

**MIKE SIMPSON**

SECOND DISTRICT, IDAHO

**WASHINGTON OFFICE:**

2312 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515  
(202) 225-5531  
FAX: (202) 225-8216

**DISTRICT OFFICE:**

802 WEST BANNOCK STREET, SUITE 600  
BOISE, ID 83702  
(208) 334-1953  
FAX: (208) 334-9533  
[www.house.gov/simpson](http://www.house.gov/simpson)



COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEES:

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT,  
AND RELATED AGENCIES  
RANKING MEMBER

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

September 30, 2013

The Honorable Chuck Winder  
Co-Chair  
Federal Lands Interim Committee  
Idaho State Senate  
Boise, Idaho 83702

The Honorable Lawrence Denney  
Co-Chair  
Federal Lands Interim Committee  
Idaho House of Representatives  
Boise, Idaho 83702

Dear Senator Winder and Representative Denney:

I am writing to share with you a report I requested from the Congressional Research Service regarding annual federal public land expenditures and revenues in Idaho.

As you may know, the Congressional Research Service (CRS) is the non-partisan research arm of the United States Congress and operates under the umbrella of the Library of Congress. CRS is staffed with experts in virtually all subject areas. It maintains a library of updated policy research but is also available to research issues at the request of Congress.

As Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and the Environment, and knowing of the interest in Idaho in exploring alternative management ideas on federal public lands, I asked CRS to research and report on federal expenditures and revenues related to lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, the United States Forest Service, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in Idaho during fiscal year 2012. The attached report only covers those lands and does not include costs and revenues for federal land in Idaho managed by the U.S. Park Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, or other federal agencies.

I asked for this information hoping to better understand the full impact of federal public land expenditures and revenues in Idaho and because the information might be useful to the ongoing deliberations of the Legislature's Federal Lands Interim Committee. I want to be clear that I draw no conclusions from the information contained in the report and share it with you without advocating any particular outcome of the Interim Committee's deliberations.

The information contained in this CRS report is simply a snapshot in time. It includes expenditures and revenues in only a single fiscal year and does NOT include the full scope of expenditures and revenues for all federal agencies with responsibilities in Idaho.

Sen. Winder and Rep. Denny  
September 30, 2013  
Page Two

Should you have any questions or concerns related to the report, or should there be any additional information that my staff or I can help provide for your ongoing work, please don't hesitate to let me know.

Thank you for your service to the people of Idaho and for the continuing efforts of the Federal Lands Interim Committee.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mike Simpson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Mike Simpson  
Member of Congress

cc: Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter  
Idaho Land Board  
Idaho Department of Lands  
Members of the Federal Lands Interim Committee



## Congressional Research Service

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

---

### MEMORANDUM

September 19, 2013

**To:** The Honorable Michael K. Simpson  
Attention: Malisah Small

**From:** Carol Hardy Vincent, Specialist in Natural Resources Policy,  
M. Lynne Corn, Specialist in Natural Resources Policy,  
Curry L. Hagerty, Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy,  
Katie Hoover, Analyst in Natural Resources Policy,  
William J. Mallett, Specialist in Transportation Policy,

**Subject:** **Federal Land Management Agency Appropriations and Revenues for Idaho**

---

This memorandum responds to your request for information on appropriations and revenues related to federal lands in the state of Idaho. You requested information on lands managed by three federal agencies: the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in the Department of the Interior (DOI) and the Forest Service (FS) in the Department of Agriculture.<sup>1</sup> At our meeting on July 17, 2013, we agreed to pursue information in five areas:

- appropriations used in Idaho provided through the three agencies,
- the total costs to the agencies of litigation related to their lands in Idaho,
- allocations of funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to the three agencies for their lands in Idaho,
- the payments to Idaho under the Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program and the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (SRS), and
- revenue derived by the three agencies in Idaho, including mineral leasing revenues reported by the DOI Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR).

Comprehensive data covering these areas do not exist in a single source.<sup>2</sup> Some of these data are readily available in public sources,<sup>3</sup> such as the payments under PILT and SRS. This is not the case for other data, such as appropriations, litigation costs, FHWA allocations, and revenues by

---

<sup>1</sup> These three agencies manage approximately 32.1 million acres of land in Idaho. While the precise total of all federal lands in Idaho is not readily available, there are an estimated 32.6 million acres managed by the five largest land management agencies—BLM, FWS, FS, National Park Service, and Department of Defense.

<sup>2</sup> For information on the extent to which land management agencies collect and make available data on lands, resources, and revenues, and the reliability of such data, see Government Accountability Office, *Federal Land Management: Availability and Potential Reliability of Selected Data Elements at Five Agencies*, GAO-12-691T, May 3, 2012, at <http://www.gao.gov/assets/600/590603.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Public sources include agency websites, agency budget justifications, and other sources that CRS could access directly.

state. In these cases, we sought to obtain the information from the pertinent agencies. This presented varying degrees of challenge for the agencies, for reasons explained below.

In some cases the agencies were able to extrapolate the information needed from data sources maintained for differing purposes and in varying formats. That information is organized and presented in this memorandum. Some of these data are inconsistent across agencies, due to differences in how agencies receive and allocate appropriations, and define, organize, and report data. This was the case for both the appropriations and revenue data, for example. Further, in some cases there is overlap in the information provided by the agencies and reported here, such as for some mandatory appropriations included in both the appropriations and revenue totals (e.g., for recreation). In light of such challenges and issues, figures in this memorandum should be regarded as estimates and are not aggregated across agencies.

In other cases the agencies were not able to provide the requested information in the timeframe of this research, because they do not collect and maintain data by state in the manner needed. In particular, the agencies were not able to estimate their total costs of litigation, or break out each agency's portion of mineral leasing revenues, due to appropriations and agency processes and practices. For example, agencies neither receive nor allocate appropriations for all costs of litigation through one account, program, or activity, nor organize and report all financial information related to litigation in a state. The sections below on these areas contain additional detail.

The memorandum does not provide information on the broader economic dimensions related to federal lands managed by the three agencies in Idaho. An analysis of economic costs and benefits and economic impacts is beyond the scope of this memorandum. Further, this memorandum is not intended to make implications about these lands under nonfederal ownership, such as the level of funds that might be provided for their management or the revenues that might be generated through their use. For example, the legal and political frameworks pertinent to management under state law may vary considerably from those that apply to the BLM, FWS, and FS.

