when they are dry, graze grasslands without
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restriction and hay grasslands after the nesting season.

Each of these voluntary easements represents a unique and valued relationship with a South Dakota landowner that starts one on one, usually with coffee around a kitchen table discussing what kind of options may or may not work for that individual. We work hard to maintain those relationships. We feel confident that this program works for landowners because there is high interest. We have a backlog of over 700 South Dakota landowners who are interested in participating when funding becomes available.

Private landowners are also vital partners in administering the Endangered Species Act. Many of our activities under the ESA involve working cooperatively with landowners to help ensure that species do not need the protection of the ESA.

In the case of the sage grouse, we worked with ranchers in western states to develop Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances. These agreements conserve sage grouse while ensuring viable ranching operations, with no future regulatory restrictions, even in the event of a future ESA listing for this species.
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Within recent years, the Service listed under the ESA two butterflies historically found in native grasslands of the Dakotas. We worked closely with individual landowners to address their concerns. One butterfly was listed as threatened, allowing us to use the flexibilities inherent in the ESA, and therefore routine operations such as fence and corral construction, noxious weed control and haying after July 15th are not impacted at all.

As we evaluated areas for ESA critical habitat designation as required by the law, we held public and individual meetings with landowners. We listened very carefully. In the end, we excluded from critical habitat any private lands that already had an ongoing conservation effort and whose owners did not want their lands designated as critical habitat.

In South Dakota and across the nation, the Service is working hard with people to accomplish our conservation mission, because our conservation mission is for people, including the next generation of farmers, ranchers and landowners.

I have been fortunate to visit South Dakota many times, and I have found much in common with the landowners that I have visited with, including
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deeply held values for family and a concern for future generations.

Three weeks ago I hosted a meeting in Aberdeen for Fish and Wildlife Service leadership from all across the nation. We visited with several landowners during that meeting. We heard good advice about building relationships between the agency and landowners, and we heard genuine appreciation for our voluntary conservation programs. We heard a landowner express excitement that a listed butterfly was found on her property because that meant that she had healthy grasslands. And lastly, we heard an urging for the Service to continue to help landowners ensure that prairie grasslands remain on the landscape, supporting future generations of both people and wildlife.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments today.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Thank you for your testimony, Director Walsh.

I will begin my questions for this panel, and then we'll move to the next panel.

First of all I just, once again, want to thank both of you for being with us here today.

Mr. McGrath, do you feel that the current
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process is sufficient for involving the public in the rule-making process and that the public comments are fully considered when the agency is promulgating regulations?

MR. SHAUN McGRATH: Thank you, Senator. Yes, in my experience, and I've been through the rule making of both the Clean Water Rule and the Clean Power Plan as a couple of examples where there really is a very directive outreach effort to propose a rule, to provide public comment opportunities, to have hearings, public meetings. And the feedback, the input that we receive as a result of that process really does have an impact on what is ultimately proposed in the final rule.

SENATOR ROUNDS: The reason why I ask the question, if you take a look at the huge number of critical comments the agency has received and the number of lawsuits challenging EPA regulations, it seems to be a testament to the flaws in the regulatory process. How do you believe the EPA can better engage the public? And do you believe that more substantive, and I mean more direct and thorough public engagement, could result in fewer lawsuits, less adversity between the EPA and the public and regulations that are more accommodating
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to private landowners' rights?
MR. SHAUN McGRATH: Senator, I --
SENATOR ROUNDS: I mean, the number of lawsuits are significant when it comes to, in particular, WOTUS and the Clean Power Plan.

MR. SHAUN McGRATH: And I don't dispute that. The challenge, of course, is regardless of what the proposal is going to read, there's always going to be the threat of lawsuits. It's very difficult in these kinds of environmental regulations to propose something that is going to please everybody and be able to avoid lawsuits. So -- but I don't dismiss the spirit of your question, which is how can we engage, do more active engagement with the public to inform, as reasonable as an approach as we're able to. And I can assure you that the agency is very much willing to engage and provide those opportunities for input. And, again, we do take to heart the feedback that we get.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Let me just look at just a couple of specifics. And perhaps -- and if you're not up to speed on them, just tell me and we'll move on.

MR. SHAUN McGRATH: Sure.
SENATOR ROUNDS: But when it comes to Atrazine,
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it's a vital tool in a producer's toolbox for controlling small seeded grounders in grasses. The EPA is currently reviewing its registration. Has your office communicated with or solicited feedback from producers, ag organizations and State Departments of Ag regarding this review and what impact it may have for them?

MR. SHAUN McGRATH: So, Senator, you're absolutely correct, it is under registration review, and that process does require, as we're looking at the ecological risk assessment, does require that there be a public comment period. And so there will be opportunity for that engagement. I can, though, take the question back to my folks and provide more specific information of what that engagement entails.

SENATOR ROUNDS: I'm just curious: What is the EPA's process for informing and working with State Departments of Ag when a pesticide violation occurs within the state?

MR. SHAUN McGRATH: So, Senator, we work closely with our state partners, and so there is coordination that happens. It depends on the case, of course. But often with enforcement where the state has delegated responsibilities, then they
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would be the lead, and we would be doing oversight of the enforcement program of the state.

Where the state doesn't have the delegation, then the EPA would be in the lead. But, again, we would inform the state, work with them to agree that it was appropriate.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Director Walsh, in your testimony you noted the number of permanent conservation easements that the Service enters into with landowners. Does the Service provide other conservation options for landowners who do not want the burden of placing their land with a lifetime easement that is passed down through the generations? Do you have other options out there available? And do you provide information to landowners who might want shorter term leases or shorter term easements?

MS. NOREEN WALSH: Thank you, Senator. We do. We provide, through the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program that I mentioned, the ability to enter into contracts as short as ten years or as long as 30 years on habitat improvement projects.

But also very importantly, our Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program biologists who visit with landowners, as they sit down with an individual
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landowner are able to represent to that landowner not only the service programs that are available but those programs through USDA, through NRCS, through South Dakota Game, Fish \& Parks or private entities like the Nature Conservancy or Pheasants Forever. So they do their best job to understand the landowners' needs and objectives for their property and point them in the direction of the program that would fit those needs the best.

SENATOR ROUNDS: You also point out the Partners Program as one of the most successful collaborative conservation programs between the Service and landowners, partly attributed to the lack of red tape and the ease of the program. How do you eliminate the usual bureaucratic red tape in the Partners Program? And should this program be a model to replace other more burdensome regulations?

MS. NOREEN WALSH: Thank you, Senator. We've worked very hard in the Partners Program over its 30-year history to keep the agreement and the paperwork, the paperwork that we send landowners, to be very streamlined and very clear. And so it starts one on one with sitting down with that landowner understanding what they are interested in and making sure that it's clearly articulated in
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what is less than a ten-page agreement that they end up signing.

SENATOR ROUNDS: I notice that you had mentioned your work with regard to two butterfly species. And there's been some success in reducing the impact a listing has to landowners such as the steps the Service was taking or has taken in regards to the Dakota skipper and the, I'm going to mispronounce this but it's the poweshiek skipperling butterfly?

MS. NOREEN WALSH: Yes.
SENATOR ROUNDS: However other species that should be delisted such as the gray wolf remain embroiled in lengthy legal battles. Why is there such a difference in the approaches to these two species, and how can the Service eliminate the inconsistencies that exist among the listings?

MS. NOREEN WALSH: Thank you, Senator. The two butterflies that I mentioned were both recently listed in 2015, so they're very early onto the list and very early in developing a recovery program for those species. Because we were able to work so closely with landowners as we made those listing decisions and the critical habitat decision, I think we have a very good foundation for working with
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private landowners where these butterflies mostly reside to work on recovery actions that will help get them off the list.

The poweshiek skipperling isn't found in South Dakota anymore and is in a pretty precarious state. Recovery may be a ways off for that.

In the case of the gray wolf species listed for a lot longer, that I think some people find very charismatic and other people find very problematic. So while the Service has firmly believed that the gray wolf in the northern Rocky Mountains and in the western Great Lakes are biologically recovered and do not need to be on the list anymore, we have faced litigation over those decisions. In both cases we're appealing that litigation and hopeful that we will again have them off the list.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Do you find any difference between the way that you approached the work concerning the butterflies in the way that you approached it with landowners? Was it different than the way that it's been done previously with other species?

MS. NOREEN WALSH: With the butterflies that primarily exist on private land, we made a very, I would say, extraordinary effort to work through our
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landowner contacts to reach out individually to those landowners who might have butterflies on their property and to discuss one on one with them. And we certainly have found over time that the ability to have staff in the field to get to those people and have those conversations one on one makes all the difference in the world in how we can work with private landowners.

SENATOR ROUNDS: And I think it comes to bear that nearly 1,600 species that are listed under the ESA, only 66 have been delisted, and some of these not due to recovery but due to extinction or an error in data that required a listing revision. This is a pretty dismal success rate, and it seems to make the ESA a rather failed program at this point, or at least at the very least a program in desperate need of reform, especially considering the huge burden imposed on landowners when species are listed. I'm just curious your thoughts with regard to, you've been with it and you've followed it, if there were changes that you would make in the way that this process works, the first one or two that would come to mind, what would they be?

MS. NOREEN WALSH: Thank you, Senator. We have delisted 31 species due to recovery. We have
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prevented the extinction of 99 percent of the species that have been listed, so we consider that the first step on the road to recovery.

But as we move forward to delist even more species to bring them to the point where they don't need the protections of the act, my experience has been and I think the experience across our agency has been that we need to have the time and the resources to work with individuals to not only help them understand why species get listed in the first place and what their recovery needs are but to figure out how we can tailor those to their constraints. So we have developed many programs for conservation on private land that are respectful of those concerns and looked for those win/win solutions and what we need as we move into the future to really be able to focus on those programs. And the Partners Program is one of those.

SENATOR ROUNDS: And I think that's one that has had some success.

I want to go to one specific program just as a difference between the way that it worked for you and the one that doesn't seem to be working. And can you explain the work that the Service has done regarding the black footed ferret and why it appears
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that millions of taxpayer dollars have been spent over the past 30 years to conserve a species that has shown little increase in population.

MS. NOREEN WALSH: Yes, thank you, Senator. I think that the black footed ferret is a species that is firmly on the road to recovery but it is not there yet. And so as I know that you and others are aware, one of the greatest impediments to the recovery of this species is Sylvatic Plague, an introduced disease that the species didn't have to contend with historically but now has to contend with. And so one of the things that we are working on most, with the most significance in this road to recovery for the ferrets is developing a vaccine, an oral plague vaccine that could be administered much more efficiently to prairie dogs than the current approach of dusting individual prairie dog burrows with insecticides. We've done some small scale testing that has shown a lot of success with that, and we are moving this season to larger scale testing of this oral plague vaccine. We're very hopeful that having that tool passed through this experimental phase of being able to use it on the ground will prevent the kind of catastrophic die-offs of prairie dog towns that take ferret
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populations that have increased and bring them back down.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Now, before we go on, I just -- I want to work my way through this because I can tell you right now that that will be the headline, if we don't verify or work our way through this a little bit, that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is planning on vaccinating large numbers of prairie dogs across the United States, and there's going to be a lot of discussion about where you're going to get the money to do that kind of a program and so forth. So I'm going to let you qualify just a little bit as to where this is at before this is hung out to dry real quick, okay?

MS. NOREEN WALSH: Thank you.
SENATOR ROUNDS: Yes.
MS. NOREEN WALSH: So we're in an experimental phase right now, and we'll have to finish that experimental phase before we use it as a widespread tool. But to put it in context, I would tell you that the recovery plan for the black footed ferret contemplates having 3,000 total adult ferrets across the entire Great Plains and contemplates needing only one-tenth of 1 percent of existing prairie dog habitat that exists now. So recovery for the ferret
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involves a very small proportion of prairie dog habitat.

SENATOR ROUNDS: So what you're saying -- and this is the reason why I ask: We've been out to places where when you protect prairie dogs or you set them in a position to where they are supposed to be left alone and not managed, most ranchers will tell you they don't mind having a few dogs around but they want them managed. And the problem you've got is if you don't manage them, they multiply. And pretty soon either you have a drought like we had back in 2002 to 2006 and we saw what it did to the Conata Basin down here, and it literally turned it into a moonscape. It was unbelievable what had happened.

And then they would migrate. And in doing so they became a real pest. And then they got to the point where they were migrating out to where the different dog towns were actually connecting. And when the plague hit, it moved right on through the entire population. And that didn't do the black footed ferret any good at all.

So what you're suggesting is that you would be able to maintain -- I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, but what you're suggesting is you could
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maintain and would look at smaller populations or pockets of prairie dogs rather than very large towns like what we're looking at today in the management for the black footed ferret? Is that a fair statement?

MS. NOREEN WALSH: Very close, I think. We consider there to be three very important prongs to get to recovery. One of them is provide incentives for landowners who might be willing to host prairie dogs on their property.

The other one is the disease that we talked about.

But the third one is boundary control around the areas where we do have ferrets and prairie dogs. Because we recognize that even if an individual landowner is willing to host these two species, his or her neighbors may not be, and so providing boundary control for prairie dogs around the boundary of those properties is an important prong of recovery. And I would just mention that USDA APHIS has been a very important partner with us in ensuring that we can do that.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Thank you.
Mr. McGrath, is there anything that you wanted to add before we --

## APEX COURT REPORTING

MR. SHAUN McGRATH: No. Thank you.
SENATOR ROUNDS: Okay, great. Thank you very much.

First of all, I just want to say thank you to both Administer McGrath and Director Walsh for taking the time to be here with us today.

I'd now like to dismiss the first panel and invite our witnesses on the second panel to come on up.

And while the second panel is coming up, I'd like to submit for the record the statement of the South Dakota Farm Bureau. And I believe Wanda Blair, the vice president of the South Dakota Farm Bureau, has joined us in the audience for today's hearing. And I'd like to thank her for taking the time to attend our hearing as well.

We really do appreciate it. Thank you.
So our witnesses joining us here today for the second panel are Mr. Larry Rhoden, Mr. Jeff Lage, Mr. Myron Williams, Mr. Chuck Clayton and Ms. Denise Parker.

Come on up.
First of all, let me just begin by saying thank you very much for taking the time today to come on out and to do this.

I'm just going to work my way through the line very similar to what we did with our first panel. I'll introduce each of you and then ask you to give an opening statement. And when we're done, we'll move right on through it, and then I've got a series of questions that we'd like to ask. I think I'll begin with Mr . Clayton.

You're the first in line over here on this side.

Mr . Clayton is the president of Prairie Pothole Consulting on behalf of the Izaak Walton League of America.

And after Mr. Clayton, Ms. Denise Parker, volunteer of the Humane Society for the United States. Thank you for being here today.

Mr. Larry Rhoden, rancher and former state senator and a good friend, I might add. We've worked together when I was governor and also when I was in the legislature.

Mr. Jeff Lage, president of the South Dakota Home Builders Association.

I think I'm saying that correct, am I not?
MR. JEFF LAGE: It's getting really close.
SENATOR ROUNDS: Lage?
MR. JEFF LAGE: Lage.
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SENATOR ROUNDS: Lage? I'll get it right yet. And Mr. Myron Williams, South Dakota Cattlemen's Association. And I appreciate you coming out today as well.

Turn to our first witness, Mr. Chuck Clayton. Mr. Clayton, you may begin.

MR. CHUCK CLAYTON: Well, Chairman Rounds and Senator Markey, staff, and members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today concerning the importance of conserving and restoring streams, wetlands and other water resources that are essential to the economy, outdoor recreation and public health in South Dakota and across the nation.

I am Chuck Clayton. I'm the past president of the Izaak Walton League of America, and I live in Huron, South Dakota.

Healthy streams and wetlands are vital to hunting and angling, communities and the outdoor recreation economy.

Wetlands and streams provide vital fish habitat and duck habitat, for wildlife. For example, prairie pothole wetlands through the northern plains and southern Canada support about 50 percent of the North American duck population. And in a good year
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when we have the water and the grass, as much as 70 percent.

Ducks that hatch and grow to adulthood in these wetlands are harvested throughout the United States every fall.

However, following two confusing U.S. Supreme Court decisions (SWANCC in 2001 and Rapanos in 2006) and subsequent agency guidance, many streams and wetlands increasingly are at risk of being polluted or drained and filled. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 117 million people in the United States get their drinking water from one of these at-risk streams. In South Dakota -it's one in three Americans. And in South Dakota 309,000 residents are served by these streams for their public drinking water, and that's consistent with the national.

In the most current Status and Trends of Wetlands report by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concludes that wetland loss increased by 140 percent during a time period of 2004 to 2009, the years immediately following those two Supreme Court decisions, compared with the previous assessment period in 1998 to 2004. From 2008 to 2012 South Dakota has lost 12,640 acres of wetlands
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to agricultural land use conversion, the most of any other state according to Lark, et al., University of Wisconsin, a Madison study in 2015.

Each year nearly 47 million Americans head into the field to hunt and fish. They support jobs, manufacturing and the overall economy. These directly support 1.5 million American jobs, and it ripples through the economy to more than $\$ 2$ billion a year is generated from this. According to the Fish and Wildlife Service, in 2011 270,000 resident and non-resident hunters took to the fields in South Dakota and spent nearly $\$ 597$ million. And also more than 260,000 anglers spent more than $\$ 203$ million. Pheasant hunting in the prairie pothole region attracted 80,000 out-of-state hunters in 2010, according to the Game, Fish and Parks.

When we think about the value of outdoor recreation, think about the economy that this tourism brings to South Dakota, it's our second largest industry, with an estimated annual positive economic impact of over $\$ 2$ billion according to the Department of Revenue in South Dakota.

Natural wetlands are also arguably one of the most cost-effective protections against flooding for communities large and small. The National Weather
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Service said that the 30-year average for flood damage is 8.2 billion annually. Water cannot be in two places at one time. If it's not in seasonal or temporary wetlands and naturally functioning streams in wetlands, it'll be in your basement or in a business.

What the Clean Water Rule, WOTUS, as the Senator called it, will and will not do: The Clean Water Rule adopted by the Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA in 2015 identified waters that are not and are covered by the Clean Water Act. It narrows the historic scope of Clean Water Act jurisdiction. It clearly defines the limits of tributaries. It draws a bright line physical and measurable boundaries on covering adjacent and nearby waters. It preserves and enhances existing exemptions for farming, ranching, forestry and other land uses. The exemptions from the Clean Water Act are maintained and enhanced.

Since 1977, the Clean Water Act has included 404 exemptions for farming, for construction, for farm and stock ponds, irrigation ditches, maintenance of ditches and roads. Under the language of the Clean Water Act, discharges associated with a broad range of activities are
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already exempt, and have been for 30 years. These statutory exemptions can only be modified by Congress. The agencies are bound by them and they cannot change them.

For the first time in regulation, explicitly excludes specific types of waters from the definition of "Waters of the United States." The following are among those types of waters: Prior converted cropland; many drainage ditches provided they are not excavated in a tributary; artificially irrigated areas; artificial, constructed lakes and ponds, including farm stock ponds and irrigation ponds; erosional features such as gullies, rills and other ephemeral features; puddles; groundwater, including groundwater draining from drain tile is exempted. When you consider the context of the existing statutory exemptions for certain discharges, the final rule more clearly identifies the waters not covered under the Clean Water Act and incorporates exemptions that had previously not been in the regulation.

The Clean Water Rule is critically important to safeguarding our nation's water resources, hunting and angling traditions and the outdoor recreation economy. The final rule provides more clarity. The
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rule is based on overwhelming science and common sense.

Thank you, Senator.
SENATOR ROUNDS: Mr. Clayton, thank you very much for your testimony and for being here today.

We will now hear from Ms. Denise Parker.
Ms. Parker, you may begin.
MS. DENISE PARKER: Senator Rounds, Senator Markey's staff and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you on behalf of the Humane Society of the United States and as a citizen of the State of South Dakota concerning the importance of the Endangered Species Act and how the loss of adequate funding to maintain a strong ESA would have a disastrous impact on endangered species that call South Dakota home or use South Dakota as a migratory corridor, in particular the gray wolf.

I am Denise Parker. I come to you as a proud South Dakotan, a resident of Lead in the beautiful Black Hills. I am a Navy veteran having served 26 years on active duty. In the last ten years I have expanded my knowledge on the environment through the Yellowstone Institute under the tutelage of some of America's foremost biologists, naturalists and
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environmentalists. I can tell you that some of my most memorable experiences in the wild have been encounters with gray wolves. One such experience was sharing a sighting of a mother wolf and her pups through a spotting scope with a foreign visitor whose only common language with me was the realization of what we were witnessing was something few in the world could say they had ever experienced, a wild wolf in its natural habitat. This experience could never have been possible were it not for the existence of the Endangered Species Act.

Recognizing that extinction is irreversible, the United States did in 1973 what no other country had done before, we established the Endangered Species Act. The act reflected the resolve of a society mature enough to guarantee a future for the rest of creation. America continues to stand behind that guarantee that says all creatures are important, not just for this generation but generations to come. Now 43 years later, the act itself has become under endangered by different entities that want free rein to dig, blast, kill, extract and pollute wherever they see fit. They want to dismantle the act through the members of
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Congress. Yet according to a national poll recently conducted, it shows 90 percent of American voters do support the ESA. The act is based on common sense, proven science and balanced solutions that offer flexibility to communities, private landowners and government agencies.

