medbenny

Sensters and Representations

My home is thepe Malberry and pleans

Thank you for the opportunity to speak before this committee. I drove here from Boise to chat with you about your plan to make more money out of my land. And I am angry at you. Every other year or so y'all legislators have gotten together for about 25 years, and more, to connive a way to get more money out of our collective landscape, the federal lands. You complain that you make no money on this, our, land from logging, mining, and grazing; that the land may catch on fire; that it could be managed by the state for less money. You say nothing about the people of Idaho who love to use this land. You say nothing about the people who own this land in Idaho and elsewhere. What we have been given is a treasure that you cannot just take away without a barroom brawl. Just quit asking for a punch in the face, again and again and again.

The State of Idaho Department of Lands pats itself on its own back for maximizing the money that it makes on the state lands. But they are just doing what the law tells them to do: make money on the state's land. And that means that the State land managers need to minimize all other costs of the land, environmental assessments of it, public involvement about it, retain the Land Board's discretion on the land, and all animals that live on it for one purpose: to make money. The State is not mandated to allow multiple use of our lands. Sometimes it gives the short term pivledge that ends up protecting the land but that is in very rare circumstances, as on Priest Lake or along Payette Lake.

In any case Idaho has no option to retain the federal lands because their mandates are very, very different. On federal land we must protect the rights of the public. ORVs, mountainbikes, or hikers must be allowed to tramp across the land. Endangerd species must be protected, sage grouse and wolves and caribou, grizzly bears, lynx and steelhead, Chinook and Sockeye salmon, and lesser protected species like Lamprey, and sturgeon, Pileated woodpeckers, and osprey, and fisher and many, many other creatures must have a pace to live. And you know what? They find it on the federal lands. And so does the wolverine, pipe and paging Nabbot.

My point here is that the state and federal lands have very different laws that direct the management of the land and that they cannot be easily interchanged. Your desire to manage the

federal land less sensitively does not settle kindly with me. You'll have to go to Congress to change that law and you will be in another and tougher brawl in DC. This federal land is the only land that I have a real connection to (I fish on it, go hike on it, camp on it, and go to it to soothe my soul) and please don't choose to eliminate my opportunities or those of any others on this land. Don't take it from us! No these values are the primary obligations of the federal land managers: BLM, USFS, NPS and others and as much as I disagree with them, I agree with them far more than I would support the proposal that I've heard about-from the State of Idaho. My suggestion is that you give up this wild goose chase and give the money back to Idahoans from whom you've stolen it from.

I would like to end with a song:

"This land is your land, this land is my land from Calfornia to the New York Island, from the Redwood forests to the River of No Return, well this land is made for you and me...As I was walkin' that Redwood highway I saw a sign that said no trespassing, but on the other side it, said "nothing." Well, that side was made for you and me."

Thank you.

It kind of reminds me of a quote that Adam Smith once wrote: "People of the same trade seldom meet, even if for merriment or diversion, but the topic ends in a discussion of ways in which to raise prices or or in how to rise prices about the way that but the connive to rise prices or cheat the public