The following sections provide information on the five areas of interest. Information is provided for FY2012, as the most complete fiscal year available. For information beyond that covered in this memorandum, please contact Carol Hardy Vincent (for BLM), Lynne Corn (for FWS), Curry Hagerty (ONRR), Katie Hoover (for FS), and Will Mallett (for FHWA).

## Appropriations

The amount of appropriations to the land management agencies for use in a particular state is not contained in sources available to the public. As a result, CRS obtained most of the information for this memorandum directly from BLM, FWS, and FS. For each agency, we sought to obtain the total appropriations for Idaho. We also requested that the agencies distinguish the portion that was discretionary and the portion that was mandatory.<sup>4</sup> Further, we asked each agency to identify the portion

---

<sup>4</sup> For all three agencies, discretionary appropriations are provided through the annual Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations law. The agencies have varied sources of mandatory funding under legislation enacted by authorizing committees. Laws authorizing mandatory appropriations allow the agencies to spend money without further action by Congress. For additional information on the distinction between discretionary and mandatory appropriations, and on other aspects of the appropriations and budgetary processes, see CRS Report R42388, *The Congressional Appropriations Process: An Introduction*, by Jessica Tollestrup and CRS Report 98-721, *Introduction to the Federal Budget Process*, coordinated by Bill Heniff Jr.

of agency appropriations used in Idaho on lands other than those managed by the agency (e.g., on state or privately owned lands).

As noted above, the information provided here is not entirely consistent across the agencies. Among other reasons, this is due to differences in how agencies allocate funds (e.g., whether by state or by other geographic area, such as national forest or regional office). Another distinction relates to the extent to which agencies use appropriations in a state on lands other than those they own, and the precision with which agencies were able to distinguish funds for that purpose.

Still another variation stems from the structure of appropriations laws, specifically whether appropriations are provided directly to an agency or to the Department (i.e., of the Interior) and then allocated to the agencies. For example, appropriations laws include funds for wildland fire management within the total appropriation for FS, the only U.S. Department of Agriculture agency with a major agency role in wildland fire management. By contrast, funds for wildland fire management by DOI agencies are appropriated to a department-wide account, and then allocated to BLM, FWS, and other agencies. For this memorandum, the data provided by BLM included allocations to the agency for wildland fire management, as well as allocations from other department-wide accounts. However, the data provided by the FWS did not similarly include any allocations from department-wide accounts. As a result of these and other distinctions, the appropriations for the three agencies for Idaho are not aggregated in this memorandum.<sup>5</sup>

## Bureau of Land Management

The Bureau of Land Management receives both discretionary and mandatory appropriations for use in Idaho. The BLM estimates that total BLM funding for Idaho was \$130.6 million in FY2012. This figure includes carryover balances from prior year appropriations. The large majority of the total BLM funding for Idaho was discretionary. Specifically, the total includes \$122.7 million (94.0%) in discretionary appropriations. The balance was mandatory appropriations, specifically \$7.9 million (6.0%) in FY2012.

The largest discretionary appropriation for BLM in the annual Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill is for Management of Lands and Resources. This account funds an array of BLM programs and activities, including land resources, wildlife and fisheries, recreation, energy and minerals, and resource planning. In FY2012, this account contained 49.0% of BLM's total discretionary appropriation nationally. The second largest discretionary appropriation was for Wildland Fire Management. BLM's allocation from this department-wide account comprised 42.3% of the agency's discretionary appropriation in FY2012. Mandatory appropriations for the BLM are derived from recreation fees and donations, among other sources.

The BLM manages 11.6 million acres of land in Idaho, about 4.7% of all BLM lands and 36.1% of the land managed by the BLM, FWS, and FS in Idaho. According to the BLM, virtually all appropriations to the agency are used for managing agency-owned lands. **Table 1** provides additional detail on BLM appropriations allocated to Idaho.

---

<sup>5</sup> Additional information on appropriations for the three land management agencies is included in CRS reports. For instance, for information on the President's FY2014 request for appropriations for the three agencies, see CRS Report R43142, *Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: Brief Overview of the President's FY2014 Appropriations Request*, by Carol Hardy Vincent. For information on appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service, see CRS Report R42466, *Fish and Wildlife Service: FY2013 Appropriations and Policy*, by M. Lynne Corn. For information on funding for wildland fire management, see CRS Report R43077, *Wildfire Management: Federal Funding and Related Statistics*, by Kelsi Bracmort.

**Table 1. Bureau of Land Management Appropriations in Idaho, FY2012**  
(amounts in thousands)

<b>Account / Purpose</b>	<b>FY2012</b>
Management of Lands and Resources	60,157
Wildland Fire Management	51,970
Land Acquisition	6,413
Service Charges, Deposits, and Forfeitures	2,177
Construction and Access	1,364
Central Hazardous Materials Fund	645
<i>Contributed Funds</i>	3,876
<i>Recreation Fees</i>	1,835
<i>Range Improvements</i>	1,116
<i>Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery</i>	480
<i>Natural Resource Damage Assessment—Receipts</i>	313
<i>Geothermal Steam Act Implementation</i>	259
<b>Total</b>	<b>130,605</b>

**Source:** Provided by Bureau of Land Management, Budget Division, August 15, 2013. Adapted by CRS.

**Notes:** Entries in italics indicate mandatory appropriations. Appropriated entitlements, such as some contributed funds and Range Improvement Funds, are reflected as mandatory appropriations. For appropriated entitlements, the level of spending is controlled by authorizing statutes but the funding is provided in the annual appropriations acts.

## Fish and Wildlife Service

The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) manages 93,259 acres in Idaho, of which 49,652 acres (53.2%) are under the primary jurisdiction of the agency. The remaining lands are under the primary jurisdiction of another federal agency or are managed under agreements, easements, or leases with other parties. Lands under FWS primary jurisdiction include National Wildlife Refuges and National Fish Hatcheries. These 49,652 acres comprise 0.05% of all lands in the National Wildlife Refuge System (NWRS)<sup>6</sup> and 0.2% of total BLM, FWS, and FS lands in Idaho. In addition, the FWS has a Fish Health Center, a Fisheries Resource Office, a law enforcement office for the Resident Agent in Charge, and the Snake River Fish and Wildlife Office in Idaho.