Today the gray wolf is protected under the ESA in all of South Dakota. Currently there is no known established population of gray wolves in South Dakota. What is known is that single wolves have been sighted and in several cases killed traversing through South Dakota. This suggests that these wolves are utilizing parts of South Dakota as a corridor migrating in search of a mate or other friendly wolves.

In 2012 a gray wolf was shot in Custer County. DNA testing showed that wolf came from the Great Lakes Region. Also in 2012 a radio collared wolf was found to be from Yellowstone National Park and was hit and killed on the Pine Ridge Reservation. Of alarming importance is the fact that the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks has no management plan for the gray wolf, either now or in the event of the loss of federal protections under the ESA.
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Additionally, our state legislature amended existing laws to list the wolf as a varmint. Were the gray wolf to lose federal protections, wolves could be shot on sight. In fact, one of our elected state legislators openly professes and encourages the doctrine of "shoot, shovel and shut up," even as the wolves are in a protected status. Certainly this type of behavior does not provide conservation minded South Dakotans with a feeling that our interests have meaning when it comes to the seriousness of the ESA.

Partnerships are critical in the efforts to conserve endangered species. The U.S. Fish and Wildife Service has developed many tools and incentives under the ESA to protect the interests of private landowners. These programs are elaborated on in my submitted written testimony. All of these programs built into the ESA are meant to help, not harm or impede private landowners in any way.

In closing, sir, the science is clear, delisting wolves prematurely will have a catastrophic effect not only for the survival of the species but for the ecosystems that depend on them. Delisted populations are left to the devices of state management plans. South Dakota has none for
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the gray wolf.
The American people need the assurances made to us 43 years ago that all species are critical to our environment in its whole. Do not allow disassembly of a program that is working. A properly and adequately funded ESA remains the most important law our nation has ever passed to protect imperiled species for our children and generations to come.

Thank you, sir, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Thank you, Ms. Parker, for your testimony today.

At this time we will turn to Mr. Larry Rhoden. Mr. Rhoden, you may begin.

MR. LARRY RHODEN: Thank you, Senator. Well, Ms. Parker has made my comments -- distracted me slightly, and so I will resist the temptation to respond to the previous testimony and stick with the subject at hand.

Thanks for the opportunity to come before this committee this morning and testify on the impact of federal regulations on private property rights of South Dakota farmers and ranchers.

My name is Larry Rhoden. I ranch with my family near Union Center in western South Dakota.
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I've also served in the South Dakota Legislature and was a member of the Ag and Natural Resources Committee during my tenure there.

The topic of today's hearing is an important conversation, and farmers and ranchers are on the front lines in dealing with mandates and overreaching policies coming from the EPA. I've always been a staunch defender of private property rights and there's no question that the impact of federal regulations is real. Federal requirements, whether from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Labor or the Fish and Wildlife Service can and do have an immediate on-the-ground impact on how farmers and ranchers manage their land and how they tend and harvest their crops and ultimately on the profitability and sustainability of their operations.

Make no mistake, private property ownership comes with rights, and the landowners understand that. We also understand that along with those rights comes great responsibility of stewardship of the land. Farmers and ranchers are self-driven to protect the land and water because our livelihood depends on it. As a western South Dakota rancher, I do a great deal to keep waters clean and safe
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because it's essential to our survival. Farmers and ranchers throughout the country exhibit that stewardship through effective management practices such as pasture rotation, creating and maintaining wildlife habitat, buffer strips, water quality protection and much, much more. The notion that a government agency would know better how to manage water than the people actually living on the land and depending on water availability and quality for our livestock as a natural resource is simply outrageous.

The only thing hindering farmers and ranchers from doing what they already know to do in order to protect our water resources is the EPA. And we know the EPA is targeting areas that are not even close to qualifying as waterways, in spite of what we may have heard. Waters of the U.S. is an infringement of property rights and our ability to do what we need to to run our operations.

The WOTUS rule creates risk and uncertainty for farmers and ranchers and others who depend on their ability to work the land. The definition of tributary has been broadened to include landscape features that may not even be visible to the human eye or that existed historically but that are no
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longer present.
Farmers face enforcement action and severe penalties under WOTUS for using the same safe, scientifically sound and federally approved crop protection tools that they've used for years. What's more is the WOTUS language is disturbingly vague, leaving farmers and ranchers at risk for wrong interpretation and ultimate consequences. The obscurity in definitions and qualifications of WOTUS are confusing and the maps are difficult to understand. How is a rancher supposed to know what is or isn't a "Water of the U.S."? Many of the areas seldom, if ever, run water, yet we have very little way of knowing what is under the control of WOTUS.

We have diligently cared for the land for generations, and all of a sudden we may be subject to federal jurisdiction. There's also the threat of prosecution and penalties for normal practices such as cleaning out dams or building fences or even driving on land under EPA jurisdiction.

The WOTUS rules are oppressive and intimidating to ranchers and private property owners. EPA is out of line when increasingly complicated regulations cause angst among landowners who don't even know
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what to comply with.
I wanted to part from the rest of my testimony because I have one last point I wanted to make, and I think it's crucial for this conversation. I wanted to direct it to Mr. McGrath.

Because as I talk to farmers and ranchers, they feel a great deal of disdain and they feel very convinced that the EPA is out of touch. And you commented about the lengths you go to to communicate with the people. I can speak for myself as a legislator for 14 years, having served on the ag committee, chaired the senate state ag committee, was past national president of state ag and rule leaders, and in those -- in that period of time I've never once been approached by the EPA and asked for input or invited to a meeting. I've carried and passed resolutions specifically addressed and sent to the EPA mapping out our concerns. If I feel that out of touch and unapproachable by the EPA, how much more so is the average citizen of South Dakota going to feel that anything they say is going to fall on deaf ears? And all we want to do is provide common-sense solutions and approaches to some of the problems that you may perceive as real that may not be .
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So with that, Mr. Chairman, thanks again for the opportunity to testify before this committee. I look forward to answering questions at the appropriate time.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Larry, thank you for your testimony.

We will now turn to our next witness, Mr. Jeff Loge -- Lage, I'm going to get it right yet, for his statement.

Mr. Lage?
MR. JEFF LAGE: Chairman Rounds, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the impact of regulation on the home-building industry and housing affordability.

My name is Jeff Lage. I am co-owner of Lage Construction, a small business based in Rapid City, South Dakota. And I am also the president of the South Dakota Home Builders Association and represent some 1,900 members, several who are here in the audience.

Home building is one of the most regulated activities in the country. Surprisingly, government regulation can account for up to 25 percent of the cost of a single-family home. Unfortunately, the added cost of regulation prevents many families from
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realizing the American dream of home ownership. Most important to these -- most important to these compliance efforts is a permitting system that is, or a permitting system that is consistent, predictable and timely.

Unfortunately, the EPA finalized a rule that falls well short of providing the clarity and certainty the construction industry needs. This rule will increase federal regulatory power over private property and will lead to increased permit requirements, litigation and lengthy delays. The expansion of the government's authority will not improve water quality because much of the rule improperly encompasses water features that are already regulated at the state level.

Under this rule the ability to sell, build or expand real estate projects will suffer notable setbacks, including added costs and delays. Currently it takes an average of 788 days and almost $\$ 300,000$ to obtain an individual permit and 313 days and close to $\$ 30,000$ for a streamlined nationwide permit. These costs are passed on to homeowners, and even relatively small price increases can price low to moderate income home buyers out of the market.
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In addition to Clean Water Act challenges, builders face repercussions when the proposed land development or construction activity occurs where endangered species exist or in an area that the ESA designated as critical habitat.

The Fish and Wildlife Service's critical habitat rule changes the purpose of establishing critical habitat from supporting a specie's survival to supporting its recovery. This concept conflicts with Congress' intention that the critical habitat be limited to areas that are essential to the specie's continued existence, meaning its survival.

The rule significantly expands both the size of future critical habitat designations and the magnitude of the impact on the homebuilding industry, while creating confusion and uncertainty. It will empower the government to regulate vast areas of land, much of which is not occupied by the species and is not essential for the specie's survival. The ESA does not allow for such expansive designations.

The Fish and Wildlife Service's goal is to establish critical habitat in unoccupied areas that could potentially, potentially serve as habitat. The dusky gopher frog offers an excellent example of
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the expanded scope of critical habitat. 1,555 acres of private land was designated as unoccupied critical habitat for the frog. However, the frog's habitat requires specific physical or biological features for its survival and this land would have to be substantially altered in order to potentially support the frog's habitat. These elements needed to support the frog are absent, and the only way to make the land suitable is through controlled burns and revegetation, which the government admits it cannot mandate on privately held land. Yet the land will still be regulated as critical habitat. Where does the regulatory authority stop?

This rule will cause significant project delays, costly project modifications and additional requirements when building in a critical habitat designated area. In some cases the project cannot proceed, resulting in the loss of the landowner's investment.

It is extremely difficult to be a homebuilder in this current regulatory environment. Regulations add to the cost of any home and increase the time it takes to build it. Protecting our nation's natural treasures is important, however my business cannot continue to thrive, grow or thrive in this
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atmosphere. We must work together to find an appropriate balance so that South Dakotans can raise their families in safe and affordable homes while also enjoying our state's natural resources. Thank you, Chairman Rounds.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Mr. Lage, thank you for your testimony.

At this time we'd like to invite Mr. Myron Williams to deliver his testimony.

MR. MYRON WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator.
Good morning. My name is Myron Williams. I ranch and farm near Wall. I'm a cow/calf producer, background feeder, and I raise wheat, corn and alfalfa.

Thank you, Senator Rounds, and other committee members, for allowing me to testify today on the impacts of the Environmental Protection Agency's WOTUS rule and the U.S. Fish \& Wildlife's implementation of the Endangered Species Act.

First to address the Waters of the U.S. Rule, let's be clear, everyone wants clean water. Farmers and ranchers rely on clean water to be successful in our businesses, but expanding the federal regulatory reach of the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers does not equal clean water. If this final rule is fully
implemented it could conceivably impact every aspect of my operation by potentially regulating every tributary, stream, pond and dry streambed on my land. What's worse is the ambiguity in the rule that makes it difficult, if not impossible, to determine just how much my operations will be affected.

We are pleased the courts saw fit to impose a stay on the implementation of the WOTUS rule and hope, Senator, you and Congress will require the EPA to go back to the drawing board and engage with farmers and ranchers and other stakeholders to seek viable solutions before any new rules are formulated.

Regarding the Endangered Species Act (ESA), many in my area are familiar with the burdens this can bring thanks to the reintroduction of the black footed ferret in the Conata Basin which you referenced in your opening testimony. I explained the seriousness of the prairie dogs to you one day in Wall, and you had the viability to come look at the situation and sent Secretary Larry Gabriel to establish these buffer zones which are still functioning today and protecting adjacent private property. Between that and the plague, the prairie
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dogs have been controlled.
But we are losing the battle on the black footed ferret. After 30 plus years and many millions of dollars, there are 75 ferrets that can be accounted for. And my question to you is: Is this a viable project? Is it worth the estimated 600,000 per surviving ferret when the national debt is $\$ 19$ trillion?

Today the number of species listed on the Endangered Species list is 2,226 with only about half of those, 1,156, having recovery plans in place. In the history of the ESA, only 66 species have been delisted. This means we spend millions and millions of taxpayer dollars on a program that has roughly a 1.4 percent success.

There was an article in last week's Tristate News on the grizzly bear and its relocation and how that problem is working and the problem it's causing landowners with losses to livestock which they have no control over. And the same with the gray wolf program, many other states have tried to develop a program but been fought by the environmental community to not delist it.

We want to continue to do our part for wildlife and the environment, but the "sue and settle"
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tactics of the so-called environmental organizations have turned the good intentions that was created by the EPA and Fish and Wildlife decades ago into a farce. Today these two important government agencies are frequently pawns that must either do the bidding of radical environmentalists or face costly lawsuits than waste valuable time, human resources and taxpayer dollars.

Nobody depends on the conservation of our natural resources more than family farms and ranches, many of which are multi-generational businesses like mine that hope to continue for many generations in the future. In order for that to be possible, we urge Congress to stop the regulation by bureaucracy and halt the onslaught of costly and burdensome rules that don't achieve measurable results.

We look forward to continuing to work with Congress to ensure that we have the ability to do what's best, produce the world's safest, most nutritious, abundant and affordable protein while giving consumers the choice they deserve. Together we can sustain our country's excellence and prosperity.

I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you

## APEX COURT REPORTING

today and thank you for your time.
One comment I would make, if nobody even thought about it, but during the '70s when those regulations were in place, we had built the interstate system before that. Today, Senator, I don't think we'd have in there an interstate system. We would not have dams on the Missouri River, and we wouldn't have any pipelines.

Thank you for your time.
SENATOR ROUNDS: Mr. Williams, thank you for your testimony today.

At this time I will begin questioning. Time constrains the total number of questions that I can ask, but I would like to work my way through a series of them and see where it goes.

I'd like to begin with Mr. Clayton.
Mr. Clayton, in your opinion how can the agencies better collaborate with landowners and the recreational community to eliminate the conflicts that have often occurred over the regulatory process?

MR. CHUCK CLAYTON: Well, thank you, Senator.
The Izaak Walton League of America, both here in South Dakota and also in Washington, D.C. seems to be the ones that -- we don't let the perfect get
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in the way of the good, and we are known for working between the groups and passing, trying to pass laws and get cooperation from both landowners, sportsmen, builders, everybody. And I think if state agencies, especially ones that deal with things regulated that private landowners own, we would advance our causes a lot more. Oftentimes what happens is in the South Dakota Legislature and in Washington, D.C. all of a sudden this bill pops up by special interest. And one side loves it and the other side hates it and there's nobody in the middle. So if we could have more groups like our own and other sportsmen's groups that would be willing to sit down with landowners and ranchers, farmers and talk, I think it would be a lot better. I used to do that when I was the president of the South Dakota Wildlife Federation and South Dakota Izaak Walton League. I don't see anything wrong with that process.

SENATOR ROUNDS: This is off a little bit, but I'm just going to ask anyway. The Conservation Reserve Program was a ten-year program. It seemed to me that it was very good for wildlife and it was a good option for a lot of farmers and ranchers out there. Has your group seen good support for the CRP program?
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MR. CHUCK CLAYTON: Oh, we support it immensely, but the problem is we had all the push from the input industries that sell feed, seed, fertilizer, tractors, and they didn't want that CRP because that cut into their business. So, as you know, you have this balancing act between all sides.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Sure. Landowners have got to decide where they can actually afford to pay for the land they've got and maintain the land they've got. MR. CHUCK CLAYTON: Exactly.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Personally I'm a proponent of CRP. I like it.

Ms. Parker, I agree with the goals of the Endangered Species Act, but I'm concerned with what appears to be a very low success rate. According to the U.S. Fish \& Wildlife Act, there are 1,226 species currently listed as endangered. In the history of the ESA only 66 species have been delisted, some of them due to extinction and others due to errors in the organizations that required the removal. The Fish \& Wildlife Service has had errors which required that their removal, you know, be ordered from the list. How should the Endangered Species Act be reformed in order to increase the success rate, and how can private landowners become
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more engaged in conservation in order to prevent a species from being listed?

MS. DENISE PARKER: Well, in the case of landowners, I highly recommend, because the Fish \& Wildlife Service does have several programs that will work with landowners in various ways to help them to balance as far as if they have an endangered species that's within the confines of their land, I think working with those programs that are already in place that a lot of times landowners are not even aware of.

As far as what appears to be a low success rate is -- probably our greatest success rate is that of the removal of the bald eagle. And of course everybody knows how important the Bald Eagle is to our country.

Some of the species that are still struggling along are struggling because of the interaction with humans in various areas of our country.

I like to look toward South Dakota. I worry about the black footed ferret. I worry about the long eared bat, our dipper which we can oftentimes find in Spearfish Canyon. But it is a matter of working with landowners, the stakeholders and compromising a lot of times. And I don't think that
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we do enough of that.
Certainly the efforts of certain groups to attach riders to unrelated bills in Congress that are seeking to either defund or tie the hands of the U.S. Fish \& Wildlife, you know, who works very hard, I mean talk about a balancing act, these folks are under fire all the time. And, you know, their primary mission is not only to conserve wildlife but also work on behalf of all the homeowners -- or the landowners and stakeholders in this.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Thank you. I actually have a house on the river, and it's one of the greatest things in the morning to come on out and see whether or not if one of the baldies is sitting on one of the trees behind the house. And it's a marvelous opportunity to see a beautiful bird, and it's something that you get up and you enjoy doing.

I do have a question for Mr. Rhoden. And you've testified that the Environmental Protection Agency actually hinders farmers and ranchers from being able to effectively manage and conserve resources on their lands. Can you explain how the EPA is often an obstacle to environmental conservation?

MR. LARRY RHODEN: Well, I believe probably the
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most important factor, especially with WOTUS, you know, we don't know what effect that will have because it's not been implemented yet. What we don't do in western South Dakota -- and I understand, you know, we have two different worlds in South Dakota. The things that affect eastern South Dakota and the management practices are significantly different than in western South Dakota, the topography, but all the more reason for public input and common sense in the way that we set forth rules.

One size does not fit all. And when I look at rules that are proposed for western South Dakota under Waters of the United States, it's hard to fathom how we would deal with it as far as what they describe as waterways and how, you know, the criteria they use to describe what constitutes a waterway. And so it's up to the imagination to know what effect that will have. I mean, it goes anywhere from none at all to catastrophic as far as our ability to do with land what we need to do to maintain our operation.

I think we lose track of the fact -- you know, I've been on the same place for 57 years. My father put the place together before me when he came home
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from World War II. My brother is on the original homestead. That is a story that we see repeated all across the state. We want what's best for the land, not because, you know, we're good guys, but we need to sustain that land. We have, you know, the skin in the game in protecting the water quality. Our survival depends upon it. And so -- and all we want to do is make a living and protect the land and fulfill our responsibility to the land.

So to have a government agency come along, especially with the type of rules that we've seen that just blow your mind as far as common sense -so I don't have a good answer to your question. God forbid I do in a couple years because it's implemented and now we're dealing with the fallout and the regulations that are being proposed under wotus.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Thank you. I just have -Larry, I'll just make a point that you were a majority leader when I was governor, and during that time we worked through the issue of regulations then. Any difference between the way you see the process of if you were working with a state agency and the processes we use in South Dakota versus the processes that you've seen in terms of your national
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 affiliations and so forth working with the EPA or the U.S. Fish \& Wildlife Service?MR. LARRY RHODEN: Yeah, you know, I -- yeah, pretty dramatic. You know, we worked together on a prairie dog management plan to help, you know, come up with a solution, you know, to back away from the brink, if you will, as far as the danger of having the prairie dog listed as an endangered species.

So Eric Bogue was the majority leader in the Senate; I was majority leader in the House, and we carried the companion bills or the same bill. House and Senate prime sponsors worked with your office to develop that management plan and the Department of Agriculture, and it was a long process but it was a good process.

During that time we had committee hearings where we invited all South Dakotans, anybody that had a stake in the game to come and testify. So that's a good process. That's the way it should work. We should be able to look the people that it's going to affect in the eye, hear a real-world scenario of how that's going to affect them, work through the process and change and tweak it to represent some common sense and sound logic. And, you know, I think it's a good process. I wish we

## APEX COURT REPORTING

had more of that at the federal level.
SENATOR ROUNDS: Thank you.
Mr. Lage, you testified about the fact that project proponents do not have a seat at the table during additional statutory reviews triggered by the Clean Water Act and this puts builders at a disadvantage. Could you explain how builders are placed at a disadvantage and the impact this has on the ability to construct new homes in South Dakota?

MR. JEFF LAGE: Well, we have an issue with affordability all over the country. And that's within South Dakota also. You know, when 25 percent of the cost of a home is government regulation, we need to have a bigger seat at the table.

People want to experience the, you know, American dream of home ownership. We need to be allowed to participate, face on the table, and put out our concerns rather than writing letters and writing reports and writing details. So we need to get -- we need to be involved. We need to be involved up front.

There's some numbers out there that are rather scary when it comes to home construction. And one is, you know, it goes back to affordability again, when you raise the price of a house on a median home
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a thousand dollars, 234,000 people can no longer qualify to buy that home.

And costs, they get passed on. When there's excessive costs, they get passed on through the process. Just like any business, you're going to add whatever cost is at the bottom product.

So we just need to be able to have a more upfront, face-to-face, accept what's going on. Home building is one of the major factors for the country.

SENATOR ROUNDS: I noticed, if I could, in terms of nationally, in your testimony you talked a little bit about this, but the vague definitions that you referred to in the Waters of the U.S. could result in the Agency interpreting regulatory terms in an overly broad manner that could greatly expand the Agency's regulatory authority. Do your members across the country have concerns that different EPA Regional Offices could interpret in different ways leading to a patchwork of varying Clean Water Act permitting issues and regulations? And I'm just curious if you want to expand on that a little bit.

MR. JEFF LAGE: Yeah, that is a major concern across the country. And, like you said, there's too much interpretation in the law.
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I'm going to give you an example. I live in a subdivision south of Rapid City. We use our ditches to move our water. In theory, it could be interpreted anything that could possibly hold water or run water at any time could be impacted. Our utilities are in the ditches. So if we need to do utility work, hook up to a water hydrant, hook up or dig up a water line, we would possibly have to get a permit, depending on the interpretation of those theories. And, you know, it just puts so much burden. You don't know whether you can even mow your own ditch in front of your yard because it could potentially hold water.

