

**Statement for the Record  
Bureau of Land Management  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
House Committee on Natural Resources  
Subcommittee on Federal Lands**

**H.R. 6441, Ranching Without Red Tape Act  
H.R. 8517, La Paz County Solar Energy and Job Creation Act  
H.R. 9062, Operational Flexibility Grazing Management Program Act  
H.R. 10082, Owyhee Wilderness and Community Protection Act**

**November 19, 2024**

**Introduction**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a Statement for the Record on the bills on the hearing agenda related to Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The BLM manages approximately 245 million surface acres, located primarily in 12 western states, and approximately 700 million acres of subsurface mineral estate. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) sets forth the BLM’s multiple-use mission, directing that public lands generally be managed for a broad range of uses, such as renewable and conventional energy development, livestock grazing, timber production, hunting and fishing, recreation, wilderness, and conservation – including protecting cultural and historic resources. FLPMA also requires the BLM to manage public land resources on a sustained-yield basis for the benefit of current and future generations.

This multiple-use, sustained yield mission enables the BLM to make tremendous contributions to economic growth, job creation, and domestic energy production, while generating revenues for Federal and state treasuries and local economies and allowing for a thoughtful, science-based approach to management of our public lands and waters. Lands managed by the BLM also provide vital habitat for more than 3,000 species of wildlife and support fisheries of exceptional regional and national value. In addition, as recognized by the Biden-Harris Administration’s America the Beautiful initiative, many uses of our lands and waters, including working lands, are consistent with the conservation of the nation’s natural resources, contributing to the long-term health and sustainability of natural systems.

We appreciate the Sponsors’ work on the bills under consideration today. A review of each of the bills follows.

**H.R. 6441, Ranching Without Red Tape**

H.R. 6441 would require the Department of the Interior (Department) to streamline the procedures for authorizing minor range improvements carried out by grazing permittees and the BLM. Minor range improvements are defined by the bill as improvements to existing fences and fence lines, wells, water pipelines, and stock tanks.

Under H.R. 6441, the Department (and the U.S. Department of Agriculture) would be directed to issue regulations that would allow for minor range improvements on permitted lands if the

grazing permit holder requests the minor range improvements with 30 days prior notice and either receives agency approval or no response. Additionally, the bill requires the BLM to respond to requests by permittees for range improvements to be carried out by the BLM within 30 days. If the BLM agrees to carry out the requested range improvement, the agency is directed to provide notification to the state office serving the area and to expedite carrying out the range improvement using any available administrative tool, including categorical exclusions.

### *Analysis*

The Department supports the goals of the bill to identify opportunities for increasing efficiency in public land grazing administration. We would like to work with the Sponsor and the Subcommittee to further these shared goals and ensure that any new regulations define minor range improvements in a manner that avoids unintended impacts to wildlife or adjacent resources. Structural improvements can often involve substantial disturbance to soils and vegetation, and all improvements may not be appropriately considered “minor.” For example, improving water pipelines can involve burying pipe, which can require clearing trees and brush and create obstacles for wildlife. Accordingly, impacts from proposed range improvements to soils, vegetation, wildlife, and cultural resources are analyzed in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other applicable laws, and can vary widely depending on the project design and the project location. Lastly, the Department recommends providing more than 30 days for the BLM to respond to requests for either the permittee or the BLM to carry out range improvements. Additional time may be required to conduct reviews and surveys to comply with NEPA and other applicable laws and allow for the timeframes established for participation in grazing decision processes currently provided by the BLM’s grazing regulations.

### **H.R. 8517, La Paz County Solar Energy and Job Creation Act**

H.R. 8517 directs the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) to convey approximately 3,400 acres of BLM-managed public lands to La Paz County, Arizona, as soon as practicable after receiving a request from the county to convey the land. Under the bill, the conveyance would be subject to valid existing rights and such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary, and the subsurface would be withdrawn from mineral entry. Any Federal lands with significant cultural, environmental, wildlife, or recreational resources would be excluded from the conveyance. La Paz County would be required to pay fair market value for the land based on an appraisal conducted using uniform appraisal standards, as well as all costs related to the conveyance, including all surveys, appraisals, and other administrative costs.

H.R. 8517 also specifies that as a condition of conveyance, La Paz County and any subsequent owner of the conveyed land are required to make good faith efforts to avoid disturbing Tribal artifacts. If Tribal artifacts are disturbed, La Paz County would be required to minimize impacts to the artifacts and allow Tribal representatives to rebury artifacts at or near where they were discovered. La Paz County is also required to coordinate with the Colorado River Indian Tribes Tribal Historic Preservation Office to identify artifacts of cultural and historic significance. Other than these conditions, the bill does not impose any further use, development, or disposal restrictions for the surface acres conveyed to the county.

Recognizing the urgency of the climate crisis, the Biden Administration has set a goal to achieve a carbon pollution-free power sector by 2035, and the Energy Act of 2020 has set a goal of permitting 25 gigawatts of renewable energy projects on public lands by 2025. The BLM is engaging our Tribal partners, industry, stakeholders, and the states to increase opportunities for renewable energy development on public lands. The BLM supports the Sponsors' stated goals of promoting solar energy development but has some concerns with the approach of the bill as discussed below.

### *Analysis*

La Paz County, located in western Arizona, is home to approximately 17,000 people. The county provides significant recreational opportunities due to its close proximity to the Colorado River; three National Wildlife Refuges; and has a number of cultural and historic sites, including old mines and ghost towns.