Determining FWS appropriations for Idaho is complex. This is because FWS not only manages the NWRS, but also devotes a considerable portion of its budget to other activities. Principal among these are certain state grant programs, including two large programs with mandatory appropriations (discussed below). States do not spend these funds on federal lands, although they might cooperate with federal land management agencies to select projects.<sup>7</sup> Further, some programs included here may serve other states

<sup>6</sup> This percent is calculated on a baseline of 91,121,041 acres in the NWRS under the primary jurisdiction of FWS. It excludes the 52,819,352 acres of Marine National Monuments under FWS. If the latter are included, Idaho lands drop to 0.035% of all lands under the primary jurisdiction of FWS.

<sup>7</sup> Including both mandatory and discretionary appropriations, the grant programs account for \$13.9 million (52.6%) of total FWS appropriations for Idaho. If title to FWS lands were passed to the state, grant programs would not be affected, although payments under the National Wildlife Refuge Fund would be eliminated. (See below.)

besides Idaho. This is particularly true of fish hatcheries, whose young fish may be shipped to several other states. At the same time, some programs at the FWS regional level benefit local Idaho FWS programs, but are budgeted at the regional level. Examples include Engineering Services and the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund. Funding for such regional programs is not reflected here.

For FY2012, FWS appropriations that can be attributed directly to Idaho were \$26.4 million. (See **Table 2.**) This total includes \$13.4 million (50.8%) in discretionary appropriations. Discretionary appropriations include accounts and programs funded by the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill, such as those for field stations and state wildlife grants.

Among the larger appropriations in FY2012 for FWS was the \$7.5 million for the Snake River Fish and Wildlife Office. It is through this office that such programs as endangered species consultation and recovery are carried out. Other programs involving coordination with or assistance to state, tribal, or private entities also are handled in this office.

The remainder of the FWS total, \$13.0 million (49.2%), was mandatory appropriations. Nearly all of this funding was for two state grant programs called Sport Fish Restoration (or Dingell-Johnson) and Wildlife Restoration (Pittman-Robertson). These two programs allocate funding to states under a formula based on the area of the state and on the number of fishing or hunting licenses sold in the state. Another portion of the mandatory appropriations, recreation fees, was far smaller (0.03% of FWS appropriations for Idaho).

A small portion of the total mandatory appropriation also was provided by the National Wildlife Refuge Fund (NWRF). Under the NWRF, counties are compensated for the presence of non-taxable federal land in the NWRS. A portion of the county payments is covered by receipts collected from all refuges. Such receipts are placed in the NWRF, and allocated by formula to county governments; this portion of funding is mandatory appropriations. However, receipts have fallen short of amounts needed to fund the full formula, and Congress has generally appropriated additional funds for the program—though not at the full level under the formula. Total mandatory and discretionary appropriations for FY2012 funded 24% of the formula. In Idaho, the FY2012 payments to counties totaled \$47,506.<sup>8</sup>

**Table 2. Fish and Wildlife Appropriations in Idaho, FY2012**  
(amounts in dollars)

Account / Purpose	FY2012
<b>Appropriations: Field Stations</b>	
Deer Flat NWR	648,000
Inland Northwest NWR Complex	440,000
Southeast Idaho NWR Complex	1,951,000
Dworshak NFH	14,000
Kooskia NFH	539,000
Idaho Fish Health Center	298,000
Idaho Fisheries Resource Office	666,000

<sup>8</sup> For each of FY2012-FY2014, the Administration proposed eliminating annual appropriations for the NWRF, leaving only the receipts to fund it. If the proposal were adopted, receipts nationally would fund about 6% of formula amounts; the available funds would be applied pro rata across all eligible counties. In Idaho, the total compensation to counties under this proposal in FY2012 would have been \$11,876.

<b>Account / Purpose</b>	<b>FY2012</b>
Resident Agent in Charge-Boise Idaho	464,000
Snake River Fish and Wildlife Office	7,476,000
Subtotal: Field Station Appropriations	12,496,000
<b>Appropriations: Grants<sup>a</sup></b>	
<i>Sport Fish Restoration Fund</i>	6,029,329
<i>Wildlife Restoration Fund</i>	6,924,407
Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund (ESA Sec. 6)	300,075
State Wildlife Formula Grants	584,450
State Wildlife Competitive Grants <sup>b</sup>	0
Subtotal: Grant Appropriations	13,838,261
<b>Recreation Fees Spent at Refuge</b>	
<i>Deer Flat NWR</i>	400
<i>Inland Northwest NWR Complex</i>	6,865
<i>Southeast Idaho NWR Complex</i>	560
Subtotal: Recreation Fee Appropriations	7,825
<b>National Wildlife Refuge Fund (NWRF)<sup>a</sup></b>	
<i>Mandatory</i>	16,742
<i>Discretionary</i>	30,764
Subtotal: NWRF Appropriations	47,506
<b>Total Appropriations</b>	<b>26,389,592</b>

**Source:** Personal communication to Lynne Corn from Jocelyn Buck Hunn, Chief, Budget Formulation and Policy, Division of Budget, FWS on August 7, 19, and 20, 2013. Adapted by CRS.

**Notes:** This table does not reflect any allocations to the FWS from DOI-wide accounts, such as Wildland Fire Management. Entries in italics indicate mandatory appropriations. The abbreviations in this table are as follows: NWR = National Wildlife Refuge; NFH = National Fish Hatchery.

- Funding for these programs is rarely, if ever spent on FWS or other federal lands.
- State Wildlife Competitive Grants vary from year to year based on applications states may submit.