I think it should be -- I mean, this is huge to every American that owns property. You are being told what you can do with your property. And you're taking away private property rights, by the government. You're not getting compensated for it. You just have to play by their rules. Like, you own a piece of property, Here's what you can do with it; here's what you can't do with it. You can't touch that because it could have water in it. You know, it's just complete overreach of the Federal Government.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Mr. Williams, in your
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testimony you mentioned that under WOTUS rule you may be required to obtain federal permits for normal ag operations. Your concern with the additional costs this could impose on your operation, how would you manage it, and how do you see this actually impacting? Are you thinking of the core permits or getting the core permits, or are there specifics that you found out about already that you're concerned with? Could you expand a little bit about --

MR. MYRON WILLIAMS: I guess I haven't found out about it specifically, but what we've been told, going by our major organizations, Farm Bureau and other ones, the Housing Association, that they're going to be there. I haven't experienced it myself, but I know of people personally that have gotten in trouble, thought they had the right permits and all of a sudden they were looking at \$44,000-a-day fine. That's the scary part is the interpretation of what the Agency said is okay, and then if we're going to forget that, I guess I don't trust. I guess I feel that that's an area that's pretty vague. And we need it to be isolated.

I think we were a lot better when it was Navigable Waters of the United States, not All
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Waters of the United States. But I think that's a key word.

SENATOR ROUNDS: You also testified about your concerns with the black footed ferret and the amount of taxpayer dollars that have been spent aimed at the conservation of the species. Can you tell us your experiences with the conservation of this species and the impact that it's had on your land?

MR. MYRON WILLIAMS: Well, it has worked on the federal land user, and that's where the Conata Basin is is on federal lands.

SENATOR ROUNDS: Down in the Badlands?
MR. MYRON WILLIAMS: Badlands, yes, but it's also owned by the Forest Service. And it's in cooperation with it. It joins the Badlands National Park. So those two agencies are trying to grow the ferret population, but they're such a critical species that they think the best way to establish that species is to give it more room and more acres so that limits the amount of control they can do.

And limiting that control, those things are migrating. I live 5 miles from the nearest dog town, and we have them on a private section of our place that I eradicate three or four times a year. They migrate. They're just like hitchhikers, you'll
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see them come up on gravel roads in the spring of the year looking for a place to go. And they find them. They've got GPS. They find places to go. And they're a residual little critter. They devastate a pasture. And there's nothing wrong with having some of them, but I think there's a number.

And just, you know, the idea of it -- I've been doing this for 30 years. I mean, shouldn't they in some way draw the line in the sand and say, Well, I guess this didn't work? I mean, I would. If I was in business and failed that long, somebody would put me out of business.

SENATOR ROUNDS: I want to thank all of the panel for being here today.

I come away with this: I know the landowners here. I've been on their places or I've been around their places, and I know that they're pretty proud of them, the work they do in terms of conservation efforts.

I also respect what our association representatives have brought in here in terms of their interests in just seeing that the endangered species be protected and their interest in conservation as well.

I was born, as my dad continues to remind me,
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on the opening day of pheasant season. And he reminded me the other day that I still owe him a pheasant hunt that I had cost him.

And I think when we talk about the economic opportunities of having clean water and clean land, that's critical. The issue I think more than anything else seems to be how we come up with the appropriate national policies that can be implemented at the local level when you have so many differing types of local needs and accepted practices.

We've heard over a period of several different committee meetings or different inquiries that there is a difference between one location and another in terms of how they are interpreted.

The Corps of Engineers, we've had testimony from one farm group in our last meeting that they were actually still implementing WOTUS in terms of ag practices and changing from one ag practice to another ag practice, and that was clearly not the intent of the law when it was created.

So I think as much as anything, when we do these subcommittee meetings and hearings, we're looking not only to try to ferret out those areas that we see specific problems on, but we also are
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trying to determine whether or not the processes that we use can be improved.

And most certainly for those of us that have had experience at the local level, we've seen where the rule-making process in South Dakota can actually work, and it's one in which the legislative body has the final say as to whether or not that rule actually goes in and becomes effective.

At the federal level we haven't had that. In fact, where 41 states have a rules review process in place similar to South Dakota's, at the federal level one of the most frustrating parts, and I think our folks here from the U.S. Fish \& Wildlife and from EPA have probably heard the frustration of not -- although there is testimony provided, the same folks that make up the rule in the first place take the testimony, and then those same folks that wrote the rule in the first place decide whether or not the rule gets changed or whether it doesn't get changed. And to change on the part of Congress, anything happening actually takes an act of Congress to become effective. So what you've got is -- the default position is is that a rule being proposed by an unelected organization, an agency, then becomes effective unless the organized elected body,
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Congress, can get 60 votes in the United States Senate, or if the President disagrees, a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate in order to stop a rule or modify a rule.

That's different than what the states do where there's a rules review process that slows the rule-making process down to the point where you have modifications made. Because in many cases the agencies do want the rule to go into effect, but they do it with the blessing of a congressional committee or a legislative committee. That does not occur at the federal level. And I think that's one of the major changes that we have to look at is the rules-making process and whether or not Congress should have an active role in the rule making before it becomes effective, other than going through the onerous process of actually writing the legislation, passed by both the House and the Senate and passed by or, and also signed by the President.

On only two occasions that I'm aware of has the rule -- or the congressionally directed current process been effective in actually changing a rule since at least the 1990s. And when you think about the fact that we have over a million federal regulations on the books today and we're creating
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them at the rate of over 3,000, close to 3,500 more per year, you suddenly realize that the true legislative body at the federal level today are the agencies and not Congress.

And I think what we're hearing today are some of the frustrations but also the desires that these processes put in place actually work. Because when you have over -- you know, the vast majority of the land in the United States is actually operated by private landowners, you start to realize that you've got to have cooperation of landowners and acceptance by landowners if you really want the Endangered Species Act to work and if you really want a Navigable Waterways process to be accepted by folks who actually live and work on the land.

So with that, I just want to take this opportunity to thank all of our witnesses for being here today. You all add to this discussion, and it is greatly appreciated.

The hearing record will be open for two weeks, which brings us to Tuesday, September 13th. And with this, this hearing is adjourned. Thank you.
(The hearing concluded at 12:35 p.m., August 30, 2016.)
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| concern [3] 17/1 64/23 66 | conversation [2] 43/5 46/4 | cut [1] 57/5 |
| concerned [2] 57/14 66/9 | conversations [1] 25/6 | D |
| concerning [3] $24 / 19$ 33/10 $38 / 13$ | conversion [1] 35/1 converted [1] 37/9 | D ${ }^{\text {D.C [2] }}$ [5/24 56/8 |
| concerns [7] 8/21 16/4 $26 / 15$ | convinced [1] 46/8 | dad [1] 68/25 |
| 46/18 63/18 64/18 67/4 | cooperation [4] 7/19 56/3 | Dakota [62] 1/24 2/10 2/11 |
| concluded [1] 72/24 | 67/15 72/11 | 9/17 10/11 10/18 11/17 11/20 |
| concludes [1] 34/20 | cooperatively [1] 15/17 | 12/8 13/1 13/2 14/12 15/4 |
| conditions [1] 14/10 | coordination [1] 20/23 | 15/11 16/18 16/23 22/4 23/8 |
| conduct [1] 3/12 | core [3] 14/6 66/6 66/7 | 24/5 31/12 31/13 32/20 33/2 |
| conducted [5] 3/20 9/10 11/18 | corn [1] 51/13 | $\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 13 & 33 / 17 & 34 / 13 & 34 / 14\end{array}$ |
| 11/21 40/2 | Corps [6] 5/23 9/3 9/10 36/9 | $34 / 25$ 35/12 35/19 35/22 |
| conducting [2] 3/24 11/6 | 51/24 69/16 | $38 / 12$ 38/16 38/17 40/8 40/10 |
| conducts [1] 10/7 | corral [1] 16/ | 40/12 $40 / 13$ 40/22 41/25 |
| confident [1] 15/9 | correct [2] 20/9 32/22 | 42/23 $42 / 25$ 43/1 $43 / 24 \quad 46 / 20$ |
| confines [1] 58/8 | corridor [2] 38/17 40/14 | 47/17 47/18 55/24 56/8 56/16 |
| conflicts [2] 49/9 55/19 | cost [10] 4/22 5/1 5/2 35/24 | 56/17 58/20 60/4 60/6 60/7 |
| confusing [2] 34/6 45/10 | 47/24 47/25 50/22 63/13 64/6 | 60/9 60/13 61/24 63/9 63/12 |
| confusion [3] 7/1 7/4 49/16 | 69/3 | 70/5 73/1 |
| Congress [14] 3/19 6/11 9/6 | cost-effective [1] 35/ | Dakota's [1] 70/11 |
| 37/3 40/1 52/10 54/14 54/19 | costly [4] 5/8 50/15 54/7 | Dakotan [1] 38/20 |
| 59/3 70/20 70/21 71/1 71/14 | 54/15 | Dakotans [3] 41/9 51/2 62/17 |
| 72/4 | costs [7] 5/4 6/5 $48 / 18$ 48/22 | Dakotas [2] 14/19 16/3 |
| Congress' [1] 49/10 | 64/3 64/4 66/4 | damage [1] 36/2 |
| congressional [1] 71/10 | could [21] 18/23 27/15 29/25 | dams [2] 45/20 55/7 |
| congressionally [1] 71/21 | 39/8 39/10 41/4 49/24 52/1 | danger [1] 62/7 |
| conjunction [1] 9/10 | 56/11 63/7 64/11 64/14 64/16 | data [1] 25/13 |
| connecting [1] 29/19 | 64/19 65/3 65/4 65/5 65/13 | DATED [1] 73/10 |
| consequences [1] 45/8 | 65/22 66/4 66/9 | day [5] 52/20 66/18 69/1 |
| consequently [1] 11/5 | countermeasure [1] 11/16 | 69/2 73/10 |
| Conservancy [1] 22/5 | country [11] 9/12 10/ | days [3] 12/25 48/1 |
| conservation [24] 6/21 7/20 | 44/2 47/22 58/16 58/19 63/11 | deaf [1] 46/22 |
| 10/22 14/17 14/17 14/22 | 64/10 64/18 64/24 | deal [4] 43/25 46/7 $56 / 5$ |
| 15/21 16/15 16/20 16/20 17/9 | country's [1] 54/23 | 60/15 |
| 21/9 21/11 22/12 26/14 41/8 | County [2] 40/16 73/2 | dealing [2] 43/6 61/15 |
| 54/9 56/20 58/1 59/24 67/6 | couple [3] $18 / 8$ 19/21 $61 / 14$ | debt [1] 53/7 |
| 67/7 68/18 68/24 | course [3] 19/7 20/24 58/14 | decades [1] 54/3 |
| conserve [7] 7/16 13/19 15/22 | Court [5] 5/25 9/4 10/3 34/7 | decide [2] 57/8 70/18 |
| 27/2 41/13 59/8 59/21 | 34/23 | decision [1] 23/24 |
| conserving [1] 33/11 | court's [1] 7/3 | decisions [5] 9/5 23/24 24/14 |
| consider [3] 26/2 30/7 37/16 | courts [1] 52/8 | 34/7 34/23 |
| consideration [1] 7/9 | covered [2] 36/11 37/1 | deeply [1] 17/1 |
| considered [1] 18/3 | covering [1] 36/15 | default [1] 70/23 |
| considering [1] 25/17 | cow [1] 51/12 | defender [1] 43/8 |
| consistent [3] 10/5 34/16 | cow/calf [1] 51/1 | defines [1] 36/13 |
| 48/4 | cows [1] 14/13 | definition [2] 37/7 44/22 |
| constitute [1] 73/ | created [2] 54/2 69/21 | definitions [2] 45/9 64/13 |
| constitutes [1] 60/17 | creates [2] 5/14 44/20 | defund [1] 59/4 |
| constrains [1] 55/13 | creating [4] 7/17 44/4 49/16 | delays [3] 48/11 48/18 50/15 |
| constraints [1] 26/13 | 71/25 | delegated [1] 20/25 |
| construct [1] 63/9 | creation [1] 39/18 | delegation [1] 21/3 |
| constructed [1] 37/11 | creatures [1] 39/19 | delist [2] 26/4 53/23 |
| construction [6] $16 / 8$ 36/21 | Creek [1] 10/25 | delisted [6] 23/13 25/11 |
| 47/16 48/8 49/3 63/23 | criteria [1] 60/17 | 25/25 41/24 53/13 57/19 |
| Consulting [2] 2/12 32/11 | critical [19] 16/10 16/14 | delisting [1] 41/21 |
| consumers [1] 54/22 | 16/16 18/17 23/24 41/12 $42 / 3$ | deliver [1] 51/9 |
| contacts [1] 25/1 | 49/5 49/6 49/8 49/10 49/14 | delivers [1] 12/8 |
| contemplates [2] 28/22 28/23 | 49/23 50/1 50/3 50/12 50/16 | delivery [1] 14/8 |
| contend [2] 27/11 27/11 | $67 / 17 \quad 69 / 6$ | demonstrate [1] 12/1 |


| D | dispute [1] 19/6 distracted [1] 42/16 | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { eared [1] } & 58 / 22 \\ \text { early [2] } & 23 / 20 & 23 / 21 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DENISE [5] 2/14 31/20 32/13 | disturbingly [1] 45/6 | ears [1] 46/22 |
| 38/6 38/19 | ditch [1] 65/12 | ease [1] 22/14 |
| Denver [1] 9/15 | ditches [5] 36/22 36/23 37/9 | easement [2] 14/22 21/13 |
| Department [6] 10/11 11/10 | 65/2 65/6 | easements [5] 14/18 14/21 |
| 35/22 40/22 43/12 62/13 | Division [1] 11/21 | 15/3 21/9 21/17 |
| Departments [2] 20/6 20/19 | DNA [1] 40/17 | eastern [1] 60/6 |
| depend [2] 41/23 44/21 | do [54] 6/24 13/22 15/18 | ecological [1] 20/11 |
| depending [2] 44/9 65/9 | 17/25 18/20 18/21 19/14 | economic [5] 5/16 10/23 14/3 |
| depends [4] 20/23 43/24 54/9 | 19/18 21/11 21/14 21/15 | 35/21 69/4 |
| 61/7 | 21/18 22/6 22/15 24/13 24/17 | economy [6] 33/12 $33 / 2035 / 6$ |
| describe [2] 60/16 60/17 | 28/11 29/21 30/14 30/22 | 35/8 35/18 37/25 |
| deserve [1] 54/22 | 31/17 31/25 36/8 40/2 42/4 | ecosystems [1] 41/23 |
| designated [4] 16/16 49/5 | $\begin{array}{llllll}43 / 13 & 43 / 25 & 44 / 13 & 44 / 18\end{array}$ | educate [2] 8/20 10/14 |
| 50/2 50/17 | 46/22 53/24 54/5 54/19 56/15 | education [2] 8/14 10/19 |
| designation [1] 16/11 | 59/1 59/18 60/4 60/21 60/21 | effect [4] 41/22 60/2 60/19 |
| designations [2] 49/14 49/21 | 61/8 61/14 63/4 64/17 65/6 | 71/9 |
| desires [1] 72/6 | 65/16 65/20 65/21 66/5 67/20 | effective [8] 12/17 35/24 |
| desperate [1] 25/17 | 68/18 69/22 71/5 71/9 71/10 | 44/3 70/8 70/22 70/25 71/16 |
| despite [1] 5/15 | doctrine [1] 41/6 | 71/22 |
| details [1] 63/19 | does [11] 18/13 20/10 20/11 | effectively [1] 59/21 |
| determine [2] 52/6 70/1 | 21/10 41/8 49/20 50/13 51/24 | efficiently [1] 27/16 |
| devastate [1] 68/5 | 58/5 60/12 71/11 | effort [4] 9/11 16/15 18/9 |
| develop [5] 4/11 6/22 15/20 | doesn't [3] 21/3 26/23 70/19 | 24/25 |
| 53/21 62/13 | dog [8] 27/17 27/25 28/24 | efforts [7] 9/25 10/12 10/19 |
| developed [3] 9/3 26/13 41/14 | 29/1 29/19 62/5 62/8 67/22 | 41/12 48/3 59/2 68/19 |
| developing [3] 9/9 23/21 | dogs [10] 27/16 28/9 29/5 | eight [1] 11/19 |
| 27/14 | 29/8 30/2 30/10 30/14 30/18 | either [4] 29/11 40/23 54/5 |
| development [2] 12/3 49/3 | 52/20 53/1 | 4 |
| developments [1] 14/12 | doing [5] 21/1 29/16 44/13 | elaborated [1] 41/16 |
| devices [1] 41/24 | 59/17 68/8 | elected [2] 41/4 70/25 |
| dictate [1] 7/14 | dollar [1] 14/1 | elements [1] 50/7 |
| did [4] 16/16 29/12 $32 / 2$ | dollars [7] 14/5 27/1 53/4 | eliminate [3] 22/15 23/16 |
| 39/14 | 53/14 54/8 64/1 67/5 | 55/19 |
| didn't [5] 12/23 27/10 29/21 | don't [18] 14/5 19/6 19/12 | else [1] 69/7 |
| 57/4 68/10 | 26/5 28/6 29/8 29/10 45/25 | embroiled [1] 23/1 |
| die [1] 27/25 | 54/16 55/6 55/25 56/18 58/25 | emphasizing [1] 12/11 |
| die-offs [1] 27/25 | 60/2 60/4 61/13 65/11 66/21 | empower [1] 49/17 |
| difference [6] 23/15 24/17 | done [6] 24/21 26/24 27/18 | enacted [1] 6/11 |
| 25/7 26/22 61/22 69/14 | 32/4 39/15 73/8 | encompasses [1] 48/14 |
| different [10] 24/20 29/19 | down [9] 10/25 21/13 21/25 | encounters [1] 39/3 |
| 39/22 60/5 60/8 64/18 64/19 | 22/23 28/2 29/13 56/13 67/12 | encourage [1] 6/20 |
| 69/12 69/13 71/5 | $71 / 7$ | encourages [1] 41/5 |
| differing [1] 69/10 | drain [1] 37/15 | end [3] 6/4 16/13 23/1 |
| difficult [5] 14/14 19/9 | drainage [1] 37/9 | endangered [24] 6/10 6/10 |
| 45/10 50/20 52/5 | drained [1] 34/10 | 6/12 6/14 6/16 7/10 15/15 |
| dig [2] 39/23 65/8 | draining [1] 37/15 | 38/13 38/16 39/11 39/15 |
| diligently [1] 45/16 | dramatic [1] 62/4 | 39/22 41/13 49/4 51/19 52/15 |
| dipper [1] 58/22 | draw [1] 68/9 | 53/10 57/14 57/17 57/23 58/8 |
| direct [2] 18/22 46/5 | drawing [1] 52/11 | 62/8 68/22 72/12 |
| directed [1] 71/21 | draws [1] 36/14 | enforcement [3] 20/24 21/2 |
| direction [1] 22/8 | dream [2] 48/1 63/16 | 45/2 |
| directive [1] 18/9 | drinking [2] 34/12 34/16 | enforcing [1] 6/9 |
| directly [1] 35/7 | driven [1] 43/22 | engage [5] 12/9 18/21 19/14 |
| Director [7] 2/6 8/2 $13 / 12$ | driving [1] 45/21 | 19/17 52/11 |
| 13/14 17/20 21/7 31/5 | drought [4] 11/25 12/3 14/10 | engaged [1] 58/1 |
| directors [2] 11/9 11/11 | 29/11 | engagement [6] 9/11 12/7 |
| disadvantage [2] 63/7 63/8 | dry [3] 14/25 28/14 52/3 | 18/23 19/14 20/13 20/15 |
| disagrees [1] 71/2 | duck [2] 33/22 33/25 | engages [1] 8/16 |
| disassembly [1] 42/4 | Ducks [1] 34/3 | Engineers [4] 9/4 36/9 51/24 |
| disastrous [1] 38/15 | due [5] 25/12 25/12 25/25 | 69/16 |
| discharges [2] 36/24 37/18 | 57/19 57/20 | enhanced [1] 36/19 |
| Discovery [1] 10/18 | during [9] 14/10 14/13 17/6 | enhances [2] 8/22 36/16 |
| discuss [2] 25/3 47/12 | 34/21 43/3 55/3 61/20 62/16 | enjoy [1] 59/17 |
| discussing [1] 15/6 | 63/5 | enjoying [1] 51/4 |
| discussion [2] 28/10 72/18 | dusky [1] 49/25 | enough [2] 39/17 59/1 |
| discussions [1] 9/18 | dusting [1] 27/17 | ensure [5] 8/24 12/13 15/17 |
| disdain [1] 46/7 | duty [1] 38/22 | 17/14 54/19 |
| disease [2] 27/10 30/11 dismal [1] 25/14 | E | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { ensuring [2] } & \text { 15/22 } & 30 / 22\end{array}$ |
| dismantle [1] 39/25 dismiss [2] 19/12 | each $[3]$ $15 / 3$ $32 / 3$ $35 / 4$ | enter [1] 21/21 |


| E | exemptions [6] $36 / 1636 / 18$ | $7 / 13 \quad 8 / 11 \quad 12 / 2 \quad 40 / 24 \quad 41 / 3$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| entire [2] 28/23 29/21 | $36 / 21 ~ 37 / 2 ~ 37 / 17 ~ 37 / 20 ~$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 22 & 43 / 10 & 43 / 10 & 45 / 18 & 48 / 9 \\ 51 / 23 & 63 / 1 & 65 / 23 & 66 / 2 & 67 / 10\end{array}$ |
| entities [2] 22/4 39/23 | exist [3] 23/17 24/24 49/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll}67 / 11 & 70 / 9 & 70 / 11 & 71 / 12 & 71 / 24\end{array}$ |
| entitled [1] 3/12 | existed [1] 44/25 | 72/3 |
| environment [6] 3/10 10/12 | existence [2] 39/11 49/12 | federally [1] 45/4 |
| $38 / 23$ 42/4 50/21 53/25 | existing [4] 28/24 36/16 | Federation [1] 56/17 |
| environmental [20] 2/5 3/13 | $37 / 17$ 41/2 | feed [1] 57/3 |
| 4/7 4/25 6/7 7/20 8/1 8/12 | exists [1] 28/25 | feedback [5] 8/13 $12 / 1418 / 12$ |
| 8/18 8/25 9/7 11/9 19/10 | expand [4] 48/17 64/16 64/22 | 19/19 20/4 |
| $34 / 11$ 43/11 51/17 53/22 54/1 | 66/9 | feeder [1] 51/13 |
| 59/19 59/23 | expanded [2] 38/23 50/1 | feel [7] 15/9 17/25 46/7 |
| environmentalists [2] 39/1 | expanding [2] 5/11 51/23 | 46/7 46/18 46/21 66/21 |
| 54/6 | expands [1] 49/13 | feeling [1] 41/9 |
| EPA [37] 5/9 5/12 5/13 6/2 | expansion [1] 48/12 | fence [1] 16/7 |
| 8/11 8/15 8/16 9/3 9/9 10/2 | expansive [1] 49/20 | fences [1] 45/20 |
| 10/10 11/4 11/24 12/7 18/18 | expedited [1] 14/11 | ferret [14] 26/25 27/5 27/25 |
| 18/20 18/24 20/3 21/4 $36 / 10$ | experience [7] 18/6 26/6 26/7 | 28/21 28/25 29/22 30/4 52/18 |
| 43/7 $44 / 14$ 44/15 $45 / 21$ 45/23 | $39 / 3$ 39/10 63/15 70/4 | 53/3 53/7 58/21 67/4 67/17 |
| 46/8 $46 / 15$ 46/18 $46 / 19$ 48/6 | experienced [2] 39/9 66/15 | 69/24 |
| 51/24 52/10 54/3 59/23 62/1 | experiences [2] 39/2 67/7 | ferrets [4] 27/14 28/22 $30 / 14$ |
| 64/18 70/14 | experimental [3] 27/23 28 | 53/4 |
| EPA's [4] 5/15 11/21 $12 / 11$ | 28/19 | fertilizer [1] 57/4 |
| 20/18 | expires [1] 73/17 | few [2] 29/8 39/8 |
| ephemeral [1] 37/14 | explain [3] 26/24 59/22 63/7 | fewer [1] 18/23 |
| equal [1] 51/25 | explained [1] 52/19 | field [4] 1/10 3/12 $25 / 5$ 35/5 |
| eradicate [1] 6 | explicitly [1] 37/5 | fields [1] 35/11 |
| Eric [1] 62/9 | exploring [1] 14/16 | figure [1] 26/12 |
| erosional [1] 37/13 | express [1] 17/10 | filled [1] 34/10 |
| error [1] 25/13 | extinction [4] 25/12 26/1 | final [7] 5/17 9/23 18/14 |
| errors [2] 57/20 57/21 | 39/13 57/19 | 37/18 37/25 51/25 70/7 |
| ESA [23] 6/11 6/21 15/16 | extract [1] 39/24 | finalized [4] 4/21 4/24 5/2 |
| 15/18 15/25 16/2 $16 / 6$ 16/10 | extraordinary [1] 24/25 | 48/6 |
| 25/11 $25 / 15$ 38/15 $40 / 3 \quad 40 / 7$ | extremely [1] 50/20 | finalizing [1] 5/9 |
| 40/25 41/11 41/15 41/18 42/6 | eye [2] $44 / 25$ 62/21 | find [7] 24/8 24/9 24/17 |
| 49/4 49/20 52/15 53/12 57/18 | F | 51/1 58/23 68/2 68/3 |
| especially [4] 25/17 56/5 |  | finding [1] 14/15 |
| 60/1 61/11 | face [7] 7/1 45/2 $49 / 2$ 54/6 | fine [1] 66/18 |
| essential [4] 33/12 | 63/17 64/8 64/8 | finish [1] 28/18 |
| 49/11 49/19 | face-to-face [1] 64/8 | fire [1] 59/7 |
| establish [3] 49/23 52/23 | faced [1] 24/13 | firmly [2] 24/10 27/6 |
| 67/18 | facing [1] 9/19 | first [16] 2/4 7/24 17/23 |
| established [2] 39/15 40/9 | fact [7] 13/5 40/21 41/4 | 25/22 $26 / 3$ 26/10 $31 / 4$ 31/7 |
| establishing [1] 49/7 | 60/23 63/3 70/10 71/24 | $31 / 23$ 32/2 $32 / 8 \quad 33 / 5 \quad 37 / 5$ |
| estate [1] 48/17 | factor [1] 60/1 | 51/20 70/16 70/18 |
| estimated [2] 35/20 | factors [1] 64/9 | fish [32] 2/7 3/14 4/8 6/8 |
| et [1] 35/2 | failed [2] 25/15 68/11 | 6/18 7/8 8/3 13/19 13/23 |
| evaluated [2] 9/13 16/10 | fair [1] 30/4 | 17/4 21/19 21/24 22/4 28/7 |
| even [12] 15/24 26/4 30/15 | fall [2] 34/5 46/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 21 & 34 / 19 & 35 / 5 & 35 / 10 & 35 / 16\end{array}$ |
| 41/6 $44 / 15$ 44/24 $45 / 2045 / 25$ | fallout [1] 61/15 | 40/22 41/13 $43 / 12 \quad 49 / 6$ 49/22 |
| 48/23 55/2 58/11 65/11 | falls [1] 48/7 | 51/18 54/3 57/16 57/21 58/5 |
| event [2] 15/24 40/24 | familiar [1] 5 | 59/5 62/2 70/13 |
| events [1] 11/14 | families [2] 47/25 51/3 | fit [4] 22/9 39/24 $52 / 8$ |
| ever [3] 39/8 42/7 45/13 | family [4] 17/1 42/25 47/2 | 60/12 |
| every [6] 11/4 14/1 $34 / 5$ 52/1 | 54/10 | five [2] 8/7 13/12 |
| 52/2 65/15 | far [6] 58/7 58/12 60/15 | flaws [1] 18/19 |
| everybody [3] 19/11 5 | 60/20 61/12 62/7 | flexibilities [1] 16/6 |
| 58/15 | farce [1] 54/4 | flexibility [1] 40/5 |
| everyone [2] 3/3 51/21 | farm [9] 11/17 $14 / 24 \quad 31 / 12$ | flood [1] 36/1 |
| evidence [1] 5/22 | 31/13 36/22 37/12 51/12 | flooding [1] 35/24 |
| Exactly [1] 57/10 | 66/13 69/17 | focus [1] 26/17 |
| example [5] 9/2 14/9 33/22 | farmers [17] 9/19 16/22 42/23 | focused [1] 10/21 |
| 49/25 65/1 | 43/5 $43 / 14 \quad 43 / 2244 / 1 \quad 44 / 12$ | focusing [1] 8/16 |
| examples [3] 11/14 12/7 18/8 | $44 / 2145 / 245 / 7$ 46/6 51/21 | folks [6] 20/14 $59 / 6 \quad 70 / 13$ |
| excavated [1] 37/10 | 52/12 56/14 56/23 59/20 | 70/16 70/17 72/14 |
| excellence [1] 54/23 | farming [2] 36/17 36/21 | followed [1] 25/20 |
| excellent [1] 49/25 | farms [1] 54/10 | following [3] 34/6 34/22 37/8 |
| excessive [1] 64/4 | father [1] 60/24 | footed [9] 26/25 27/5 28/21 |
| excitement [1] 17/10 | fathom [1] 60/15 | 29/22 $30 / 4 \quad 52 / 18 \quad 53 / 3 \quad 58 / 21$ |
| excluded [1] 16/13 | features [5] 37/13 37/14 | 67/4 |
| excludes [1] 37/6 | 44/24 48/14 50/5 | forbid [1] 61/14 |
| exempt [1] 37/1 | February [1] 73/18 | foregoing [1] 73/6 |
| exempted [1] 37/16 | federal [24] 3/20 3/21 7/11 | foreign [1] 39/5 |


| $F$ | $32 / 1 \text { 46/20 46/21 47/8 56/20 }$ | happens [2] 20/23 56/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| foremost [1] 38/25 | 66/13 66/15 66/20 71/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { hard [5] } & 15 / 8 & 16 / 19 & 22 / 19\end{array}$ |
| Forest [1] 67/14 | good [19] $3 / 3$ 3/9 13/15 $17 / 6$ | 59/5 60/14 |
| forestry [1] 36/17 | 23/25 29/22 32/17 33/25 | harm [1] 41/19 |
| Forever [1] 22/5 | 51/11 54/2 56/1 56/22 56/23 | harvest [1] 43/15 |
| forget [1] 66/21 | 56/24 61/4 61/13 62/15 62/19 | harvested [1] 34/4 |
| former [2] 2/9 32/16 | 62/25 | has [35] 3/19 4/21 7/7 13/24 |
| formulated [1] 52/14 | gopher [1] 49/25 | 18/17 20/3 20/25 23/6 23/7 |
| forth [3] 28/12 60/11 62/1 | got [9] 29/10 29/17 32/5 | 24/10 26/6 26/8 26/20 26/24 |
| fortunate [1] 16/23 | 57/7 57/9 57/9 68/3 70/22 | 27/3 27/11 27/19 30/21 31/14 |
| Forum [1] 4/20 | 72/11 | $34 / 25$ 36/20 39/22 40/22 |
| forward [8] 3/17 5/9 5/23 | gotten [1] 66/16 | 41/14 41/25 42/7 42/16 44/23 |
| 7/22 12/20 $26 / 4$ 47/3 54/18 | government [11] 7/11 40/6 | 53/15 56/24 57/21 63/8 67/9 |
| fought [1] 53/22 | 44/7 47/22 49/17 50/10 54/4 | 70/6 71/20 |
| found [8] 16/2 16/24 17/11 | 61/10 63/13 65/18 65/24 | hatch [1] 34/3 |
| 24/4 25/4 40/19 66/8 66/11 | government's [1] 48/12 | hates [1] 56/10 |
| foundation [1] 23/25 | governments [2] 4/4 4/5 | have [99] |
| four [1] 67/24 | governor [3] 12/25 32/18 | haven't [3] 66/11 66/15 70/9 |
| Fourche [1] 10/24 | 61/20 | having [9] 27/22 28/22 29/8 |
| free [1] 39/23 | governors [2] 5/19 13/2 | 38/21 46/11 53/11 62/7 68/6 |
| frequently [1] 54/5 | GPS [1] 68/3 | 69/5 |
| friend [1] 32/17 | grants [1] 10/17 | hay [1] 15/1 |
| friendly [1] 40/15 | grass [2] 10/16 34/1 | haying [1] 16/8 |
| frog [3] 49/25 50/3 50/8 | grasses [1] 20/2 | he [2] 60/25 69/1 |
| frog's [2] 50/3 50/7 | grasslands [7] 14/13 14/23 | head [1] 35/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { front [4] } 3 / 6 \quad 43 / 6 \quad 63 / 21 \\ & 65 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ccccc} 14 / 25 & 15 / 1 & 16 / 3 & 17 / 12 & 17 / 15 \\ \text { gravel } & {[1]} & 68 / 1 & & \end{array}\right.$ | ```headline [1] 28/6 health [2] 8/25 33/13``` |
| frustrating [1] 70/12 | gray [12] 23/13 24/7 24/11 | healthy [3] 14/13 17/12 $33 / 18$ |
| frustration [1] 70/14 | 38/18 39/3 40/7 40/9 40/16 | hear [5] 4/6 4/10 4/12 $38 / 6$ |
| frustrations [1] 72/6 | 40/23 41/3 42/1 53/20 | 62/21 |
| fulfill [1] 61/9 | graze [1] 14/25 | heard [8] 5/22 17/6 17/8 |
| full [1] 73/7 | great [7] 24/12 28/23 31/2 | 17/10 17/13 44/17 69/12 |
| fully [3] 10/2 18/3 51/25 | 40/17 43/21 43/25 46/7 | 70/14 |
| functioning [2] 36/4 52/24 | greatest [3] 27/8 58/13 59/12 | hearing [12] 1/10 3/12 3/17 |
| funded [1] 42/6 | greatly [3] 8/22 64/16 72/19 | 7/23 7/25 31/15 31/16 43/4 |
| funding [4] 14/3 14/11 15/12 | grew [1] 13/3 | 72/5 72/20 72/22 72/24 |
| 38/14 | grizzly [1] 53/17 | hearings [4] 3/24 18/11 $62 / 16$ |
| future [8] 15/23 15/25 17/2 | ground [2] 27/24 43/14 | 69/23 |
| 17/16 26/17 39/17 49/14 | grounders [1] 20/2 | heart [2] 14/19 19/19 |
| 54/13 | groundwater [2] 37/14 37/15 | held [5] 3/24 9/15 16/11 |
| G | group [2] 56/24 69/17 | $17 / 150 / 11$ |
| Gabriel [1] | 56/12 56/13 59/2 | $\begin{array}{cccccl}\text { help } \\ \text { 17/14 } & 24 / 2 & 26 / 9 & 41 / 18 & 58 / 7\end{array}$ |
| game [5] $22 / 4$ 35/16 40/22 | grouse [2] 15/19 15/22 | 62/5 |
| 61/6 62/18 | grow [3] 34/3 50/25 67/1 | helping [2] 8/23 10/14 |
| general [1] 5/20 | guarantee [2] 39/17 39/19 | helps [1] 8/11 |
| generated [1] 35/9 | guess [4] 66/11 66/21 66/21 | her [4] 17/11 $30 / 17$ 31/15 |
| generates [1] 14/3 | 68/10 | 39/4 |
| generation [2] 16/21 39/20 | guidance [1] 34/8 | here [21] 7/22 8/5 11/1 12/23 |
| generational [1] 54/11 | gullies [1] 37/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 3 & 13 / 8 & 13 / 17 & 17 / 24 & 29 / 13\end{array}$ |
| generations [7] 17/2 17/16 | guys [1] 61/4 | 31/6 31/18 32/8 32/15 38/5 |
| 21/14 39/21 42/8 45/17 54/13 | H | 47/19 55/23 68/14 68/16 |
| gentlemen [1] 3/9 |  | 68/21 70/13 72/18 |
| genuine [1] 17/8 | habitat [28] 6/17 13/19 13/25 | here's [2] 65/20 65/21 |
| get [18] 19/19 24/3 25/5 | 14/20 16/10 16/14 16/17 | hereby [1] 73/5 |
| 26/10 28/11 30/8 33/1 34/12 | 21/22 23/24 28/25 29/2 33/21 | high [2] 14/8 15/10 |
| 47/8 55/25 56/3 59/17 63/20 | 33/22 39/9 44/5 49/5 49/7 | highly [1] 58/4 |
| 64/3 64/4 65/8 70/19 71/1 | 49/8 49/10 49/14 49/23 49/24 | Hills [1] 38/21 |
| gets [1] 70/19 | 50/1 50/3 50/4 50/7 50/12 | him [2] 69/2 69/3 |
| getting [3] 32/23 65/18 66/7 | 50/16 | hindering [1] 44/12 |
| give [4] 5/11 $32 / 3$ 65/1 | habitats [1] 6/13 | hinders [1] 59/20 |
| 67/19 | had [23] 16/15 17/12 23/3 | his [3] 30/16 47/8 51/9 |
| giving [1] 54/22 | 26/20 29/11 29/14 37/20 39/8 | historic [1] 36/12 |
| go [8] 12/24 26/21 28/3 46/9 | 39/15 52/21 55/4 57/2 57/21 | historically [3] 16/2 27/11 |
| 52/11 68/2 68/3 71/9 | 62/16 62/18 63/1 66/17 67/8 | 44/25 |
| goal [4] 6/7 6/12 7/19 49/22 | 69/3 69/16 70/4 70/9 73/8 | history [3] 22/20 53/12 57/18 |
| goals [1] 57/13 | half [3] 5/1 6/16 53/11 | hit [2] 29/20 40/20 |
| God [1] 61/13 | halt [1] 54/15 | hitchhikers [1] 67/25 |
| goes [4] 55/15 60/19 63/24 | hand [1] 42/19 | hold [2] 65/4 65/13 |
| 70 / 8 | hands [1] 59/4 | home [17] 2/10 32/21 38/16 |
| going [22] 3/5 19/8 $19 / 8$ | happened [1] 29/15 | 47/13 $47 / 18$ 47/21 $47 / 24$ 48/1 |
| 19/11 23/8 28/10 28/11 28/12 | happening [1] 70/21 | 48/24 50/22 60/25 63/13 |