## Forest Service

The Forest Service (FS) receives mandatory and discretionary appropriations for use in Idaho. FS mandatory appropriations derive from timber salvage sales, recreation fees, brush disposal, the cooperative work trust fund, the reforestation trust fund, and the Knutsen-Vandenberg fund, among others. Discretionary appropriations are funded by the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies appropriations bill and include accounts such as the National Forest System, Wildland Fire Management, and Land Acquisition. The FS estimates that approximately \$165.6 million of agency funds in FY2012 was directed for use primarily in Idaho. However, the agency noted that some national forests (NF) in Idaho extend into adjoining states, resulting in a portion of the reported funding credited to Idaho actually being used in the adjoining states (as discussed further below). Of this FY2012 total for Idaho, the mandatory appropriations were \$16.4 million (9.9%) and the discretionary appropriations were \$149.2 million (90.1%). **Table 3** provides additional detail on FS appropriations allocated to Idaho.

**Table 3. Forest Service Appropriations in Idaho, FY2012**  
(amounts in thousands)

Account / Purpose	FY2012
National Forest System	56,722
Wildland Fire Management	44,129
Cost Allocation (discretionary)	22,011
Capital Improvement and Maintenance	16,847
State and Private Forestry	5,229
Forest and Rangeland Research	3,286
Land Acquisition	896
Other	92
<i>Misc. Permanent Funds</i>	<i>10,908</i>
<i>Misc. Trust Funds</i>	<i>4,745</i>
<i>Cost Allocation (mandatory)</i>	<i>702</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>165,567</b>

**Source:** Provided by Forest Service, Budget Office, August 15, 2013. Adapted by CRS.

**Note:** Entries in italics indicate mandatory appropriations.

The Forest Service manages approximately 20.5 million acres of land in Idaho, about 11% of all FS land and 63.7% of all lands in Idaho managed by three agencies of interest. FS funding in Idaho is used primarily on agency-managed lands. Specifically, of the total Idaho funding, roughly \$6.0 million (4%) in FY2012 was not used on FS lands. These appropriations, identified as cooperative programs, are associated with the State and Private Forestry account (e.g., for the Forest Legacy program) and the Wildland Fire Management account (e.g., for state fire assistance) in the annual appropriations bills.

A precise total of FS appropriations specifically for Idaho is difficult to ascertain. This is primarily because FS appropriations for the National Forest System account, among others, are not geographically organized by state.<sup>9</sup> Further, the national forests in Idaho are divided primarily into two Forest Service regions: the Intermountain Region and the Northern Region.<sup>10</sup> There are sixteen national forests and one national grassland in Idaho, many of which are administered by the Forest Service as larger administrative units.<sup>11</sup> Eight of the sixteen forests in Idaho include acreage in adjoining states, as shown in **Table 4**. This could mean that the totals reported here may overestimate the amount of money allocated to Idaho. While

<sup>9</sup> The National Forest System (NFS) account constitutes about 34% of the FY2012 FS appropriations, second to the Wildland Fire Management account which comprises some 45% of the FY2012 FS appropriations. NFS programs support the planning, coordination, implementation, and monitoring of activities that provide: water-quality protection and improvement, recreation, energy resources, timber and non-timber forest products, habitat for wildlife, and forage for domestic animals.

<sup>10</sup> There are nine FS regions. The Northern Region (Region 1) encompasses nearly 28 million acres of National Forest System land in North and South Dakota, Montana, and northern Idaho. The Intermountain Region (Region 4) encompasses nearly 34 million acres of National Forest System land in Utah, Nevada, western Wyoming, and southern and central Idaho. In addition, just under 6,000 acres of the Wallowa National Forest is in Idaho. The Wallowa National Forest is in the Pacific Northwest Region (Region 6), which encompasses just over 27 million acres of National Forest System land primarily in Oregon and Washington.

<sup>11</sup> For example, the Caribou National Forest and Targhee National Forest are managed jointly as one administrative unit, the Caribou-Targhee National Forest.

it may seem feasible to apportion the funding for these eight forests based on the amount of land in Idaho, there is not always a one-to-one distribution between dollars and forest acreage. Projects in each national forest can change annually depending on where the need is, which may be in an adjoining state.

**Table 4. Idaho National Forests that Extend into Adjoining States**  
(acres by state)

National Forest	Idaho	Montana	Oregon	Utah	Washington	Wyoming	Total	% in Idaho
Bitterroot	464,160	1,191,593	0	0	0	0	1,655,753	28
Cache	264,441	0	0	952,337	0	0	1,216,778	22
Caribou	1,067,414	0	0	8,940	0	9,612	1,085,966	98
Kaniksu	1,045,691	489,672	0	0	298,120	0	1,833,483	57
Kootenai	46,480	2,098,788	0	0	0	0	2,145,268	2
Sawtooth	1,802,374	0	0	92,404	0	0	1,894,778	95
Targhee	1,355,074	0	0	0	0	333,704	1,688,778	80
Wallowa	5,593	0	1,069,168	0	0	0	1,074,761	1

Source: Forest Service, *Land Areas Report*, September 30, 2012, Table 8, [www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/LAR2012index.html](http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/LAR2012index.html).

## Cost of Litigation

You requested the costs to BLM, FWS, and FS of actions related to litigation. None of the three agencies was able to provide the total cost of activities related to litigation. There are many reasons it may be difficult for an agency to determine the portion of funding related to litigation. First, agencies might be sued under an array of laws challenging agency actions, such as under the Endangered Species Act, National Environmental Policy Act, or Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.<sup>12</sup> Second, agencies might use monies provided through numerous programs to address cases in court, such as to provide technical and subject matter expertise to assist with cases on a range of matters. Similarly, they might use monies provided through a variety of different programs to address court decisions, such as to update a land management plan, revise an environmental impact statement, issue new contracts for consultants, or carry out new or different actions for species recovery. The agencies do not consistently code and aggregate their financial information to track appropriations for litigation. Third, program funds often are spent to achieve multiple purposes and goals, complicating efforts to discern any portion specifically related to litigation. Fourth, some litigation affects multiple states, and allocation of a part of the cost to a particular state may not be possible. Fifth, some costs of litigation are not borne by the land management agencies themselves, as in the case of payments made from the Judgment Fund, discussed below.

We also sought to determine payments through the Judgment Fund and under certain other laws as a result of litigation in Idaho. These payments may represent a small portion of an agency's litigation costs, broadly defined. First, we were unable to identify payments from the Judgment Fund on behalf of the BLM, FWS, and FS. The Judgment Fund is a permanent appropriation used for payment of certain judgments against the United States when payment is not otherwise provided for.<sup>13</sup> It may be used to pay

<sup>12</sup> Title VII prohibits discrimination in employment.