| H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { impacted [2] } 16 / 9 \text { 65/5 } \\ & \text { impacting [1] } 66 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | ```linteraction [1] 58/18``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| home... [5] 63/16 63/23 63/25 | impacts [2] 4/4 51/17 | interested [4] 11/12 12/18 |
| 64/2 64/8 | impede [2] 6/21 41/19 | 15/12 22/24 |
| home-building [1] 47/13 | impediments [1] 27/8 | interests [4] 14/15 41/10 |
| homebuilder [1] 50/20 | imperiled [1] 42/7 | 41/15 68/22 |
| homebuilding [1] 49/15 | implementation [4] 10/4 12/3 | interpret [1] 64/19 |
| homeowners [2] 48/22 59/9 | 51/19 52/9 | interpretation [4] 45/8 64/25 |
| homes [2] 51/3 63/9 | implemented [5] 7/3 52/1 60/3 | 65/9 66/19 |
| homestead [1] 61/2 | 61/15 69/9 | interpreted [2] 65/4 69/15 |
| hook [2] 65/7 65/7 | implementing [4] 5/24 6/9 | interpreting [1] 64/15 |
| hope [3] 12/6 52/10 54/12 | 10/5 69/18 | interstate [2] 55/5 55/6 |
| hopeful [2] 24/15 27/22 | importance [3] 33/10 38/13 | intimidating [1] 45/22 |
| host [2] 30/9 30/16 | 40/21 | into [10] 12/9 21/9 21/21 |
| hosted [1] 17/3 | important [15] 12/12 14/21 | 26/16 29/14 35/4 41/18 54/3 |
| hot [1] 3/6 | $30 / 7$ 30/19 30/21 37/22 39/20 | 57/5 71/9 |
| house [7] 59/12 59/15 62/10 | 42/6 $43 / 4$ 48/2 $48 / 2$ 50/24 | introduce [1] 32/3 |
| 62/11 63/25 71/3 71/18 | 54/4 58/15 60/1 | introduced [1] 27/10 |
| housekeeping [1] 3/4 | importantly [1] 21/23 | invested [1] 14/1 |
| housing [2] 47/13 66/14 | impose [4] 4/3 7/13 52/8 66/4 | investment [1] 50/19 |
| how [36] 4/7 4/10 4/13 4/15 | imposed [1] 25/18 | invite [2] 31/8 51/8 |
| 4/17 8/10 8/16 9/21 12/1 | imposing [1] 6/23 | invited [2] 46/16 62/17 |
| 18/20 19/13 $22 / 14$ 23/16 $25 / 7$ | impossible [1] 52/5 | involve [1] 15/16 |
| 26/12 $38 / 14 \quad 43 / 14 \quad 43 / 1544 / 7$ | improperly [1] 48/14 | involved [2] 63/20 63/21 |
| 45/11 $46 / 19$ 52/6 53/17 55/17 | improve [2] 10/23 48/13 | involves [1] 29/1 |
| 57/23 57/25 58/15 59/22 | improved [3] 4/17 4/18 70/2 | involving [1] 18/1 |
| 60/15 60/16 62/22 63/7 66/4 | improvement [1] 21/22 | irreversible [1] 39/13 |
| 66/5 69/7 69/15 | in [254] | irrigated [1] 37/11 |
| however [6] 5/24 7/12 $23 / 12$ | incentives [2] $30 / 8$ 41/15 | irrigation [2] 36/22 37/12 |
| $34 / 650 / 3$ 50/24 | include [4] 11/15 $12 / 12$ 14/7 | is [142] |
| huge [3] 18/16 25/18 65/14 | 44/23 | isn't [2] 24/4 45/12 |
| human [2] 44/24 54/7 | included [2] 9/11 36/20 | isolated [1] 66/23 |
| Humane [3] 2/14 32/14 38/11 | including [10] 3/25 8/12 9/17 | issue [3] 61/21 63/10 69/6 |
| humans [1] 58/19 | 10/13 14/17 16/21 16/25 | issued [2] 5/21 10/2 |
| hundreds [1] 9/11 | $37 / 12$ 37/15 48/18 | issues [3] 9/19 10/8 64/21 |
| hung [1] 28/14 | inclusive [1] 73/6 | it [97] |
| hunt [2] 35/5 69/3 | income [1] 48/24 | it'll [1] 36/5 |
| hunters [2] 35/11 35/15 | inconsistencies [1] 23/17 | it's [26] 19/9 20/1 22/25 |
| hunting [3] 33/19 35/14 $37 / 23$ | incorporates [1] 37/20 | 23/9 24/21 32/23 34/14 35/19 |
| hurdles [1] 5/14 | increase [4] 27/3 48/9 50/22 | $36 / 3$ 44/1 $46 / 4 \quad 53 / 18$ 59/12 |
| Huron [1] 33/17 | 57/24 | 59/15 59/16 60/3 60/14 60/18 |
| hydrant [1] 65/7 | increased [3] 28/1 34/20 | 61/14 62/21 62/25 65/23 67/8 |
| I | 48/10 | 67/13 67/14 70/6 |
|  | increases [1] 48/2 | its [8] 20/3 22/19 39/9 42/4 |
| $31 / 10$ 31/15 55/16 | increasing [2] | 49/9 49/12 50/5 53 |
| $31 / 10$ 31/15 55/16 | increasingly [2] 34/9 45/24 | itself [1] 39/22 |
| I'll [4] 32/3 32/6 33/1 | individual [7] 15/7 16/4 | Izaak [5] 2/13 32/11 $33 / 16$ |
| 61/19 | 16/12 21/25 27/17 30/15 | 55/23 56/17 |
| I'm [16] 20/17 23/8 25/19 | 48/20 | J |
| 28/12 $29 / 24$ 32/1 $32 / 22$ 33/15 | individually [1] 25/1 |  |
| 47/8 51/12 56/20 57/11 57/14 | individuals [1] 26/9 | JEFF [5] 2/10 $31 / 19$ 32/20 |
| 64/21 65/1 71/20 | industries [1] 57/3 | 47/7 47/15 |
| I've [10] 18/6 32/5 43/1 $43 / 7$ | industry [6] 9/7 11/4 35/20 | job [1] 22/6 |
| 46/14 46/16 60/24 68/7 68/16 | 47/13 48/8 49/16 | jobs [2] 35/5 35/ |
| 68/16 | inform [2] 19/15 21/5 | joined [1] 31/14 |
| idea [1] 68/7 | information [5] 8/22 10/13 | joining [2] 7/24 31/18 |
| identified [1] 36/10 | 10/19 20/15 21/15 | joins [1] 67/15 |
| identifies [1] 37/18 | informing [1] 20/18 | joint [1] 11/8 |
| if [28] 6/2 12/23 18/16 | informs [1] 8/22 | jointly [1] 9/3 |
| 19/21 25/20 28/6 29/10 $30 / 15$ | infringement [1] 44/17 | JOURNEY [1] 1/23 |
| $36 / 3$ 45/13 $46 / 18$ 51/25 $52 / 5$ | inherent [1] 16/6 | July [2] 11/23 16/9 |
| 55/2 $56 / 4$ 56/11 58/7 59/14 | initiated [1] 11/25 | jurisdiction [4] 5/13 36/12 |
| 61/23 62/7 64/11 64/22 65/6 | injunction [1] 7/7 | 45/18 45/21 |
| 66/20 68/10 71/2 $72 / 12$ 72/13 | input [8] 8/13 9/24 12/14 | just [33] 3/7 10/25 12/5 |
| II [1] 61/1 | 18/12 19/18 46/16 57/3 60/10 | 12/15 17/23 19/20 19/20 |
| imagination [1] 60/18 | inquiries [1] 69/13 | 19/22 20/17 $25 / 19$ 26/21 $28 / 4$ |
| immediate [1] 43/13 | insecticides [1] 27/18 | 28/12 $30 / 20$ 31/4 $31 / 23$ 32/1 |
| immediately [1] 34/22 | insight [1] 12/9 | $39 / 2052 / 6$ 56/20 61/12 61/18 |
| immensely [1] 57/2 | Institute [1] 38/24 | 61/19 64/5 64/7 64/21 65/10 |
| impact [17] 3/13 4/18 5/16 | integral [1] 13/21 | 65/19 65/23 67/25 68/7 68/22 |
| 6/5 18/13 20/7 23/6 35/21 | intent [1] 69/21 | 72/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}38 / 15 & 42 / 21 & 43 / 9 & 43 / 14 \\ 49 / 15 & 52 / 1 & 63 / 8 & 67 / 8\end{array}$ | intention [1] 49/10 | K |
|  |  | keep [3] 14/23 22/20 43/25 |


| K | lawsuit [1] $7 / 7$ <br> lawsuits [9] 7/2 7/4 7/5 | $10 / 18 \quad 10 / 22 \quad 69 / 9 \quad 69 / 10 \quad 70 / 4$ location [1] 69/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| key [1] 67/2 | 18/18 18/24 19/3 19/9 19/12 | Loge [1] 47/8 |
| kill [1] 39/23 | 54/7 | logic [1] 62/24 |
| killed [2] 40/11 40/20 | lead [4] 21/1 21/4 $38 / 20$ | long [4] 21/22 58/22 62/14 |
| kind [3] 15/6 27/24 28/11 | 48/10 | 68/11 |
| kinds [1] 19/10 | leader [3] 61/20 62/9 62/10 | longer [3] 24/8 45/1 64/1 |
| kitchen [1] 15/6 | leaders [2] 9/16 46/14 | look [13] 3/17 7/22 12/20 |
| know [36] 12/25 13/3 27/7 | leadership [1] 17/4 | 18/16 19/20 30/1 47/3 52/21 |
| 44/7 $44 / 13$ 44/14 45/11 45/25 | leading [1] 64/20 | 54/18 58/20 60/12 62/20 |
| 57/6 57/22 59/5 59/7 60/2 | League [5] 2/13 32/11 $33 / 16$ | 71/13 |
| 60/2 60/5 60/16 60/18 60/23 | 55/23 56/17 | looked [1] 26/15 |
| 61/4 61/5 62/3 62/4 62/5 | learn [1] 8/20 | looking [5] 20/10 30/3 66/18 |
| 62/6 62/25 63/12 63/15 63/24 | leases [1] 21/16 | 68/2 69/24 |
| 65/10 65/11 65/22 66/16 68/7 | least [3] 25/16 25/16 71/23 | lose [2] 41/3 60/23 |
| 68/15 68/17 72/8 | leaving [1] 45/7 | losing [1] 53/2 |
| knowing [1] 45/14 | led [1] 7/7 | loss [4] 34/20 38/14 40/24 |
| knowledge [1] 38/23 | left [2] 29/7 41/24 | 50/18 |
| known [3] 40/8 40/10 $56 / 1$ | legal [1] 23/14 | losses [1] 53/19 |
| knows [1] 58/15 | legislation [1] 71/17 | lost [1] 34/25 |
| 工 | legislative [4] 11/13 70/6 | lot [9] 24/8 27/19 28/10 |
|  | 71/11 72/3 | $56 / 7$ 56/15 56/23 58/10 58/25 |
| lack [1] 22/14 | legislators [1] 41/ | loves [1] 56 |
| ladies [1] 3/9 | legislature [4] 32/19 41/1 | low [3] $48 / 24 \quad 57 / 15$ 58/12 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { LAGE [12] } & 2 / 10 & 31 / 19 & 32 / 20\end{array}$ | 43/1 56/8 | M |
| $\begin{array}{llll}32 / 24 & 32 / 25 & 33 / 1 & 47 / 8 \\ 47 / 15 & 47 / 15 & 51 / 6 & 63 / 3\end{array}$ | lengths [1] 46/9 |  |
| 47/15 47/15 51/6 63/3 | lengthy [2] 23/14 48/11 | made [5] 23/23 24/24 42/2 |
| lakes [3] 24/12 37/11 40/18 | less [2] 18/24 23/1 | 42/16 71/8 |
| land [41] 4/12 4/19 5/12 6/18 | let [4] 19/20 28/12 31/23 | Madison [1] 35/3 |
| 6/23 6/24 7/12 7/16 21/12 | 55/25 | magnitude [1] 49/15 |
| 24/24 $26 / 14$ 35/1 $36 / 17$ 43/15 | let's [1] 51/21 | maintain [7] 14/13 $15 / 8$ 29/24 |
| 43/22 $43 / 23$ 44/8 $44 / 22$ 45/16 | letters [1] 63/18 | 30/1 38/14 57/9 60/22 |
| 45/21 49/2 49/18 50/2 50/5 | level [8] 48/15 63/1 69/9 | maintained [1] 36/19 |
| 50/9 50/11 $50 / 11$ 52/4 $57 / 9$ | 70/4 70/9 70/12 71/12 $72 / 3$ | maintaining [1] 44/4 |
| 57/9 58/9 60/21 61/3 61/5 | leverage [1] 12/2 | maintenance [1] 36/23 |
| 61/8 61/9 67/8 67/10 69/5 | leverages [1] 14/2 | major [5] 11/3 64/9 64/23 |
| 72/9 72/15 | liaison [1] 13/2 | 66/13 71/13 |
| landowner [8] 14/9 15/5 17/10 | lifetime [1] 21/12 | majority [4] 61/20 62/9 62/10 |
| 22/1 22/1 22/24 25/1 30/16 | like [21] 3/16 7/21 12/11 | 72/8 |
| landowner's [1] 50/18 | 22/5 $29 / 11$ 30/3 31/7 $31 / 11$ | make [12] 3/21 12/17 $13 / 8$ |
| landowners [60] 5/5 6/2 6/6 | 31/15 $32 / 6$ 51/8 54/12 $55 / 14$ | 25/15 $25 / 2143 / 18$ 46/3 50/9 |
| 6/19 6/24 6/25 7/11 7/15 | 55/16 56/12 57/12 58/20 64/5 | 55/2 61/8 61/19 70/16 |
| 7/19 10/22 13/21 14/1 14/12 | 64/24 65/19 67/25 | makes [2] 25/6 52/5 |
| 14/23 15/10 15/11 15/14 | limited [2] 5/7 49/11 | making [12] 3/25 6/4 8/23 $9 / 8$ |
| 15/17 16/4 16/12 16/22 16/25 | limiting [1] 67/21 | 12/12 18/2 18/7 22/25 70/5 |
| 17/6 17/8 17/14 21/10 21/11 | limits [2] 36/13 67/20 | 71/7 71/14 71/15 |
| 21/16 21/25 22/13 22/21 23/6 | line [6] 32/1 32/8 36/14 | manage [5] 29/10 43/15 44/7 |
| 23/23 24/1 24/20 25/2 25/8 | 45/24 65/8 68/9 | 59/21 66/5 |
| 25/18 30/9 40/5 41/16 41/19 | lines [1] 43/6 | managed [2] 29/7 29/9 |
| 43/19 45/25 53/19 55/18 56/3 | list [8] 7/10 23/20 24/3 | management [10] 3/11 6/20 |
| 56/6 56/14 57/7 57/25 58/4 | 24/13 24/16 41/2 53/10 57/23 | 10/15 $30 / 3$ 40/23 $41 / 2544 / 3$ |
| 58/6 58/10 58/24 59/10 68/15 | listed [16] 6/14 6/15 6/17 | 60/7 62/5 62/13 |
| 72/10 72/11 72/12 | $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 1 & 16 / 5 & 17 / 11 & 23 / 20 & 24 / 7\end{array}$ | mandate [1] 50/11 |
| landowners' [3] 6/22 19/1 | 25/10 25/19 26/2 26/10 53/9 | mandates [2] 4/3 43/6 |
| 22/7 | 57/17 58/2 62/8 | manner [1] 64/16 |
| lands [4] 16/14 $16 / 16$ 59/22 | listened [1] 16/13 | manufacturing [1] 35/6 |
| 67/11 | listing [5] 7/9 15/25 23/6 | many [16] 5/6 15/15 16/24 |
| landscape [2] 17/15 44/23 | 23/23 25/13 | 26/13 $34 / 8 \quad 37 / 9$ 41/14 45/12 |
| language [3] 36/24 39/6 45/6 | listings [1] 23/17 | 47/25 52/16 53/3 53/21 54/11 |
| large [3] 28/8 30/2 35/25 | literally [1] 29/13 | 54/12 69/9 71/8 |
| larger [1] 27/20 | litigation [3] 24/14 $24 / 15$ | mapping [1] 46/18 |
| largest [1] 35/20 | 48/11 | maps [1] 45/10 |
| Lark [1] 35/2 | little [9] 27/3 28/7 28/13 | market [1] 48/25 |
| LARRY [8] 2/9 31/19 32/16 | 45/14 56/19 64/13 64/22 66/9 | Markey [1] 33/8 |
| 42/13 42/24 47/5 52/22 61/19 | 68/4 | Markey's [1] 38/9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { last [4] } \\ & 69 / 17 \end{aligned} \quad 38 / 22 \quad 46 / 3 \quad 53 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{cccccl}\text { live [5] } & 13 / 4 & 33 / 16 & 65 / 1 \\ 67 / 22 & 72 / 15 & & \end{array}$ | marvelous [1] 59/15 masses [1] 5/13 |
| lastly [1] 17/13 | livelihood [1] 43/23 | mate [1] 40/14 |
| later [1] 39/21 | livestock [4] 10/16 14/11 | matter [3] 13/5 58/23 73/8 |
| law [5] 10/6 16/11 42/6 | 44/10 53/19 | mature [1] 39/17 |
| 64/25 69/21 | living [2] 44/8 61/8 | may [17] 5/23 8/8 13/14 15/7 |
| laws [3] 8/12 41/2 56/2 | local [9] 4/3 4/5 8/25 $9 / 6$ | 15/7 20/7 24/6 30/17 33/6 |


| M | $\begin{array}{ccccc} \text { most [17] } & 14 / 19 & 22 / 11 & 27 / 13 \\ 27 / 13 & 29 / 7 & 34 / 18 & 35 / 1 & 35 / 24 \end{array}$ | ational [9] $34 / 17$ 35/25 40/1 $40 / 19 \text { 46/13 53/7 61/25 67/15 }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| may... [8] 38/7 42/14 44/16 | 39/2 $42 / 6$ 47/21 $48 / 2 \quad 48 / 2$ | 69/8 |
| 44/24 45/17 46/24 46/24 66/2 | 54/20 60/1 70/3 70/12 | nationally [1] 64/12 |
| mayor [1] 13/5 | mostly [1] 24/1 | nationwide [3] 5/21 7/6 48/21 |
| maze [1] 6/25 | mother [1] 39/4 | native [1] 16/2 |
| McGRATH [8] 2/5 7/25 8/7 8/8 | Mountain [2] 2/6 8/3 | natural [8] 10/12 $35 / 23$ 39/9 |
| 17/25 30/24 31/5 46/5 | Mountain-Prairie [2] 2/6 8/3 | 43/2 44/10 50/23 51/4 54/10 |
| me [11] 19/20 19/22 31/23 | Mountains [1] 24/11 | naturalists [1] 38/25 |
| 39/6 42/16 51/16 56/22 60/25 | mouth [1] 29/25 | naturally [1] 36/4 |
| 68/12 68/25 69/2 | move [6] 17/22 19/22 $26 / 4$ | Nature [1] 22/5 |
| mean [7] 18/22 19/3 59/6 | 26/16 32/5 65/3 | Navigable [2] 66/25 72/14 |
| 60/19 65/14 68/8 68/10 | moved [2] 5/9 29/20 | Navy [1] 38/21 |
| meaning [2] 41/10 49/12 | moving [2] 5/23 27/20 | near [2] 42/25 51/12 |
| meaningful [2] 12/9 12/14 | mow [1] 65/11 | nearby [1] 36/15 |
| means [1] 53/13 | Mr [8] 31/19 31/19 31/20 | nearest [1] 67/22 |
| meant [2] 17/12 41/18 | $31 / 20$ 42/14 47/10 51/6 55/17 | nearly [5] 4/23 5/1 25/10 |
| measurable [2] 36/14 54/16 | Mr. [24] $7 / 25$ 8/9 $12 / 21$ | 35/4 35/12 |
| median [1] 63/25 | $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 25 & 30 / 24 & 32 / 7 & 32 / 10 & 32 / 13\end{array}$ | need [18] 15/18 24/13 25/17 |
| meeting [6] 3/12 13/8 17/3 | $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 16 & 32 / 20 & 33 / 2 & 33 / 5 & 33 / 6\end{array}$ | 26/6 26/8 26/16 42/2 44/19 |
| 17/6 46/16 69/17 | 38/4 $42 / 13$ 46/5 $47 / 147 / 7$ | 60/21 61/4 63/14 63/16 63/19 |
| meetings [9] 9/12 $9 / 15$ 11/7 | 51/8 55/10 55/16 59/18 63/3 | 63/20 63/20 64/7 65/6 66/23 |
| 11/8 11/9 16/12 18/11 69/13 | 65/25 | needed [1] 50/7 |
| 69/23 | Mr. Chairman [3] 8/9 12/21 | needing [1] 28/23 |
| member [1] 43/2 | 47/1 | needs [6] 14/9 22/7 22/9 |
| members [7] 9/6 33/8 38/9 | Mr. Chuck [1] 33/5 | 26/11 48/8 69/10 |
| 39/25 47/19 51/16 64/17 | Mr. Clayton [6] 32/7 32/10 | neighbors [1] 30/17 |
| memorable [1] 39/2 | $32 / 13$ 33/6 38/4 55/16 | nesting [1] 15/1 |
| mention [1] 30/20 | Mr. Jeff [2] 32/20 47/7 | never [2] 39/10 46/15 |
| mentioned [4] 21/20 23/4 | Mr. Lage [1] 63/3 | new [4] 1/24 14/11 52/13 |
| 23/19 66/1 | Mr. Larry [2] 32/16 42/13 | 63/9 |
| mics [1] 3/6 | Mr. McGrath [3] 17/25 30/24 | News [1] 53/17 |
| middle [1] 56/11 | 46/5 | next [4] 13/11 16/21 17/22 |
| might [4] 21/16 25/2 30/9 | Mr. Myron [2] 33/2 51/8 | 47/7 |
| 32/17 | Mr. Rhoden [1] 59/18 | no [10] 15/23 $31 / 1 \quad 39 / 14$ |
| migrate [2] 29/16 67/25 | Mr. Shaun [1] 7/25 | 40/8 $40 / 22$ 43/9 $43 / 18 \quad 44 / 25$ |
| migrating [3] 29/18 40/14 | Mr. Williams [2] 55/10 65/25 | 53/20 64/1 |
| 67/22 | Ms [3] 8/2 31/20 57/13 | nobody [3] 54/9 55/2 56/11 |
| migratory [1] 38/17 | Ms. [5] 32/13 38/6 38/7 | non [1] 35/11 |
| MIKE [1] 1/10 | 42/11 42/16 | non-resident [1] 35/11 |
| miles [1] 67/22 | Ms. Denise [2] 32/13 38/6 | none [2] 41/25 60/20 |
| million [7] 9/13 $34 / 11$ 35/4 | Ms. Parker [3] 38/7 42/11 | nompoint [2] 10/10 10/18 |
| $35 / 7$ 35/12 35/13 71/24 | 42/16 | NOREEN [3] 2/6 8/2 13/12 |
| millions [4] 27/1 53/4 53/13 | much [16] 16/24 19/17 27/15 | normal [3] 5/14 45/19 66/2 |
| 53/14 | 31/3 31/24 34/1 $38 / 5$ 44/6 | North [1] 33/25 |
| mind [3] 25/23 29/8 61/12 | 44/6 46/19 48/13 49/18 52/6 | northern [2] 24/11 33/23 |
| minded [1] 41/9 | 64/25 65/10 69/22 | not [63] 5/4 5/13 5/25 7/11 |
| mine [1] 54/12 | multi [3] 9/11 11/22 54/11 | 7/13 9/22 12/15 15/7 15/18 |
| minimal [1] 5/16 | multi-generational [1] 54/11 | 16/9 16/16 19/22 21/11 22/2 |
| minimize [2] 4/18 6/5 | multi-stakeholder [1] 11/22 | 24/13 $25 / 12 \quad 26 / 9 \quad 27 / 6 \quad 29 / 7$ |
| minutes [2] 8/7 13/13 | multi-year [1] 9/11 | 29/24 $30 / 17$ 32/22 $36 / 3 \quad 36 / 8$ |
| misconceptions [1] 11/18 | multiply [1] 29/10 | $36 / 10 \quad 37 / 10 \quad 37 / 19 \quad 37 / 20$ |
| mispronounce [1] 23/9 | MUSEUM [1] 1/23 | $39 / 11$ 39/20 41/8 41/18 41/22 |
| mission [4] 13/18 16/20 16/21 | must [2] 51/1 54/5 | 42/4 $44 / 15$ 44/24 $46 / 24 \quad 48 / 12$ |
| 59/8 | mutual [1] 14/15 | 49/18 $49 / 19$ 49/20 $51 / 25$ 52/5 |
| Missouri [2] 12/1 55/7 | my [30] $8 / 16$ 12/5 $17 / 2118 / 6$ | 53/23 $55 / 7$ 58/11 $59 / 8$ 59/14 |
| mistake [1] 43/18 | 20/14 26/6 28/4 32/1 38/23 | 60/3 60/12 61/4 63/4 65/18 |
| model [1] 22/17 | $39 / 141 / 17$ 42/16 $42 / 24 \quad 42 / 24$ | 66/25 69/20 69/24 70/1 $70 / 7$ |
| moderate [1] 48/24 | 43/3 $46 / 2$ 47/15 $50 / 24$ 51/11 | 70/15 70/19 71/11 $71 / 14 \quad 72 / 4$ |
| modifications [2] 50/15 71/8 | 52/2 52/3 52/6 52/16 53/5 | notable [1] 48/17 |
| modified [1] 37/2 | 55/14 60/24 61/1 68/25 73/9 | noted [1] 21/8 |
| modify [1] 71/4 | 73/17 | nothing [1] 68/5 |
| money [1] 28/11 | myriad [1] 7/ | notice [1] 23/3 |
| moonscape [1] 29/14 | MYRON [5] $2 / 11$ 31/20 $33 / 2$ | noticed [1] 64/11 |
| more [33] 6/2 7/4 7/9 7/13 | 51/8 51/11 | notion [1] 44/6 |
| 12/17 12/17 18/22 18/22 | myself [2] 46/10 66/15 | now [13] 8/6 13/11 27/11 |
| 18/25 19/14 $20 / 14$ 22/17 $26 / 4$ | N | 28/3 28/5 28/18 28/25 31/7 |
| 27/16 $35 / 8 \quad 35 / 12 \quad 35 / 13 \quad 37 / 18$ | $N$ | 38/6 39/21 40/23 47/7 61/15 |
| $37 / 2544 / 6$ 45/6 $46 / 20$ 54/10 | name [3] 42/24 47/15 51/11 | noxious [1] 16/8 |
| 56/7 56/12 58/1 60/9 63/1 | narrows [1] 36/11 | NRCS [1] 22/3 |
| 64/7 67/19 67/19 69/6 72/1 | nation [4] 16/18 $17 / 5$ 33/14 | number [8] 4/2 18/16 18/18 |
| morning [6] 3/3 3/9 13/15 | 42/7 | 19/3 21/8 53/9 55/13 68/6 |
| 42/21 51/11 59/13 | nation's [2] 37/23 50/23 | numbered [1] 73/6 |