<sup>13</sup> 31 U.S.C. § 1304.

certain costs to the prevailing party in litigation, typically including court fees and compensation for court-appointed experts. Settlements paid from the fund must be the final and comprehensive award for actual or threatened litigation, negotiated or agreed to by the Department of Justice. The fund is administered by the Financial Management Service (FMS) in the Treasury Department.<sup>14</sup> The FMS was not able to provide CRS information on payments by state during FY2012.

Second, we sought available information on agency payments under other laws. Under the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA), agencies provide awards of attorneys' fees to individuals and small entities that prevail in cases against the federal government.<sup>15</sup> Agencies have begun reporting information on EAJA awards in their budget justifications partly as a result of direction in appropriations reports.<sup>16</sup> For BLM, the government appears to have made two payments during FY2012 under settlements pursuant to litigation that occurred at the federal district court of Idaho. The FY2012 payments for the two cases totaled \$172,000. There were no FY2012 payments by the FWS under EAJA. For the FS, it appears that one payment was awarded in Idaho during FY2012, for \$90,000.<sup>17</sup>

In agency budget justifications, DOI also reports information on payments for lawsuits under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). There were no ESA cases filed in Idaho courts for which payments were made by DOI agencies during FY2012.<sup>18</sup> The FS budget justification does not include information on any payments by the agency under ESA.

## Allocations from Federal Highway Administration

In a limited number of cases, the BLM, FWS, and FS receive allocations of funds from other agencies. A major allocation program, in which you expressed interest, is the distribution of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds to states for federal lands projects. Since 1905, FHWA and its predecessor offices and agencies have been involved in the development of roads to and through federal lands.<sup>19</sup> Funds for FY2012 were authorized by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA), enacted in 2005.<sup>20</sup> The distribution of federal lands highway funds for FY2013 and FY2014 is authorized by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (MAP-

---

<sup>14</sup> This summary of the Judgment Fund is taken from CRS Report R42835, *The Judgment Fund: History, Administration, and Common Usage*, by Vivian S. Chu and Brian T. Yeh. The report contains information on the operation of the fund and related legislative proposals.

<sup>15</sup> For information on EAJA, see CRS Report R42835, *The Judgment Fund: History, Administration, and Common Usage*, by Vivian S. Chu and Brian T. Yeh, pp. 12-13.

<sup>16</sup> See for instance, House Committee on Appropriations, *Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2012*, H.Rept. 112-151, pp. 8-9 at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CRPT-112hrpt151/pdf/CRPT-112hrpt151.pdf>.

<sup>17</sup> The information for the BLM and FWS is taken from the FY2014 budget justification for the DOI Office of the Solicitor, p. SOL-45, at [http://www.doi.gov/budget/appropriations/2014/upload/FY2014\\_SOL\\_Greenbook.pdf](http://www.doi.gov/budget/appropriations/2014/upload/FY2014_SOL_Greenbook.pdf). The information for the Forest Service is taken from the agency's FY2014 budget justification, pp. 14-36 and 14-37, at <http://www.fs.fed.us/aboutus/budget/2014/FY2014ForestServiceBudgetJustificationFinal041613.pdf>. Note that suits filed, or payments awarded, in a particular state could involve cases affecting multiple states.

<sup>18</sup> Information on DOI payments under ESA is included in the FY2014 budget justification for the DOI Office of the Solicitor, p. SOL-43, at [http://www.doi.gov/budget/appropriations/2014/upload/FY2014\\_SOL\\_Greenbook.pdf](http://www.doi.gov/budget/appropriations/2014/upload/FY2014_SOL_Greenbook.pdf).

<sup>19</sup> U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, *America's Highways, 1776-1976: A History of the Federal-Aid Program*, Washington, DC, 1976, p. 486. FHWA was formerly the Office of Road Inquiry, the Office of Public Roads, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Public Roads Administration.

<sup>20</sup> 23 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq.

21), enacted in 2012.<sup>21</sup> MAP-21 made major changes to the federal lands and tribal transportation programs that are not reflected in the data presented here.<sup>22</sup>

In FY2012, nearly \$213 million was distributed by FHWA to FS, FWS, and BLM. About \$9 million of these funds cannot be identified by state, and are not reflected in this memorandum. Of the remaining \$204 million, \$16.0 million was distributed for expenditure in Idaho. See **Table 5**. All but \$25,000 went for FS projects and none went for BLM projects.<sup>23</sup>

FHWA's Public Lands Highways (PLH) Program had three components.<sup>24</sup> Of the nearly \$16 million distributed to Idaho for FS projects, \$14.2 million came from the Forest Highways Program, one part of the PLH Program. The Forest Highways Program provided funding for projects on public roads that provide access to or within a national forest or grassland. These funds were distributed by formula. Another \$1.7 million distributed for FS projects came from the PLH Discretionary (PLHD) Program, a second part of the PLH Program. The PLHD provided funding for transportation projects within, adjacent to, or providing access to Indian reservations and federal public lands, including national parks, refuges, forests, recreation areas, and grasslands. Projects were selected for funding by FHWA from among proposals submitted by states. A third component of the PLH Program included funding for some federal land management agencies to carry out planning and administration. These are some of the \$9 million in funds FHWA cannot identify by state.

The remaining \$25,000 of FY2012 funds distributed to Idaho went to FWS projects from the Refuge Roads Program.<sup>25</sup> Refuge roads provide access to and within the FWS' National Wildlife Refuge System.

**Table 5. Federal Highway Administration FY2012 Funds for Federal Lands in Idaho, for Selected Federal Land Management Agencies**

(amounts in dollars)

Agency / Program	Amount
<b>Forest Service</b>	15,983,259
Forest Highways	14,235,259
Public Lands Highways Discretionary	1,748,000
<b>Fish and Wildlife Service</b>	
Refuge Roads Program	25,000
<b>Bureau of Land Management</b>	0
<b>Total</b>	16,008,259

**Source:** Data prepared for CRS by the Federal Highway Administration, August 20, 2013.

<sup>21</sup> 23 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq.