| $\mathbf{N}$ | options [3] $15 / 7$ 21/11 $21 / 14$ or [59] 5/10 6/11 7/2 15/7 | $65 / 12 \quad 65 / 19$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| numbers [3] 14/5 28/8 63/22 | 20/4 21/16 21/21 22/4 $22 / 5$ | owner [1] 47/15 |
| numerous [1] 5/19 | 23/7 25/12 25/16 25/22 28/6 | owners [2] 16/15 45/23 |
| nutritious [1] 54/21 | 29/5 30/1 $30 / 17$ 34/10 $36 / 3$ | ownership [3] 43/18 48/1 |
| 0 | $36 / 5 \quad 38 / 16 \quad 40 / 14 \quad 40 / 23 \quad 41 / 19$ $43 / 12 \quad 44 / 25 \quad 45 / 12 \quad 45 / 20$ | $63 / 16$ <br> owns [1] 65/15 |
| Obama [1] 4/21 | 45/20 $46 / 16$ 48/4 48/16 $49 / 3$ | P |
| tives | $49 / 450 / 4 \quad 50 / 25 \quad 54 / 659$ |  |
| obstacle [1] 59/23 | 65/7 66/6 66/7 67/24 68/16 | page [1] 23/1 |
| obtain [2] 48/20 66/2 | 69/13 $70 / 1 \quad 70 / 7 \quad 70 / 18 \quad 70 / 19$ | pages [1] 73/6 |
| occasions [1] 71/20 | 71/2 $71 / 4 \quad 71 / 11$ 71/14 $71 / 19$ | paid [1] 14/23 |
| occupied [1] 49/18 | 71/21 | panel [11] 2/4 2/8 7/24 17/21 |
| occur [1] 71/12 | oral [2] 27/15 27/21 | 17/22 31/7 31/8 31/10 31/19 |
| occurred [1] 55/ | order [7] 10/2 44/13 50/6 | 32/2 68/14 |
| occurs [2] 20/19 | 54/13 57/24 58/1 71/3 | paperwork [2] 22/21 22/21 |
| off [4] 24/3 24/6 24/16 | ordered [1] 57/23 | Park [2] 40/19 67/16 |
| 56/19 | organization [1] 70/24 | PARKER [9] 2/14 31/21 32/13 |
| offer [1] 40/4 | organizations [4] 20/5 54/1 | 38/6 38/7 38/19 42/11 42/16 |
| offered [1] 13/24 | 57/20 66/13 | 57/13 |
| offering [1] 4/15 | organized [2] 11/17 70/25 | Parks [3] 22/4 35/16 40/22 |
| offers [1] 49/25 | original [1] 61/1 | part [4] 46/2 53/24 66/19 |
| office [4] 4/21 9/15 20/4 | Other [21] 21/10 21/14 22/17 | 70/20 |
| 62/12 | 23/12 $24 / 9$ 24/22 $30 / 11$ 33/11 | participate [1] 63/17 |
| Offices [1] 64/19 | 35/2 $36 / 17$ 37/14 $39 / 14$ 40/14 | participating [1] 15/12 |
| officials [2] 9/6 11/13 | 51/15 52/12 53/21 56/10 | participation [2] 3/23 12/13 |
| offs [1] 27/25 | 56/12 66/14 69/2 71/16 | particular [2] 19/4 38/18 |
| often [5] 7/13 $14 / 15$ 20/24 | others [4] 13/18 27/7 44/21 | parties [1] 14/16 |
| 55/20 59/23 | 57/19 | partly [1] 22/13 |
| oftentimes [2] 56/7 58/22 | Our [72] 3/16 4/6 7/16 7/16 | partner [1] 30/21 |
| Oh [1] 57/1 | 7/21 7/24 8/6 9/14 10/9 12/6 | partners [13] 11/5 13/22 |
| okay [3] 28/14 31/2 66/20 | 12/9 12/10 13/11 $13 / 2214 / 6$ | 13/24 14/6 14/14 15/14 20/22 |
| on [127] | 14/22 15/16 16/20 16/20 17/9 | 21/19 21/23 22/11 22/16 |
| on-the-ground [1] 43/1 | 20/22 21/23 24/25 26/7 28/6 | 22/19 26/18 |
| once [2] 17/23 46/15 | $31 / 8 \quad 31 / 16$ 31/18 $32 / 2 \quad 33 / 5$ | partnerships [2] 10/9 41/12 |
| one [46] 3/3 11/15 15/5 15/5 | $35 / 19$ 37/23 41/1 41/4 41/9 | parts [2] 40/13 70/12 |
| 16/5 22/11 22/23 22/23 25/3 | 42/3 $42 / 7$ 42/8 $43 / 23$ 44/1 | pass [1] 56/2 |
| 25/3 25/6 25/6 25/22 26/18 | 44/10 $44 / 14$ 44/18 $44 / 19$ | passed [10] 5/5 21/13 27/22 |
| 26/19 26/21 26/23 27/8 27/12 | 46/18 $47 / 7$ 50/23 $51 / 4 \quad 51 / 23$ | 42/7 46/17 48/22 64/3 64/4 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}28 / 24 & 30 / 8 & 30 / 11 & 30 / 13 & 34 / 13\end{array}$ | 53/24 54/9 54/23 56/6 56/12 | 71/18 71/18 |
| $34 / 14 \quad 35 / 23$ 36/3 $39 / 3$ 41/4 | 58/13 58/16 58/19 58/22 | passing [1] 56/ |
| 46/3 47/21 52/20 55/2 56/10 | 60/21 60/22 61/6 61/9 63/18 | past [3] 27/2 33/15 46/13 |
| 59/12 59/14 59/14 60/12 | 65/2 65/3 65/5 66/13 67/23 | pasture [2] 44/4 68/5 |
| 63/23 64/9 69/14 69/17 69/19 | 68/20 69/17 70/13 72/17 | patchwork [1] 64/20 |
| 70/6 70/12 71/12 | out [26] 13/3 13/8 21/14 | pawns [1] 54/5 |
| one-tenth [1] 28/24 | 22/10 $25 / 1 \begin{array}{lllll} & 26 / 12 & 28 / 14 & 29 / 4\end{array}$ | pay [1] 57/8 |
| one-week [1] 11/15 | 29/18 $31 / 25$ 33/4 $35 / 15$ 45/20 | penalties [2] 45/3 45/19 |
| onerous [1] 71/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}45 / 23 & 46 / 8 & 46 / 18 & 46 / 19 & 48 / 24\end{array}$ | PENNINGTON [1] 73/2 |
| ones [3] 55/25 56/5 66/14 | 56/23 59/13 63/18 63/22 66/8 | people [16] 4/23 13/20 16/19 |
| ongoing [1] 16/15 | 66/12 68/12 69/24 | 16/21 17/16 24/8 24/9 25/5 |
| only [16] 5/4 22/2 25/11 26/9 | out-of-state [1] 35/15 | $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 11 & 42 / 2 & 44 / 8 & 46 / 10 & 62 / 20\end{array}$ |
| 28/24 37/2 39/6 41/22 44/12 | outcomes [1] 8/23 | 63/15 64/1 66/16 |
| 50/8 53/10 53/12 57/18 59/8 | outdoor [4] 33/13 $33 / 19$ 35/17 | per [2] 53/7 72/2 |
| 69/24 71/20 | $37 / 24$ | perceive [1] 46/24 |
| onslaught [1] 54/15 | outrageous [1] 44/11 | percent [10] 6/17 26/1 $28 / 24$ |
| onto [1] 23/20 | outreach [9] 8/19 10/7 10/13 | $33 / 2434 / 2 \quad 34 / 2140 / 2 \quad 47 / 23$ |
| open [3] 3/22 14/7 72/20 | 10/21 11/2 11/15 12/6 12/10 | 53/15 63/12 |
| opening [3] 32/4 52/19 69/1 | 18/9 | perfect [1] 55/25 |
| openly [1] 41/5 | Over [21] 5/12 9/13 9/15 14/1 | perhaps [1] 19/21 |
| operated [1] 72/9 | 14/2 14/11 15/11 $22 / 19$ 24/14 | period [5] 20/12 $34 / 21$ 34/24 |
| operation [3] 52/2 60/22 66/4 | 25/4 27/2 $32 / 8 \quad 35 / 2148 / 9$ | 46/14 69/12 |
| operations [9] 5/15 9/22 | 53/20 55/20 63/11 69/12 | periodic [2] 11/8 11/11 |
| 10/17 15/23 16/7 43/17 44/19 | 71/24 72/1 72/8 | permanent [1] 21/8 |
| 52/6 66/3 | overall [1] 35/6 | permit [4] 48/10 48/20 48/22 |
| opinion [1] 55/17 | overly [2] 6/1 64/1 | 65/9 |
| opportunities [5] 8/13 14/17 | overreach [1] 65/23 | permits [4] 66/2 66/6 66/7 |
| 18/11 19/18 69/5 | overreaching [1] 43/7 | 66/17 |
| opportunity [12] 8/10 13/16 | oversight [6] 3/11 3/13 3/20 | permitting [4] 12/12 48/3 |
| 17/17 20/13 33/9 38/10 42/20 | 3/24 4/6 21/1 | 48/4 64/21 |
| 47/2 47/12 54/25 59/16 72/17 | overwhelming [1] 38/1 | personally [2] 57/11 66/16 |
| oppressive [1] 45/22 | owe [1] 69/2 | perspectives [1] 9/14 |
| option [1] 56/23 | Own [5] 6/24 56/6 56/12 | pest [1] 29/17 |


| P | $31 / 13 \quad 32 / 10 \quad 32 / 20 \quad 33 / 15$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 11 & 22 / 7 & 25 / 3 & 30 / 10 & 42 / 22\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pesticide [2] 11/10 20/19 | pretty [6] 24/5 25/14 29/11 | 52/25 65/15 65/16 65/17 |
| PFINGSTON [2] 73/5 73/13 | 62/4 66/22 68/17 | 65/20 |
| phase [3] 27/23 28/18 28/19 | prevent [2] 27/24 58/1 | proponent [1] 57/11 |
| pheasant [3] 35/14 69/1 69/3 | prevented [1] 26/1 | proponents [1] 63/4 |
| Pheasants [1] 22/5 | prevention [1] 11/16 | proportion [1] 29/1 |
| physical [2] 36/14 50/4 | prevents [1] 47/25 | proposal [1] 19/8 |
| piece [1] 65/20 | previous [2] 34/23 42/18 | propose [2] $18 / 10$ 19/10 |
| Pierre [1] 11/23 | previously [2] 24/21 37/20 | proposed [6] 8/18 $18 / 14$ 49/2 |
| Pine [1] 40/20 | price [3] 48/23 48/23 63/25 | 60/13 61/16 70/23 |
| pipelines [1] 55/8 | primarily [1] 24/24 | prosecution [1] 45/19 |
| place [13] 14/8 26/11 53/12 | primary [3] 5/25 13/22 59/8 | prosper [1] 4/11 |
| 55/4 58/10 60/24 60/25 67/24 | prime [1] 62/12 | prosperity [1] 54/24 |
| 68/2 70/11 70/16 70/18 72/7 | prior [2] 10/5 37/8 | protect [6] 29/5 41/15 42/7 |
| placed [1] 63/8 | priorities [2] 8/25 12/18 | 43/23 44/14 61/8 |
| places [5] 29/5 36/3 68/3 | priority [1] 11/3 | protected [3] 40/7 41/7 68/23 |
| 68/16 68/17 | private [29] 3/15 4/9 4/19 | protecting [4] 6/12 50/23 |
| placing [1] 21/12 | 6/5 6/18 13/21 15/14 16/14 | 52/24 61/6 |
| plague [5] 27/9 27/15 27/21 | 19/1 22/4 24/1 24/24 25/8 | protection [13] $2 / 5$ 3/14 4/7 |
| 29/20 52/25 | 26/14 40/5 41/16 41/19 42/22 | 4/25 6/7 8/1 15/18 34/11 |
| plains [2] 28/23 33/23 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 43 / 8 & 43 / 18 & 45 / 23 & 48 / 10 & 50 / 2\end{array}$ | 43/11 44/6 45/5 51/17 59/19 |
| plan [6] 18/8 19/5 28/21 | 52/24 56/6 57/25 65/17 67/23 | protections [4] 26/6 35/24 |
| 40/23 62/5 62/13 | 72/10 | 40/24 41/3 |
| planning [1] 28/8 | privately [1] 50/11 | protein [1] 54/21 |
| plans [4] 12/4 13/8 41/25 | probably [3] 58/13 59/25 | proud [2] 38/19 68/17 |
| 53/11 | 70/14 | proven [1] $40 / 4$ |
| play [1] 65/19 | problem [4] $29 / 9$ 53/18 $53 / 18$ | provide [14] $10 / 13$ 12/8 $13 / 17$ |
| please [1] 19/11 | 57/2 | 17/17 18/10 19/17 $20 / 14$ |
| pleased [1] 52/8 | problematic [1] $24 / 9$ | 21/10 21/15 21/19 30/8 33/21 |
| plus [1] 53/3 | problems [2] 46/24 69/25 | 41/8 46/22 |
| pockets [1] 30/2 | proceed [1] 50/18 | provided [3] 9/18 37/9 70/15 |
| point [8] 22/8 22/10 25/16 | proceedings [1] 73/8 | provides [2] 12/5 37/25 |
| 26/5 29/18 46/3 61/19 71/7 | process [31] 3/21 3/23 3/25 | providing [3] 9/20 30/17 48/7 |
| policies [2] 43/7 69/8 | 4/17 6/4 7/5 8/23 18/1 18/2 | public [26] 3/10 3/23 4/13 |
| poll [1] 40/1 | 18/13 18/20 20/10 20/18 | 4/14 4/16 8/13 8/20 8/24 9/8 |
| pollute [1] 39/24 | 25/22 55/21 56/18 61/23 | 9/13 12/6 12/13 12/18 16/11 |
| polluted [1] 34/9 | 62/14 62/15 62/19 62/23 | 18/1 18/2 18/10 18/11 18/21 |
| pond [1] 52/3 | 62/25 64/5 70/5 70/10 71/6 | 18/23 18/25 19/14 20/12 |
| ponds [4] 36/22 37/12 $37 / 12$ | 71/7 71/14 71/17 71/22 72/14 | 33/13 34/16 60/10 |
| 37/13 | processes [4] 61/24 61/25 | puddles [1] 37/14 |
| pops [1] 56/9 | 70/1 72/7 | pups [1] 39/4 |
| population [5] 27/3 29/21 | produce [1] | purpose [1] 49/7 |
| 33/25 40/9 67/17 | producer [2] 11/19 51/12 | push [1] 57/2 |
| populations [3] 28/1 30/1 | producer's [1] 20/1 | put [6] 28/20 29/24 60/25 |
| 41/24 | producers [3] 9/16 9/20 $20 / 5$ | 63/17 68/11 72/7 |
| position [2] 29/6 70/23 | product [1] 64/6 | puts [2] 63/6 65/10 |
| positive [1] 35/20 | productive [1] 14/20 | Q |
| possible [2] 39/10 54/14 | professes [1] 41/5 | 2 |
| possibly [2] 65/4 65/8 | Professional [1] 73/14 | qualifications [1 |
| potential [1] 7/8 | profitability [1] 43/16 | qualify [2] 28/12 64/2 |
| potentially [5] 49/24 49/24 | program [31] $10 / 10$ 10/17 | qualifying [1] 44/16 |
| 50/6 52/2 65/13 | 11/10 13/23 13/24 14/2 14/6 | quality [5] 10/23 44/5 44/9 |
| pothole [4] $2 / 12$ 32/10 $33 / 23$ | 14/14 15/9 21/2 21/20 21/24 | 48/13 61/6 |
| 35/14 | 22/8 22/11 22/14 22/16 22/16 | question [7] 18/16 19/13 |
| power [3] 18/8 19/5 48/9 | 22/19 23/21 25/15 25/16 | 20/14 43/9 53/5 59/18 61/13 |
| poweshiek [2] 23/9 24/4 |  | questioning [1] 55/12 |
| practice [2] 69/19 69/20 | 53/21 53/22 56/21 56/21 | questions [8] 8/21 11/19 |
| practices [7] 10/16 10/22 | 56/25 | 12/21 17/21 32/6 42/10 47/3 |
| 44/3 45/19 60/7 69/11 69/19 | programs [10] 17/10 22/2 22/3 | 55/13 |
| prairie [22] 2/6 2/12 8/3 | 22/12 26/13 26/17 41/16 | quick [2] 14/9 28/14 |
| 17/14 27/16 27/17 27/25 28/9 | 41/18 58/5 58/9 | quite [1] 12/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}28 / 24 & 29 / 1 & 29 / 5 & 30 / 2 & 30 / 9\end{array}$ | project [8] 10/14 $11 / 25$ 14/3 | R |
| $30 / 14 \quad 30 / 18 \quad 32 / 10 \quad 33 / 23$ | 50/14 50/15 50/17 53/6 63/4 | R |
| 35/14 52/20 52/25 62/5 62/8 | projects [6] 10/20 10/24 | radical [1] 54/6 |
| precarious [1] 24/5 | 10/25 13/25 21/22 48/17 | radio [1] 40/18 |
| predictable [1] 48/5 | promulgated [1] 3/22 | raise [3] 51/2 51/13 63/25 |
| prematurely [1] 41/21 | promulgating [2] 4/2 18/3 | ranch [2] 42/24 51/12 |
| premium [1] 14/8 | prong [1] 30/19 | rancher [4] 2/9 32/16 43/24 |
| preparedness [1] 11/22 | prongs [1] 30/7 | 45/11 |
| present [1] 45/1 | properly [1] $42 / 5$ | ranchers [19] 10/14 15/20 |
| preserves [1] 36/16 | properties [1] 30/19 | 16/22 29/7 42/23 43/5 43/14 |
| president [11] 2/10 2/12 | property [18] $3 / 15$ 4/9 14/24 | 43/22 44/2 $44 / 12$ 44/21 45/7 |
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regulation [8] 7/2 $37 / 5$ 37/21 47/12 47/23 47/25 54/14 63/13
regulations [34] $3 / 15$ 3/22 4/2 4/4 4/8 4/10 4/14 4/18
$\begin{array}{llllll}4 / 22 & 4 / 22 & 4 / 24 & 5 / 2 & 5 / 4 & 5 / 7\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}5 / 8 & 7 / 14 & 8 / 12 & 8 / 18 & 8 / 24 & 10 / 5\end{array}$ 18/4 18/18 18/25 19/10 22/17 $42 / 22 \quad 43 / 10 \quad 45 / 24 \quad 50 / 21 \quad 55 / 4$ 61/16 61/21 64/21 71/25
regulatory [14] 3/11 $3 / 21$
$4 / 17$ 6/25 $7 / 5$ 15/24 $18 / 20$
$48 / 9 \quad 50 / 13 \quad 50 / 21 \quad 51 / 23 \quad 55 / 20$ 64/15 64/17
rein [1] 39/23
reintroduction [1] 52/17
relationship [3] 4/16 7/18 15/4
relationships [2] 15/8 17/7
relatively [1] 48/23
relocation [1] 53/17
rely [2] 4/1 51/22
remain [2] 17/15 $23 / 13$
remains [1] $42 / 6$
remarks [1] $8 / 16$
remind [2] 3/4 68/25
reminded [1] 69/2
remiss [1] 12/23
removal [3] 57/21 57/22 $58 / 14$
repeated [1] 61/2
repercussions [1] 49/2
replace [1] 22/17
replicable [1] 11/25
report [1] 34/19
Reporter [1] 73/14
reports [1] 63/19
represent [3] 22/1 47/18 62/24
representatives [1] 68/21
representing [1] 9/14
represents [1] 15/3
require [3] 20/10 20/11 52/10
required [6] $12 / 16$ 16/11
25/13 57/20 57/22 66/2
requirements [6] 11/16 $12 / 13$
12/15 43/10 48/11 50/16
requires [1] 50/4
Reservation [1] 40/20
Reserve [1] 56/21
reside [1] 24/2
resident [3] 35/10 35/11 38/20
residents [1] 34/15
residual [1] 68/4
resilience [1] 11/25
resiliency [2] $11 / 22$ 12/4
resist [1] 42/17
resolutions [1] 46/17
resolve [1] 39/16
resource [1] 44/10
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { resources [14] } 5 / 7 & 7 / 16 & 10 / 12\end{array}$ 10/16 12/2 $26 / 9 \quad 33 / 12 \quad 37 / 23$ $43 / 2 \quad 44 / 14 \quad 51 / 4 \quad 54 / 8 \quad 54 / 10$ 59/22
respect [1] 68/20
respectful [1] 26/14
respond [1] 42/18
response [1] 9/4
responsibilities [1] 20/25
responsibility [2] 43/21 61/9
responsible [1] 6/9
rest [2] 39/18 46/2
restoration [1] 10/21
restoring [1] 33/11
restriction [1] 15/1
restrictions [2] 6/23 15/24
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { result [6] 6/4 } & 9 / 23 & 10 / 15\end{array}$ 18/13 18/23 64/15
resulted [1] $7 / 6$
resulting [1] 50/18
results [2] 14/16 54/17
returns [1] 14/4
revegetation [1] 50/10
Revenue [1] 35/22
review [5] $7 / 8 \quad 20 / 6 \quad 20 / 9$
70/10 71/6
reviewing [1] 20/3
reviews [1] 63/5
revision [1] 25/13
RHODEN [7] 2/9 $31 / 19$ 32/16
42/13 42/14 42/24 59/18
riders [1] 59/3
Ridge [1] 40/20
right [7] 28/5 28/18 29/20 32/5 33/1 47/8 66/17
rights [9] $3 / 15$ 4/9 $19 / 1$ $42 / 22$ 43/9 $43 / 19$ 43/21 $44 / 18$ 65/17
rills [1] 37/13
ripples [1] 35/8
risk [5] 20/11 $34 / 9 \quad 34 / 13$
44/20 45/7
river [3] 12/1 55/7 59/12
road [4] $10 / 25$ 26/3 27/6
27/13
roads [2] 36/23 68/1
Rocky [1] 24/11
role [1] 71/15
room [1] 67/19
rotation [1] 44/4
roughly [1] 53/15
ROUNDS [7] $1 / 10$ 2/2 $33 / 7$ 38/8 47/11 51/5 51/15
routine [1] 16/7
rule [55] 3/25 5/10 5/14 5/16 $\begin{array}{llllll}5 / 17 & 5 / 22 & 5 / 24 & 6 / 4 & 7 / 6 & 8 / 23\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}9 / 2 & 9 / 8 & 9 / 9 & 9 / 23 & 10 / 4 & 12 / 12\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 2 & 18 / 6 & 18 / 7 & 18 / 10 & 18 / 14\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 7 & 36 / 9 & 37 / 18 & 37 / 22 & 37 / 25\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 1 & 44 / 20 & 46 / 13 & 48 / 6 & 48 / 9\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}48 / 13 & 48 / 16 & 49 / 7 & 49 / 13 & 50 / 14\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}51 / 18 & 51 / 20 & 51 / 25 & 52 / 4 & 52 / 9\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}66 / 1 & 70 / 5 & 70 / 7 & 70 / 16 & 70 / 18\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}70 / 19 & 70 / 23 & 71 / 4 & 71 / 4 & 71 / 7\end{array}$ 71/9 71/15 71/21 71/22
rule-making [8] 3/25 6/4 8/23 9/8 $12 / 12$ 18/2 $70 / 5$ 71/7
rules [13] 6/1 $6 / 5 \quad 12 / 17$ $45 / 22 \quad 52 / 13 \quad 54 / 16 \quad 60 / 11$ 60/13 61/11 65/19 70/10 71/6 71/14
rules-making [1] 71/14
ruling [1] 7/3
run [3] $44 / 19 \quad 45 / 13 \quad 65 / 5$

## S

safe [3] 43/25 45/3 51/3
safeguarding [1] 37/23
safest [1] 54/20
sage [2] 15/19 15/22
said [3] 36/1 $64 / 24 \quad 66 / 20$
same [6] 45/3 53/20 60/24
62/11 70/16 70/17
sand [1] 68/9
saw [2] 29/12 $52 / 8$
say [6] $24 / 25$ 31/4 $39 / 8$
46/21 68/9 70/7
saying [3] 29/3 31/23 32/22
says [1] 39/19
scale [2] 27/18 27/20
scary [2] 63/23 66/19

| S | she [1] $17 / 12$ <br> shoot [1] 41/6 | $\begin{array}{\|lrl} \text { soon [1] } & 29 / 11 & \\ \text { sound [2] } & 45 / 4 & 62 / 24 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| scenario [1] 62/22 | short [2] 21/21 48/7 | source [2] 10/10 10/19 |
| science [5] 4/1 10/6 38/1 | shorter [2] 21/16 21/17 | south [67] 1/24 2/10 2/11 |
| 40/4 41/20 | shot [2] 40/16 41/4 | 9/17 10/11 10/17 11/17 11/20 |
| scientifically [1] 45/4 | should [9] 5/25 7/18 22/16 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 8 & 13 / 1 & 13 / 2 & 14 / 12 & 15 / 4\end{array}$ |
| scope [5] 9/5 9/21 36/12 $39 / 5$ | 23/13 57/23 62/19 62/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 11 & 16 / 18 & 16 / 23 & 22 / 4 & 24 / 4\end{array}$ |
| $50 / 1$ | 65/14 71/15 | 31/12 31/13 32/20 33/2 33/13 |
| search [1] 40/14 | shouldn't [1] 68/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 17 & 34 / 13 & 34 / 14 & 34 / 25\end{array}$ |
| season [3] 15/2 27/20 69/1 | shovel [1] 41/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 11 & 35 / 19 & 35 / 22 & 38 / 12\end{array}$ |
| seasonal [1] 36/3 | showed [1] 40/17 | 38/16 38/17 38/20 40/8 40/9 |
| seat [2] 63/4 63/14 | shown [2] 27/3 27/19 | 40/12 40/13 40/21 41/9 41/25 |
| second [5] 2/8 31/8 31/10 | shows [1] 40/2 | 42/23 $42 / 25$ 43/1 $43 / 2446 / 20$ |
| 31/19 35/19 | shut [1] 41/6 | 47/17 47/18 51/2 55/24 56/7 |
| Secretary [1] 52/22 | side [3] 32/9 56/10 56/10 | 56/16 56/17 58/20 60/4 60/6 |
| section [1] 67/23 | sides [2] 9/14 57/6 | 60/7 60/8 60/13 61/24 62/17 |
| Security [1] 11/21 | sight [1] 41/4 | 63/9 63/12 65/2 70/5 70/11 |
| see [10] 39/24 55/15 56/18 | sighted [1] 40/11 | 73/1 |
| 59/13 59/16 61/2 61/22 66/5 | sighting [1] 39/4 | southern [1] 33/24 |
| 68/1 69/25 | signed [1] 71/19 | speak [1] 46/10 |
| seed [1] 57/3 | significance [1] 27/13 | Spearfish [1] 58/23 |
| seeded [1] 20/2 | significant [5] 5/12 5/14 | special [1] 56/9 |
| seeing [1] 68/22 | 6/23 19/4 50/14 | specie's [3] 49/8 49/12 49/19 |
| seek [1] 52/12 | significantly [2] 49/13 60/8 | species [58] 6/10 6/10 6/13 |
| seeking [1] 59/4 | signing [1] 23/2 | 6/14 6/16 6/17 6/20 7/9 7/10 |
| seem [1] 26/23 | similar [3] 9/25 32/2 70/11 | 15/15 15/18 15/25 23/5 23/12 |
| seemed [1] 56/21 | simply [2] 7/4 44/10 | 23/16 23/22 24/7 24/22 25/10 |
| seems [4] 18/19 25/14 55/24 | since [5] 4/20 4/23 13/24 | 25/18 25/25 26/2 26/5 26/10 |
| 69/7 | 36/20 71/23 | 27/2 27/5 27/9 27/10 30/16 |
| seen [4] 56/24 61/11 61/25 | single [2] 40/10 47/24 | $38 / 13$ 38/16 39/11 39/16 |
| 70/4 | single-family [1] 47/24 | 41/13 $41 / 23$ 42/3 $42 / 8$ 49/4 |
| seldom [1] 45/13 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\operatorname{sir} & {[4]} & 12 / 22 & 13 / 6 & 41 / 20\end{array}$ | 49/19 51/19 52/15 53/9 53/10 |
| self [1] 43/22 | 42/9 | 53/12 57/14 57/17 57/18 |
| self-driven [1] 43/22 | sit [2] 21/25 56/13 | 57/24 58/2 58/8 58/17 62/8 |
| sell [2] 48/16 57/3 | sitting [2] 22/23 59/14 | 67/6 67/8 67/18 67/19 68/23 |
| senate [6] 46/12 62/10 62/12 | situation [1] 52/22 | 72/13 |
| 71/2 71/3 71/18 | six [1] 10/19 | specific [7] 8/20 11/14 20/15 |
| senator [24] 1/10 2/2 2/9 | Sixth [2] 5/21 10/3 | 26/21 37/6 50/4 69/25 |
| 18/5 19/2 20/8 20/21 21/18 | size [2] 49/13 60/12 | specifically [2] 46/17 66/12 |
| 22/18 23/18 25/24 27/4 32/17 | skill [1] 73/9 | specifics [2] 19/21 66/7 |
| $33 / 8$ 36/8 38/3 38/8 38/8 | skin [1] 61/5 | speed [1] 19/22 |
| 42/15 51/10 51/15 52/10 55/5 | skipper [1] 23/8 | spend [1] 53/13 |
| 55/22 | skipperling [2] 23/9 24/4 | spent [4] 27/1 35/12 35/13 |
| send [1] 22/21 | slightly [1] 42/17 | 67/5 |
| sense [6] 38/2 40/3 46/23 | slows [1] 71/6 | spill [1] 11/15 |
| 60/10 61/12 62/24 | small [9] 4/5 5/18 10/17 20/2 | spirit [1] 19/13 |
| sensitive [1] 3/7 | 27/18 29/1 35/25 47/16 48/23 | spite [1] 44/16 |
| sent [2] 46/17 52/22 | smaller [1] 30/1 | sponsors [1] 62/12 |
| September [2] 72/21 73/10 | snapshot [1] 12/5 | sportsmen [1] 56/3 |
| September 13th [1] 72/21 | so [49] $3 / 7$ 13/3 $19 / 12$ 20/8 | sportsmen's [1] 56/12 |
| series [2] 32/5 55/15 | 20/12 20/21 20/22 22/6 22/22 | spotting [1] 39/5 |
| seriously [1] 12/15 | 23/20 23/22 24/10 26/2 26/13 | spring [2] 10/25 68/1 |
| seriousness [2] 41/11 52/20 | 27/7 27/12 28/12 28/12 28/17 | ss [1] 73/1 |
| serve [1] 49/24 | 28/25 29/3 29/16 29/23 30/17 | staff [3] $25 / 5$ 33/8 $38 / 9$ |
| served [4] 34/15 38/21 43/1 | 31/18 42/17 46/20 47/1 51/2 | stake [1] 62/18 |
| 46/11 | 54/1 56/11 57/5 60/18 61/7 | stakeholder [1] 11/22 |
| service [29] $2 / 7$ 3/14 4/8 6/8 | 61/10 61/13 62/1 62/9 62/18 | stakeholders [10] 8/11 8/17 |
| 6/19 7/8 8/3 16/1 16/19 17/4 | 63/19 64/7 65/6 65/10 67/16 | 8/21 9/1 9/12 12/10 12/19 |
| 17/13 21/9 21/10 22/2 22/13 | 67/20 69/9 69/22 70/22 72/16 | 52/12 58/24 59/10 |
| 23/7 23/16 24/10 26/24 28/8 | so-called [1] 54/1 | stand [1] 39/18 |
| $34 / 20$ 35/10 36/1 41/14 43/13 | society [4] 2/14 32/14 38/11 | start [1] 72/10 |
| 57/21 58/5 62/2 67/14 | 39/17 | starts [2] 15/5 22/23 |
| Service's [3] 13/18 49/6 | solicited [1] 20/4 | state [37] 2/9 4/3 4/5 5/19 |
| 49/22 | solution [1] 62/6 | 8/25 9/6 $10 / 15$ 10/20 11/4 |
| set [2] 29/6 60/10 | solutions [4] 26/16 40/4 | 11/7 11/8 11/9 12/2 13/1 |
| setbacks [1] 48/18 | 46/23 52/13 | 20/5 20/18 20/20 20/22 20/25 |
| settle [1] 53/25 | some [17] 23/5 24/8 25/11 | 21/2 21/3 21/5 24/5 32/16 |
| several [7] 9/4 10/12 17/5 | 26/20 $27 / 18$ 38/24 $39 / 1$ 46/23 | 35/2 35/15 38/12 41/1 41/5 |
| 40/11 47/19 58/5 69/12 | 47/19 50/17 57/19 58/17 | 41/25 46/12 $46 / 13$ 48/15 56/4 |
| severe [1] 45/2 | 62/24 63/22 68/6 68/9 72/5 | 61/3 61/23 73/1 |
| shared [1] 7/19 | somebody [1] 68/11 | state's [1] 51/4 |
| sharing [1] 39/4 | something [3] 19/11 $39 / 7$ | statement [4] $30 / 5$ 31/11 $32 / 4$ |
| SHAUN [4] $2 / 5$ 7/25 8/7 12/24 | 59/17 | 47/9 |


| S | 49/12 49/20 50/5 61/7 | that's [15] 26/19 34/16 58/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| states [24] 2/14 6/3 6/15 | sustain [2] 54/23 61/5 | $\begin{array}{lllll}66 / 19 & 66 / 22 & 66 / 22 & 67 / 1 & 67 / 10\end{array}$ |
| 9/17 10/9 11/5 11/12 14/21 | sustainability [2] 10/23 | 69/6 71/5 71/12 |
| 15/20 28/9 32/15 34/4 34/12 | 43/17 | their [36] 4/12 6/13 6/17 |
| 37/7 38/11 39/14 53/21 60/14 | sustainable [1] 10/15 | 6/22 6/24 7/12 9/22 13/19 |
| $66 / 25$ 67/1 70/10 71/1 71/5 | SWANCC [1] 34/7 | 14/13 14/24 16/4 16/16 21/12 |
| 72/9 | Sylvatic [1] 27 | 22/6 22/7 25/2 26/11 26/12 |
| status [2] 34/18 41/7 | system [5] $5 / 25$ 48/3 $48 / 4$ | 30/10 34/12 34/16 43/15 |
| statutory [3] 37/2 37/17 $63 / 5$ | 55/5 55/6 | 43/16 $43 / 17$ 44/21 51/3 57/5 |
| staunch [1] 43/8 | systematic [1] 3/20 | 57/22 58/9 59/7 59/22 65/19 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \text { stay } & {[2]} & 5 / 22 & 52 \\ \text { staying } & {[1]} & 10 / 4 \end{array}$ | T | /16 68/17 68/22 68/23 |
| step [1] $26 / 3$ | table [4] $15 / 6 \mathrm{63/4}$ 63/14 |  |
| steps [1] 23/7 | 63/17 |  |
| stewards [1] 7/12 | tactics [1] | 29/10 $30 / 8 \quad 37 / 3$ 37/4 41/23 |
| stewardship [2] 43/21 44/3 | tailor [1] 26/12 | 55/15 57/19 58/7 62/22 67 |
| stick [1] 42/18 | take [7] 12/15 18/16 19/18 | 68/1 68/3 68/6 68/18 72/1 |
| still [6] 6/6 50/12 52/23 | 20/14 27/25 70/17 72/16 | then [11] 17/22 20/25 21/4 |
| 58/17 69/2 69/18 | taken [2] 1/23 23/7 | 29/16 29/17 32/3 32/5 61 |
| stock [2] 36/22 37/12 | takes [3] 48/19 50/23 70/21 | 66/20 70/17 70/24 |
| stop [4] 7/2 50/13 54/14 | taking [6] 4/21 23/7 31/6 | theories [1] 65/10 |
|  | 31/15 31/24 65/17 | theory [1] 65/3 |
| story [2] 14/6 61/2 | talk [4] 46/6 56/14 59/6 | there [25] 3/6 6/13 15/10 |
| stream [1] 52/3 | 69/4 |  |
| streambed [1] 52/3 | talked [2] 30/11 | 23/14 25/21 27/7 30/7 30/24 |
| streamline [1] 14/8 | tape [2] 22/14 22/15 | 40/8 43/3 53/4 53/16 55/6 |
| streamlined [2] 22/22 48/21 | targeting [1] 44/15 | 56/24 57/16 63/22 66/7 66/15 |
| streams [7] 33/11 33/18 33/21 | taxpayer [4] 27/1 53/14 54 | 69/13 70/15 |
| $34 / 8$ 34/13 34/15 36/4 | 67/5 | there's [12] 19/8 23/5 28/9 |
| Street [1] 1/24 | taxpayers [1] 5/1 | 43/9 45/18 56/11 63/22 64/3 |
| strips [1] 44/5 | tell [7] 14/5 19/22 28/5 | 64/24 68/5 68/6 71/6 |
| strive [1] 7/18 | 28/20 29/8 39/1 67/6 | therefore [1] 16/7 |
| strong [1] 38/15 | temporary [1] 36/4 | these [35] $4 / 44 / 22 \quad 4 / 24 \quad 5 / 4$ |
| struggling [2] 58/17 58/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { temptation [1] } & 42 / 17 \\ \text { ten [4] } & 21 / 21 & 23 / 1 & 38 / 22\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}5 / 6 & 5 / 8 & 7 / 3 & 9 / 18 & 12 / 6 & 12 / 15 \\ 15 / 3 & 15 / 21 & 17 / 17 & 19 / 10 & 23 / 15\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\begin{array}{llll}\text { study [1] } & 35 / 3 \\ \text { subcommittee } & {[5]}\end{array} & 3 / 10 & 3 / 19\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { ten [4] } \\ 56 / 21 & 21 / 21 & 23 / 1 & 38 / 22\end{array}$ | $15 / 3$ $15 / 21$ $17 / 17$ $19 / 10$ $23 / 15$ <br> $24 / 1$ $25 / 11$ $30 / 16$ $34 / 3$ $34 / 13$ |
| 33/9 38/9 69/23 | ten-page [1] |  |
| subdivision [1] 65/2 | ten-year [1] 56/21 | 41/17 $48 / 2$ 48/2 $48 / 22$ 50/7 |
| subject [3] 5/13 42/19 45/17 | tend [1] 43/15 | 52/23 54/4 59/6 69/23 72/6 |
| submit [1] 31/11 | tenth [1] 28/24 | they [54] $3 / 7$ 4/13 $7 / 15$ 12/16 |
| submitted [1] 41/17 | tenure [1] 43/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 24 & 14 / 25 & 20 / 25 & 21 / 25 & 22 / 6\end{array}$ |
| subsequent [1] 34/8 | term [2] 21/16 21/17 | 22/24 23/1 25/23 26/5 29/6 |
| substantially [1] 50 | terms [8] 14/22 61/25 64 | 29/8 29/9 29/10 29/16 29/17 |
| substantive [1] 18/22 | 64/15 68/18 68/21 69/15 | 29/17 29/18 35/5 37/3 37/10 |
| success [9] $23 / 5$ 25/14 $26 / 20$ | 69/18 | 39/8 39/24 39/24 43/15 44/13 |
| 27/19 53/15 57/15 57/25 | testament [1] 18/19 | 46/6 46/7 46/21 53/19 54/22 |
| 58/12 58/13 | testified [3] $59 / 19$ 63/3 67/3 | 57/4 57/8 58/7 60/15 60/17 |
| successful [2] 22/11 51/22 | testify [6] 8/10 33/10 42/21 | 64/3 64/4 66/17 66/18 67/18 |
| such [10] 16/7 $23 / 6$ 23/13 | 47/2 51/16 62/18 | 67/20 67/25 68/2 68/3 68/4 |
| 23/15 37/13 39/3 44/4 45/19 | testifying [1] 3/5 | 68/8 68/18 69/15 69/17 71/ |
| 49/20 67/17 | testimony [22] 3/18 4/7 7/23 | they're [7] 12/16 23/20 66/14 |
| sudden [3] 45/17 56/9 66/18 |  | 67/17 67/25 68/4 68/17 |
| suddenly [1] 72/2 | $41 / 17$ 42/12 $42 / 18 \quad 46 / 2 \quad 47 / 6$ | they've [4] $45 / 5$ 57/9 57/9 |
| sue [1] 53/25 | 51/7 51/9 52/19 55/11 64/12 | 68/3 |
| suffer [1] 48/17 | 66/1 69/16 70/15 70/17 | thing [1] 44/12 |
| sufficient [1] 18/1 | testing [3] 27/19 27/21 40/17 | things [5] 27/12 56/5 59/13 |
| suggesting [2] 29/23 29/25 | than [18] 7/9 7/13 7/17 $23 / 1$ | 60/6 67/21 |
| suggestions [1] 4/15 | 24/21 27/16 30/2 35/8 35/13 | think [32] 13/4 23/24 24/8 |
| suggests [1] 40/12 | 35/13 44/8 54/7 54/10 60/8 |  |
| suitable [1] 50/9 | 63/18 69/6 71/5 71/16 |  |
| Superfund [1] 3/11 | thank [47] 3/16 7/21 8/4 8/9 | 55/6 56/4 56/14 58/9 58/25 |
| support [9] $10 / 18$ 33/24 35/5 | 12/22 12/23 $13 / 913 / 1513 / 16$ | 60/23 62/25 65/14 66/24 67/1 |
| 35/7 40/3 50/7 50/8 56/24 |  | 67/18 68/6 69/4 69/6 69/22 |
| 57/1 | 22/18 23/18 25/24 27/4 28/15 | 70/12 71/12 71/23 72/5 |
| supporting [4] 10/11 17/15 | $30 / 2331 / 131 / 231 / 4 \quad 31 / 15$ | thinking [1] 66/6 |
| 49/8 49/9 | $31 / 17$ 31/23 $32 / 15$ 38/3 38/4 | third [1] 30/13 |
| supposed [2] 29/6 45/11 | 42/9 42/11 42/15 47/5 51/5 | thirds [1] 71/2 |
| Supreme [3] $9 / 4 \begin{array}{lllll}\text { [ }\end{array}$ | 51/6 51/10 51/15 55/1 55/9 | this [73] 3/19 3/19 4/15 5/2 |
| sure [4] 13/10 19/24 22/25 | 55/10 55/22 59/11 61/18 63/2 | 5/14 $8 / 2113 / 813 / 1714 / 2$ |
| 57/7 | 68/13 72/17 72/23 | 15/9 15/25 17/21 20/6 22/16 |
| Surprisingly [1] 47/22 | thanks [3] $42 / 2047 / 1 \quad 52 / 17$ |  |
| survival [7] 41/22 44/1 49/8 | that [277] | 27/13 27/20 27/21 27/22 28/4 |