<sup>22</sup> For information on the changes made by MAP-21 to federal lands and tribal transportation programs, see CRS Report R42762, *Surface Transportation Funding and Programs Under MAP-21: Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (P.L. 112-141)*, coordinated by Robert S. Kirk.

<sup>23</sup> In addition, \$689,000 was distributed for National Scenic Byways Program projects in Idaho. Some of the Scenic Byways funds may have been spent on federal lands, but FHWA is not able to provide more detail on these projects.

<sup>24</sup> The Public Lands Highways Program in SAFETEA has been replaced by the Federal Lands Access Program in MAP-21.

<sup>25</sup> The Refuge Roads Program in SAFETEA was replaced by the Federal Lands Transportation Program in MAP-21.

## Payment Programs

Under federal law, local governments are compensated through various programs for reductions to their property tax bases due to the presence of most federally owned land. These lands cannot be taxed, but may create demand for services such as fire protection, police cooperation, or longer roads to skirt the federal property. Some of these programs are run by specific agencies and apply only to one agency's land, while others are broader and apply to lands of multiple agencies.<sup>26</sup>

In FY2012, Idaho received payments under two major compensation programs in which you expressed particular interest. First, the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program, or PILT,<sup>27</sup> is the most widely applicable program and applies to many types of federally owned land. The program is administered by DOI. The authorized level of PILT payments is calculated under a complex formula, and is direct (mandatory) spending.<sup>28</sup> In FY2012, Idaho had 32,596,479 acres of land in 44 counties eligible for PILT. Of these eligible lands, 11,619,715 acres (36%) were under the jurisdiction of BLM and 20,229,298 acres (62%) were under FS. In addition, 18,984 acres (0.06%) under FWS were eligible. The remaining 728,482 acres (2%) were under the jurisdiction of other agencies. For FY2012, the PILT formula authorized \$26,586,644 in payments to Idaho counties.<sup>29</sup> After administrative expenses were deducted, the net amount was \$26,560,218 or 99.9% of the gross amount. The complexity of the PILT formula prevents breaking out the amounts that can be attributed to the lands of each of the BLM, FWS, and FS. However, lands of these three agencies accounted for the bulk of the payments, as collectively they had 98% of the eligible lands.

Second, counties with national forest lands and with certain BLM lands have historically received a percentage of agency revenues, primarily from timber sales. However, starting in the 1990s, timber sales declined substantially—by more than 90% in some areas from peak harvest levels in the 1980s. Thus, Congress enacted the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (SRS)<sup>30</sup> as a temporary, optional program of payments based in part on historic, rather than current, revenues.<sup>31</sup> In FY2012, Idaho received a \$31.2 million payment for FY2011 activities as authorized by SRS. Of the total, \$27.4 million went to counties in Idaho for use on roads, schools, and certain other specified uses, and \$3.8 million was retained by the FS for use on specified projects on the national forests in Idaho.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> For an overview of programs to compensate state and local governments for the tax-exempt status of federal lands, and related issues, see CRS Report R42439, *Compensating State and Local Governments for the Tax-Exempt Status of Federal Lands: What Is Fair and Consistent?*, by M. Lynne Corn.

<sup>27</sup> 31 U.S.C. §§ 6901-6907.

<sup>28</sup> Under current law, mandatory spending for PILT is authorized through FY2013. As mandatory spending, no appropriation in the annual appropriation law is required. For more on the PILT program, see CRS Report RL31392, *PILT (Payments in Lieu of Taxes): Somewhat Simplified*, by M. Lynne Corn.

<sup>29</sup> For Idaho's county-by-county payments, see the program's web site at <http://www.doi.gov/pilt/index.cfm>.

<sup>30</sup> 16 U.S.C. §§ 7101-7153.

<sup>31</sup> The SRS program expired at the end of FY2012. For additional information on the SRS program, see CRS Report R41303, *Reauthorizing the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000*, by Katie Hoover.

<sup>32</sup> U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, "All Service Receipts (ASR), Final Title I, II, and III Report PNF (ASR-18-01)," [http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5349604.pdf](http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5349604.pdf).

## Revenues

The amount of revenue derived by BLM, FWS, and FS in Idaho is not available in public sources. As a result, CRS obtained information for this memorandum directly from the three agencies. The data in **Tables 6-8** reflect revenues collected by each of the BLM, FWS, and FS respectively, whether or not these revenues were retained by the agency or allocated to another source (e.g., to the general fund of the Treasury). Depending on the agency, sources of revenue might include grazing, timber, recreation entrance/use, hardrock minerals, and rights of way, among others. The information provided here is not entirely consistent across the agencies. A primary reason is due to whether the data reflect total revenue collected by an agency in the state of Idaho or only revenues from activities and resources on lands the agency owns. For instance, the BLM data include payments from federal, state, and local governments for fire work performed on non-BLM land in the Idaho. By contrast, the FWS data reflect revenue generated exclusively on FWS lands. As a result of this and other variations, the revenues collected in Idaho by the three agencies are not aggregated in this memorandum.

It is important to note that the data in **Tables 6-8** do not reflect the share of each agency, if any, of revenues from onshore mineral leasing in Idaho. This is because these revenues are collected by ONRR, rather than by the three land management agencies themselves. While ONRR collects the revenue from this activity, BLM administers the leases. Accordingly, we have endeavored to obtain, from both ONRR and BLM, the total revenue derived from onshore mineral leasing in Idaho and the portion derived on the lands of each of the BLM, FWS, and FS. Further information on these revenues is presented below under “Office of Natural Resources Revenue,” and included in **Table 9**.

### Bureau of Land Management

BLM revenues in Idaho totaled \$9.4 million for FY2012. The revenues were derived from a variety of activities and resources on BLM lands, donations, and payments to BLM from other entities. **Table 6** shows the amount of revenue from each source during FY2012. More than three-quarters (77.3%) of the revenue was derived from three categories of activities and resources on BLM land: locatable minerals, lands and realty management, and range management. Locatable minerals was the single largest source, with \$3.9 million (41.3%), primarily from fees associated with mining claims for hardrock minerals. The second largest source of revenues was from lands and realty management activities, with \$1.9 million (20.7%) from land use permits and rights of way, among other activities. Range management was the third largest source, with \$1.4 million (15.2%) from fees for grazing private livestock on BLM land.

Some of the total revenue was not derived on BLM land; it was payment to BLM for work performed in the state of Idaho. For instance, the \$313,850 for state assistance represents payments to BLM by state and local governments for wildland fire work on non-federal lands, and the \$115,450 for fire reimbursement represents payments to BLM for wildland fire work undertaken to assist other federal agencies. Also, the \$116,400 for fire trespass is collections from individuals for human-caused fires on BLM lands. Of additional note is the negative revenue of \$131,800 for timber management, which was due to refunds, transfers of revenue, and other accounting transactions during the year.

**Table 6. Revenues Collected by BLM in Idaho, FY2012**  
(amounts in dollars)

Revenue Source	Revenue
Locatable Minerals	3,883,500
Lands and Realty Management	1,948,480

Revenue Source	Revenue
Range Management	1,432,550
Recreation	795,500
Contributed Funds (Donations)	555,950
State Assistance	313,850
Mineral Materials	233,250
Other	136,500
Fire Trespass	116,400
Fire Reimbursement	115,450
Timber Management	-131,800
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,399,630</b>

**Source:** Provided by Bureau of Land Management, Budget Division, August 20, 2013. Adapted by CRS.

**Note:** This table reflects revenue generated on BLM lands and collected directly by BLM, donations to the agency, and certain payments to BLM.

## Fish and Wildlife Service

In contrast to BLM and FS lands, relatively little revenue is directly generated on FWS lands.<sup>33</sup> Under law, activities in the NWRS must be compatible with the purposes for which the refuge was designated.<sup>34</sup> As a result of this compatibility provision, few commercial activities are permitted on lands in the NWRS unless the activities benefit wildlife conservation. For a number of years, it has been the policy of FWS to gradually eliminate pre-existing incompatible uses from refuges, except in cases of valid existing rights over which the agency has no control.<sup>35</sup> With few permitted commercial activities, very little revenue is usually collected in the NWRS.

Those revenues that are derived on FWS lands come from varied activities and resources. One category of receipts is recreation fees, and these are generally used at the refuges where they are collected. Where receipts for other activities are collected through the NWRS, they are deposited into the National Wildlife Refuge Fund.<sup>36</sup> Such receipts are derived from the sale of products, such as timber or gravel; rights of way; grazing permits; and leases for accommodations (such as those built for oil and gas exploration or development). Any given refuge may have all, few, or none of these activities.

<sup>33</sup> Nationally, for FY2012 FWS collected \$19.2 million for activities on its lands. In contrast, BLM revenues in Idaho alone in FY2012 were \$9.4 million. See "Bureau of Land Management," above. The \$19.2 million in FWS revenue derives from the four categories of revenue which can reasonably be associated with some particular unit: funds collected at refuges for certain commercial activities and paid into the National Wildlife Refuge Fund (\$7.6 million), recreation fees (\$5.1 million), contributed funds earmarked for special projects at specific sites (\$2.6 million), and miscellaneous permanent appropriations (\$3.9 million). The total does not include fines under various laws, such as the Lacey Act (18 U.S.C. § 42), as they are not usually associated with a particular refuge or hatchery; nor the sale of duck stamps, which may be purchased in many locations or on-line, and used in many locations on or off refuges. These figures on FY2012 revenues for the FWS nationally were taken from: U.S. Department of the Interior, *Budget Justifications and Performance Information, Fiscal Year 2014, Fish and Wildlife Service*, at <http://www.fws.gov/budget/2014/FWS%202014%20Budget%20Justifications.pdf>.

<sup>34</sup> See 16 U.S.C. § 668dd.

<sup>35</sup> In some instances, FWS lacks discretion to reduce or eliminate commercial activities. Examples include split estates, in which some other entity owns subsurface rights to energy or mineral resources; secondary FWS jurisdiction, where some other federal agency has primary jurisdiction; and the presence of easements or leases.

<sup>36</sup> Note that some economic activity may occur in the NWRS and generate receipts, but the receipts are not paid to FWS. Examples may include pre-existing energy or mineral rights. This section reflects only receipts collected by the FWS.

As shown in **Table 7**, revenues from FWS lands in Idaho totaled \$104,986. The revenues included timber sales (87.0%), haying (3.6%), grazing (1.4%), and miscellaneous other special uses (0.6%). These receipts, totaling \$97,160, were paid into the National Wildlife Refuge Fund (NWRF), and make up 92.5% of the revenues collected through FWS lands in Idaho. The receipts placed in the NWRF are not retained for direct local payments to counties, but are shared nationally on a pro rata basis. With collections of \$97,160, and payments to Idaho counties totaling \$47,506, Idaho's payments into the fund exceeded its return to county governments by \$49,654.

In addition to receipts paid into the NWRF, some refuges collected recreation fees; these collections were retained at the site where they were collected and totaled \$7,825 in FY2012. This figure is 7.5% of the \$104,986 in receipts collected on FWS lands in the state.

**Table 7. Revenues Collected by FWS from Refuges in Idaho, FY2012**  
(amounts in dollars)

Revenue Source	Revenue
<b>Receipts</b>	
Forest products	91,312
Haying	3,794
Grazing	1,455
Other special uses	600
<b>Subtotal: Receipts (paid into NWRF)</b>	<b>97,160</b>
<b>Recreation Fees Collected at Refuges</b>	
Inland Northwest NWR Complex	6,865
Southeast Idaho NWR Complex	560
Deer Flat NWR	400
<b>Subtotal: Recreation Fees</b>	<b>7,825</b>
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>104,986</b>

**Source:** Personal communication to Lynne Corn from Jocelyn Buck Hunn, Chief, Budget Formulation and Policy, Division of Budget, FWS on August 7, 19, 20, and 21, 2013. Adapted by CRS.

**Notes:** First, this table reflects revenue generated on FWS lands and collected directly by the FWS. Second, no recreation fees were collected at hatcheries. Third, numbers may not add due to rounding.