| $T$ | tour [1] 11/15 <br> tourism [1] 35/19 | $38 / 11 \quad 39 / 14 \quad 60 / 14 \quad 66 / 25 \quad 67 / 1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| this... [49] 28/7 28/13 28/13 | toward [1] 58/20 | University [1] 35/2 |
| 29/4 31/25 32/8 35/9 35/18 | towards [1] 7/19 | unless [1] 70/25 |
| 39/10 39/20 40/12 41/8 42/13 | town [1] 67/23 | unoccupied [2] 49/23 50/2 |
| $42 / 20$ $42 / 21$ $46 / 4$ $47 / 2$ <br> $8 / 8$    | towns [4] 11/19 27/25 29/19 | unprecedented [1] 5/12 |
| 48/16 $49 / 9$ 50/5 $50 / 14$ 50/21 | 30/2 | unrelated [1] 59/3 |
| 50/25 51/8 51/25 52/16 53/6 | track [1] 60/23 | up [19] 13/3 19/22 $23 / 2$ 31/9 |
| 53/13 55/12 $56 / 9 \quad 56 / 19$ 57/6 | tractors [1] 57/4 | 31/10 $31 / 22$ 41/6 47/23 56/9 |
| 59/10 63/6 63/8 64/13 65/14 | traditions [1] 37/24 | 59/17 60/18 62/6 63/21 65/7 |
| 66/4 66/5 67/7 68/8 68/10 | training [1] 11/18 | 65/7 65/8 68/1 69/7 70/16 |
| 68/15 72/16 72/18 72/22 | transparent [1] 3/22 | upfront [1] 64/8 |
| 72/22 73/10 | travel [1] 13/8 | upon [1] 61/7 |
| thorough [1] 18/23 | traversing [1] 40/11 | upper [1] 12/1 |
| those [30] 10/24 15/8 19/17 | treasures [1] 50/24 | urge [1] 54/14 |
| 22/3 22/9 23/22 23/23 24/14 | trees [1] 59/15 | urging [1] 17/13 |
| 25/2 25/5 25/6 26/12 26/15 | Trends [1] 34/18 | us [15] $3 / 17$ 7/22 $7 / 24$ 11/1 |
| 26/15 26/17 26/18 30/19 | tribal [2] 9/1 11/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 16 & 16 / 5 & 17 / 24 & 30 / 21 & 31 / 6\end{array}$ |
| $34 / 22$ 37/8 43/20 46/14 53/11 | tribes [1] 11/5 | $31 / 14$ 31/18 42/3 67/6 70/3 |
| 55/3 58/9 65/9 67/16 67/21 | tributaries [1] 36/13 | 72/21 |
| 69/24 70/3 70/17 | tributary [3] 37/10 44/23 | USDA [2] 22/3 $30 / 20$ |
| though [1] 20/13 | 52/3 | use [10] 4/11 16/6 27/23 |
| thought [2] 55/3 66/17 | tried [1] 53/21 | 28/19 35/1 38/17 60/17 61/24 |
| thoughts [1] 25/19 | triggered [1] 63/5 | 65/2 70/2 |
| thousand [1] 64/1 | trillion [1] 53/8 | used [2] 45/5 56/15 |
| threat [2] 19/9 45/18 | Tristate [1] 53/16 | user [1] 67/10 |
| threatened [3] 6/13 6/15 16/5 | trouble [1] 66/17 | uses [2] 8/19 36/17 |
| three [4] 17/3 30/7 34/14 | true [3] 14/5 72/2 73/7 | using [1] 45/3 |
| 67/24 | trust [2] 14/7 66/21 | usual [1] 22/15 |
| thrive [2] 50/25 50/25 | try [1] 69/24 | usually [1] 15/5 |
| through [30] 9/25 10/9 10/17 | trying [4] 29/24 56/2 67/16 | utilities [1] 65/6 |
| 14/2 18/6 21/13 21/19 $22 / 3$ | 70/1 | utility [1] 65/7 |
| 22/3 22/3 24/25 27/22 $28 / 4$ | Tuesday [1] 72/21 | utilize [1] 6/22 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}28 / 6 & 29 / 20 & 32 / 1 & 32 / 5 & 33 / 23\end{array}$ | turn [5] 8/6 13/11 $33 / 5$ | utilizing [1] 40/13 |
| $35 / 8 \quad 38 / 23$ 39/5 $39 / 25$ 40/12 | 42/13 47/7 | V |
| 44/3 50/9 55/14 61/21 62/23 | turned [2] 29/13 54/2 | $V$ |
| 64/4 71/16 | tutelage [1] 38/24 | vaccinating [1] $28 / 8$ |
| throughout [6] 3/19 6/3 9/24 | tweak [1] 62/23 | vaccine [3] 27/14 27/15 27/21 |
| 9/25 34/4 44/2 | two [16] 10/24 16/2 $23 / 4$ | vague [3] 45/7 64/13 66/22 |
| tie [1] 59/4 | 23/15 $23 / 18$ 25/22 $30 / 16$ 34/6 | valuable [2] 9/24 54/7 |
| tile [1] 37/15 | $34 / 22$ 36/3 54/4 60/5 67/16 | value [1] 35/17 |
| time [25] 3/7 13/1 14/14 25/4 | 71/2 71/20 72/20 | valued [1] 15/4 |
| 26/8 31/6 31/16 $31 / 2434 / 21$ | two-thirds [1] 71/2 | values [2] 14/6 17/1 |
| $36 / 3$ 37/5 $42 / 13$ 46/14 $47 / 4$ | type [2] 41/8 61/11 | variety [1] 8/19 |
| 50/22 51/8 54/7 55/1 55/9 | types [3] $37 / 6$ 37/8 69/10 | various [3] 3/24 58/6 58/19 |
| 55/12 55/12 59/7 61/21 62/16 | U | varmint [1] 41/2 |
| 65/5 |  | varying [1] 64/20 |
| timely [1] 48/5 | U.S [23] $2 / 5$ 3/13 $5 / 10$ 5/23 | vast [2] 49/17 72/8 |
| times [4] 16/24 58/10 58/25 | 5/24 6/8 8/1 10/3 28/7 34/6 | verify [1] 28/6 |
| 67/24 | $34 / 10$ 34/19 $41 / 13$ 43/11 | versus [1] 61/24 |
| today [31] 3/5 3/12 3/17 4/6 | $44 / 17$ 45/12 51/18 51/20 | very [31] $3 / 7$ 16/13 $18 / 9$ 19/9 |
| 7/22 8/10 13/17 17/18 $17 / 24$ | 57/16 59/5 62/2 64/14 70/13 | 19/16 21/23 22/19 22/22 |
| $30 / 3$ 31/6 $31 / 18$ 31/24 $32 / 15$ | ultimate [1] 45/8 | 22/22 23/20 23/21 23/25 24/8 |
| $33 / 4 \quad 33 / 10 \quad 38 / 5 \quad 40 / 7 \quad 42 / 12$ | ultimately [2] 18/14 43/16 | 24/9 24/24 25/16 27/21 29/1 |
| 51/16 52/24 53/9 54/4 55/1 | unapproachable [1] 46/19 | $30 / 2 \quad 30 / 6$ 30/7 30/21 31/2 |
| 55/5 55/11 $68 / 14$ 71/25 $72 / 3$ | unbelievable [1] 29/14 | $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 24 & 32 / 2 & 38 / 4 & 45 / 13 & 46 / 7\end{array}$ |
| 72/5 72/18 | uncertainty [2] 44/20 49/16 | 56/22 57/15 59/5 |
| today's [3] $7 / 25$ 31/14 $43 / 4$ | under [21] 6/15 14/22 $15 / 16$ | veteran [1] 38/21 |
| together [5] 32/18 51/1 54/22 | 16/1 20/9 25/10 36/23 37/19 | viability [1] 52/21 |
| 60/25 62/4 | $38 / 24$ 39/22 40/7 40/24 41/15 | viable [3] 15/23 52/13 53/6 |
| told [2] 65/16 66/12 | 45/3 45/14 45/21 $48 / 16$ 59/7 | vice [1] 31/13 |
| too [1] 64/24 | 60/14 61/16 66/1 | violation [1] 20/19 |
| took [1] 35/11 | understand [7] 8/11 22/6 | visible [1] 44/24 |
| tool [5] 13/22 14/22 20/1 | 26/10 43/19 43/20 45/11 60/5 | visit [3] 16/23 21/24 54/25 |
| 27/22 28/20 | understanding [4] 4/14 9/19 | visited [2] 16/25 17/5 |
| toolbox [1] 20/ | 9/20 22/24 | visitor [1] 39/5 |
| tools [3] 8/19 41/14 45/5 | unelected [1] 70/24 | vital [4] 15/14 20/1 $33 / 18$ |
| top [1] 11/2 | Unfortunately [2] 47/24 48/6 | 33/21 |
| topic [1] 43/4 | unfunded [1] 4/3 | voluntary [6] 6/20 13/25 |
| topography [1] 60/9 | Union [1] 42/25 | 14/16 14/21 15/3 17/9 |
| total [4] 5/2 14/2 28/22 | unique [2] 9/19 15/4 | volunteer [2] 2/14 32/14 |
| 55/13 | United [15] 2/14 6/15 $14 / 20$ | vote [1] 71/3 |
| touch [3] 46/8 46/19 65/21 | 28/9 32/14 34/4 34/12 $37 / 7$ | voters [1] 40/2 |


| V | $\text { [2] } 17 / 3 \quad 72 / 20$ | \|Wildlife's [1] 51/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| votes [1] 71/1 | well [14] 4/15 13/9 31/16 | 8/6 8/16 13/11 17/21 20/12 |
| W | 33/4 33/7 42/15 48/7 55/22 | 24/2 24/16 27/24 28/5 29/7 |
| Wall [2] 51/12 52/21 | 58/3 59/25 63/10 67/9 68/9 $68 / 24$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 8 & 36 / 8 & 38 / 6 & 41 / 21 & 42 / 13 \\ 42 / 17 & 47 / 7 & 48 / 9 & 48 / 10 & 48 / 12\end{array}$ |
| WALSH [7] $2 / 6$ 8/2 13/12 $13 / 14$ | were [16] $12 / 25$ 13/4 23/19 | 48/17 49/17 50/12 50/14 52/6 |
| 17/20 21/7 31/5 | 23/22 25/21 29/18 29/19 39/7 | 52/10 55/12 58/6 60/2 60/19 |
| Walton [5] 2/13 $32 / 11$ 33/16 | 39/10 41/2 55/4 61/19 61/23 | 62/7 72/20 |
| 55/23 56/17 | 66/18 66/24 69/18 | WILLIAMS [7] $2 / 11$ 31/20 $33 / 2$ |
| Wanda [1] 31/12 | West [1] 13/3 | 51/9 51/11 55/10 65/25 |
| want [22] 16/16 17/23 21/11 | western [9] $12 / 24$ 13/2 $15 / 20$ | willing [4] 19/17 30/9 30/16 |
| 21/16 26/21 28/4 29/9 31/4 | 24/12 42/25 43/24 60/4 60/8 | 56/13 |
| 39/23 39/25 46/22 53/24 57/4 | 60/13 | win [2] 26/15 26/15 |
| 61/3 61/7 63/15 64/22 68/13 | wetland [1] 34/20 | win/win [1] 26/15 |
| 71/9 72/12 72/13 72/16 | wetlands [13] 14/23 14/25 | Wisconsin [1] 35/3 |
| wanted [4] 30/24 46/2 46/3 | $33 / 11 \quad 33 / 18 \quad 33 / 21 \quad 33 / 23 \quad 34 / 4$ | wish [1] 62/25 |
| 46/5 | 34/9 34/19 34/25 35/23 36/4 | within [4] 16/1 20/20 58/8 |
| wants [1] 51/ | 36/5 | 63/12 |
| War [1] 61/1 | what [49] 6/23 7/15 13/22 | without [1] 14/25 |
| was [36] 6/11 7/7 9/2 16/5 | 15/6 18/14 19/7 20/6 20/15 | witness [3] $13 / 12$ 33/5 47/7 |
| 17/11 21/6 23/7 24/20 29/14 | 20/17 22/24 23/1 25/23 26/11 | witnesses [8] 3/5 3/16 7/21 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 18 & 32 / 19 & 39 / 4 & 39 / 6 & 39 / 7\end{array}$ | 26/16 29/3 29/12 29/14 29/23 | 7/24 8/6 31/8 31/18 72/17 |
| 40/16 40/19 40/20 43/2 46/13 | 29/25 30/3 32/2 36/7 39/7 | witnessing [1] 39/7 |
| 50/2 53/16 54/2 56/16 56/21 | 39/14 $40 / 1044 / 13$ 44/16 | wolf [15] 23/13 24/7 24/11 |
| 56/22 56/22 61/20 62/9 62/10 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { 44/18 } & 45 / 11 & 45 / 14 & 46 / 1 & 56 / 7\end{array}$ | 38/18 39/4 39/9 40/7 40/16 |
| 62/14 62/14 66/24 68/10 | 57/14 58/12 60/2 60/3 60/15 | 40/17 40/18 40/23 41/2 41/3 |
| 68/25 69/20 69/21 | 60/17 60/19 60/21 65/16 | 42/1 53/20 |
| Washington [2] 55/24 56/8 | 65/20 65/21 66/12 66/19 | wolves [8] 39/3 40/9 40/10 |
| waste [2] 3/11 54/7 | 68/20 70/22 71/5 72/5 | 40/13 40/15 41/3 41/7 41/21 |
| water [52] 5/11 9/2 9/5 9/9 | what's [5] 45/6 52/4 54/20 | word [1] 67/2 |
| 9/21 10/4 10/8 10/10 10/23 | 61/3 64/8 | words [1] 29/24 |
| 11/21 11/22 14/11 18/7 33/12 | whatever [1] 64/6 | work [34] 4/13 6/19 7/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 1 & 34 / 12 & 34 / 16 & 36 / 2 & 36 / 7\end{array}$ | wheat [1] 51/13 | 11/12 15/7 15/8 20/21 21/5 |
| $36 / 9$ 36/11 $36 / 12$ 36/18 36/20 | when [37] 4/1 14/25 15/12 | 23/4 23/22 24/2 24/18 24/25 |
| 36/24 37/19 37/22 37/23 | 18/3 19/4 19/25 20/19 25/18 | 25/7 26/9 26/24 28/4 28/6 |
| 43/23 44/5 $44 / 8$ 44/9 44/14 | 29/5 29/20 32/4 32/18 32/18 | 32/1 44/22 51/1 54/18 55/14 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 45/12 } & 45 / 13 & 48 / 13 & 48 / 14 & 49 / 1\end{array}$ | $34 / 1$ 35/17 $37 / 16$ 41/10 45/24 | 58/6 59/9 62/20 62/22 65/7 |
| 51/21 51/22 51/25 61/6 63/6 | 49/2 50/16 53/7 55/3 56/15 | 68/10 68/18 70/6 72/7 72/13 |
| 64/20 65/3 65/4 65/5 65/7 | 60/12 60/25 61/20 63/12 | 72/15 |
| 65/8 65/13 65/22 69/5 | 63/23 63/25 64/3 66/24 69/4 | worked [10] 6/2 15/19 16/3 |
| waterfowl [1] 14/20 | 69/9 69/21 69/22 71/23 72/7 | 22/19 26/22 32/18 61/21 62/4 |
| waters [14] 5/10 36/10 36/15 | where [22] 18/8 20/24 21/3 | 62/12 67/9 |
| 37/6 37/7 37/8 37/19 43/25 | 24/1 26/5 28/10 28/13 29/5 | working [16] 4/12 $12 / 25$ 13/18 |
| 44/17 51/20 60/14 64/14 | 29/6 29/18 29/18 30/14 49/3 | 15/16 16/19 20/18 23/25 |
| 66/25 67/1 | 50/12 55/15 57/8 62/17 67/10 | 26/23 27/12 42/5 53/18 56/1 |
| watershed [2] 10/21 12/3 | 70/4 70/10 71/5 71/7 | 58/9 58/24 61/23 62/1 |
| watersheds [1] 10/20 | wherever [1] 39/24 | works [4] 3/10 15/9 25/22 |
| waterway [1] 60/18 | whether [8] 43/11 59/13 65/11 | 59/5 |
| waterways [3] 44/16 60/16 | 70/1 70/7 70/18 70/19 71/14 | workshop [1] 11/23 |
| 72/14 | which [13] 5/11 11/17 19/13 | world [4] 25/7 39/8 61/1 |
| way [19] 7/15 24/18 24/19 | 49/18 50/10 52/18 52/23 | 62/21 |
| 24/21 25/21 26/22 28/4 28/6 | 53/19 54/11 57/22 58/22 70/6 | world's [1] 54/20 |
| 32/1 41/19 45/14 50/8 55/14 | 72/21 | worlds [1] 60/5 |
| 56/1 60/10 61/22 62/19 67/18 | while [12] $4 / 11$ 6/6 6/18 $7 / 5$ | worry [2] 58/20 58/21 |
| 68/9 | 9/20 12/5 15/22 24/10 31/10 | worse [1] 52/4 |
| ways [4] 12/24 24/6 58/6 | 49/16 51/3 54/21 | worth [1] 53/6 |
| 64/19 | who [13] 5/5 7/12 $15 / 11$ | WOTUS [17] 5/10 5/24 7/6 19/5 |
| we [147] | 21/11 21/16 21/24 25/2 $30 / 9$ | 36/7 44/20 45/3 45/6 45/10 |
| we'd [3] $32 / 6$ 51/8 55/6 | 44/21 45/25 47/19 59/5 72/15 | 45/15 45/22 51/18 52/9 60/1 |
| we'll [4] 17/22 19/22 28/18 | whole [1] 42/4 | 61/17 66/1 69/18 |
| $32 / 4$ | whose [2] 16/15 39/6 | would [36] 3/4 3/16 5/11 6/4 |
| we're [13] 19/15 20/10 $24 / 15$ | why [5] 18/15 23/14 26/10 | 9/21 9/21 12/22 21/1 21/1 |
| 27/21 28/17 $30 / 3$ 32/4 61/4 | 26/25 29/4 | 21/4 21/5 22/9 24/25 25/21 |
| 61/15 66/20 69/23 71/25 72/5 | widespread [1] 28/19 | 25/23 25/23 28/20 29/16 |
| we've [9] $22 / 18$ 27/18 29/4 | wild [2] 39/2 39/9 | 29/23 30/1 30/20 38/15 42/9 |
| 32/17 61/11 66/12 69/12 | wildiffe [34] 2/7 3/14 4/8 | 44/7 50/5 55/2 55/7 55/14 |
| 69/16 70/4 | 6/8 6/18 $7 / 8$ 8/3 13/19 13/23 | 56/6 56/13 56/15 60/15 65/8 |
| Weather [1] 35/25 | 13/25 17/4 17/16 21/20 21/24 | 66/4 68/10 68/11 |
| Webinars [1] 11/11 | 28/7 33/22 34/19 35/10 41/14 | wouldn't [1] 55/8 |
| weed [1] 16/8 | 43/13 $44 / 5$ 49/6 49/22 53/24 | writing [4] 63/18 63/19 63/19 |
| week [1] 11/15 | 54/3 56/16 56/22 57/16 57/21 | 71/17 |
| week's [1] 53/16 | 58/5 59/5 59/8 62/2 70/13 | written [1] 41/17 |
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