## Forest Service

In FY2012, the national forests in Idaho generated approximately \$9.2 million in revenue.<sup>37</sup> Revenues were derived from an array of activities and resources on National Forest lands, including recreation, timber, grazing, and power. **Table 8** describes the type of revenue from each source and shows the amount of revenue from each source during FY2012. The top three revenue classes were payments for salvage

<sup>37</sup> The FS collects revenue by state to calculate the payments due under a 1908 Payments to States revenue-sharing law which returns 25% of the revenue generated on a national forest to the counties which contain that national forest land. SRS was enacted as an alternative to the Payments to States program.

sales, deposits into the Knutsen-Vandenberg Fund, and recreation fees. Together, revenues from these three sources totaled \$6.4 million, more than two-thirds (68.8%) of all Forest Service revenues during FY2012. Looked at from another perspective, timber-related activities generated the most revenue. The combined revenue from timber sales (and other forest products), the Knutsen-Vandenberg Fund, specified road credits, and salvage sales was \$5.7 million, or 62.0% of the total revenues in FY2012.

**Table 8. Revenue Collected by FS from National Forests in Idaho, FY2012**  
(amounts in dollars)

Revenue Source	Description	Revenue
Salvage Sales	Payment for salvageable material used to facilitate the timely removal of damaged timber.	2,531,888
Recreation Special Uses	Amounts collected for all types of recreation except user fees collected under LWCF.	1,964,239
Knutsen-Vandenberg Fund	Collections authorized under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act of June 9, 1930, from timber sale purchasers for sale area improvement work and reforestation.	1,869,483
Specified Road Credits	Credits, deposits, or adjustments to payments by purchasers of timber sale contracts.	896,740
Land Use	Amounts collected for land uses except power, minerals, or recreational uses.	710,332
Grazing West	Amounts collected for grazing fees in the national forests in the sixteen western States.	590,412
Timber	Amounts collected for the sale of timber and certain other forest products.	439,201
Power	Amounts collected for uses authorized by FS permits or easements for all types of power generating projects and power transmission line rights-of-way.	237,935
Minerals	Amounts collected from sale of minerals and permit fees.	6,318
<b>Total</b>		<b>9,246,547</b>

**Source:** U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, *All Service Receipts (ASR), Final Forest Statement of Receipts (ASR-13-2)*, [http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5407187.pdf](http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5407187.pdf).

**Note:** This table reflects revenue generated on national forest lands and collected directly by the FS.

## Office 6 Natural Resources Revenue

A wide variety of minerals are leased on federal lands. Leases typically require operators who extract minerals to make payments to the federal government. Payments might be in the form of bonuses to secure, or rents to maintain, the lease, and royalties based on the value of the minerals extracted, among others.

For FY2012, the federal government reported \$10.1 million in revenue from mineral leasing activity on federal land in Idaho.<sup>38</sup> These revenues were collected by the DOI, Office of Natural Resources Revenue

<sup>38</sup> For the most part, the statutory basis for the federal onshore leasing program is the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (MLA, 30 U.S.C. § 181 et seq.). The MLA has evolved over time, including significant amendments in 1976 that changed some of the definitions and revenue management provisions (P.L. 94-570). In its current form, the act addresses most but perhaps not all (continued...)

(ONRR), which collects, manages, and disburses revenues from federal offshore and federal and Indian onshore mineral leases. This \$10.1 million in mineral leasing revenues reported by ONRR is in addition to the revenues shown in **Tables 6-8** above, which were collected by the BLM, FWS, and FS for other activities and resource uses.<sup>39</sup>

Of the \$10.1 million in revenues, phosphates accounted for the overwhelming majority—\$9.8 million (97.1%). Most of the remaining \$0.3 million was from geothermal resources, with smaller amounts from oil and gas and hardrock minerals. Further, royalties accounted for the bulk of all revenues—\$8.9 million (88.1%), primarily from phosphates.<sup>40</sup> **Table 9** provides additional detail.

Neither ONRR nor BLM, who issues and administers the leases on federal lands, was able to break out the \$10.1 million based on the surface agency administering the lands. This is because neither agency has a repository of data organized and reported by surface management agency. Instead, agency records are aggregated by type of revenue, commodity, and other variables, which could facilitate broad analyses. Thus, it is not possible to identify the portion of the revenues, if any, derived on lands of each of the BLM, FWS, and FS, as well as other federal agencies.<sup>41</sup> However, nearly all of the revenues were derived from BLM lands, according to the BLM Budget Office.

**Table 9. Revenues Collected by ONRR from Onshore Mineral Leasing in Idaho, FY2012**

(amounts in dollars)

Revenue Type	Commodity/Product	Revenue
Reported Royalties	Gold	797
	Phosphate Raw Ore	8,863,129
Rents	Geothermal	222,162
	Hardrock	165
	Oil and Gas	14,718
	Phosphate	4,585
Bonus	Geothermal	49,764
	Phosphate	799,998
Other Revenues	Hardrock	126
	Phosphate	107,856

(...continued)

federal revenue management policies implemented in Idaho. Consistent with the revenue management policies found in this act, reported revenues typically include royalties, rents, and bonuses. Records of these receipts reflecting operations in Idaho, as shown in **Table 9**, pertain to certain leases on lands managed by federal agencies.

<sup>39</sup> For a discussion of issues associated with revenues collected by the federal government from mineral leasing activity on federal and Indian lands generally (in FY2010 and FY2011), see Government Accountability Office, *Leaseable Minerals on Federal and Indian Lands: Volume, Value, and Revenue*, GAO-13-45R, November 15, 2012, at <http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/650122.pdf>.

<sup>40</sup> For information on 18 phosphate mines in southeastern Idaho where the federal government is overseeing mining operations or cleanup activities, see Government Accountability Office, *Phosphate Mining: Oversight has Strengthened, but Financial Assurances and Coordination Still Need Improvement*, GAO-12-505, May 2012, at <http://www.gao.gov/assets/600/590642.pdf>.

<sup>41</sup> Reported revenue, if any, from activities on federal lands other than those managed by BLM, FWS, and FS is outside the scope of this memorandum.

---

<b>Revenue Type</b>	<b>Commodity/Product</b>	<b>Revenue</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>10,063,299</b>

---

**Source:** Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Statistical Information, Reported Revenues, at <http://statistics.onrr.gov/ReportTool.aspx>.

---