The John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act (Public Law 116-9, Dingell Act) included provisions directing the conveyance to La Paz County of approximately 5,900 acres of BLM-managed public lands for economic development and renewable energy generation. The BLM announced the successful conveyance of this land to La Paz County on May 22, 2020. The approximately 3,400 acres of BLM-managed public land to be conveyed under H.R. 8517 are adjacent to the lands conveyed to La Paz County under the Dingell Act.

Currently, the lands proposed for conveyance under H.R. 8517 are primarily utilized for livestock grazing and include range improvements to facilitate grazing. The BLM is in the midst of processing a photovoltaic solar energy application on 3,495 acres within the proposed area to be conveyed, with a proposed capacity of 600 megawatts. The BLM released a final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for this project on November 15, 2024, and anticipates issuance of a final decision in the coming weeks. The lands have not been identified as potentially suitable for disposal in the Yuma Resource Management Plan, which the BLM completed in 2010.

The BLM recognizes the importance of efficiently deploying renewable energy projects on both public and private lands to meet the urgent demands of the climate crisis while empowering American workers and businesses to lead a clean energy revolution. We also recognize the Sponsor's effort in the bill to protect cultural and tribal resources, and the BLM is aware of public support for using these lands for solar energy development.

As noted above, the BLM is currently reviewing a solar energy project within the proposed conveyance area through a process that will ensure full protection for sensitive resources, including cultural resources, and gives full consideration to the cumulative impacts of the multiple solar projects in the area. If this legislation is enacted and some or all of the lands are conveyed, the BLM will not be able to approve the pending photovoltaic solar energy application.

Given the BLM's pending review of this project, we question whether the proposed land conveyance is necessary to advance responsible renewable energy development while protecting environmental and cultural resources and the interests of American taxpayers. Furthermore, as

currently written, the bill does not guarantee that once the lands are conveyed, those lands would be used for renewable energy development. Should Congress decide to pursue the conveyance, the BLM would like to work with the Sponsor on modifications that would solidify the intended use of these lands for renewable energy development and ensure appropriate environmental reviews.

We appreciate the sponsors' inclusion of the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition and Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice provisions and would welcome the opportunity to work with the bill Sponsor to ensure the responsibilities of each party to the conveyance are clear. The BLM notes that there are several actions that may be required before the BLM can convey public lands, such as environmental assessments and cultural, biological, and cadastral surveys. The BLM is also aware of possible range improvements in the proposed area that may need to be compensated for, in compliance with grazing laws and regulations, in addition to the assessment and survey work required for conveyance.

### **H.R. 9062, Operational Flexibility Grazing Management Program Act**

H.R. 9062 aims to provide grazing permittees and leaseholders with increased operational flexibility based on emerging landscape conditions as a way to improve the long-term ecological health of Federal land. The Department supports the bill's goal to provide the BLM with flexibility to restore the ecological health of public lands used for grazing and welcomes the opportunity to work with the Sponsor to ensure the use of operational flexibility does not result in unintended consequences.

#### ***Analysis***

H.R. 9062 provides that the Secretary may carry out an Operational Flexibility Grazing Management Program. Under this program, at the request of an authorized grazing permittee or lessee when renewing a grazing permit or lease, the Secretary would be required to "develop and authorize at least [one] alternative to provide operational flexibility" to permittees and leaseholders to address changing conditions on the ground. Such alternatives would be developed in consultation with the authorized grazing permittee or lessee; affected Federal and state agencies; applicable Indian Tribes; and other landowners, permittees, or lessees in the affected allotment.

As currently written, the draft appears to require the BLM to not just consider but select and authorize an alternative that includes operational flexibility. Such a requirement may prevent the BLM from selecting the most appropriate management alternative to promote ecological health. The Department recommends that the bill require the BLM to develop and analyze at least one alternative that includes operational flexibility, but not require that the agency necessarily authorize that alternative. That approach provides the agency with flexibility to manage public lands to support ecological health.

The bill also directs the Secretary, if requested by the permittee or lessee, to use new and existing data to provide interim operational flexibility that may include an allowance to deviate from the 21 terms and conditions of the existing permit – for up to the remaining term of the permit – to address significant changes in weather or forage production or effects due to fire,

drought, market conditions, or other temporary conditions. Management flexibility may include adjusting the season of use; the beginning or ending date, or both, of the period of use; the stocking level; water placement and transportation; and other operational actions. Under the bill, the season of use could be adjusted by up to 14 days before the beginning date specified in the permit or up to 14 days after the ending date of the permit, unless an allotment management plan or its equivalent would allow for an even greater adjustment.

As currently drafted, implementing interim operational flexibility outside the terms and conditions of the existing permit, for the duration of the permit, may not comply with the requirements of other state or Federal laws, including NEPA, and may cause unintended impacts to resources. The Department recommends that the bill specify that these adjustments cannot exceed the active use authorized by the permit or cause new surface disturbance.

Under the bill, permittees would also be required to provide the BLM with advance notice of two business days before utilizing the flexibility. The Department recommends defining the market conditions and other temporary reasons that would prompt the use of interim operational flexibility. The Department would also like to work with the Sponsor to identify a more appropriate period for advanced notice before exercising flexibility to facilitate implementation.

Additionally, the Secretary would be required to develop cooperative rangeland monitoring plans, in coordination with grazing permittees and lessees, that comply with applicable monitoring requirements under FLPMA, applicable Federal grazing regulations, and rangeland health objectives to monitor and evaluate outcomes from the use of operational flexibilities under the program. Eight years after the date of enactment, the Secretary would be required to conduct a review of the use of operational flexibilities under the program, including a review of ecological and other relevant outcomes.

The Department recognizes that providing permittees with flexibility to adjust their grazing use will provide more timely and responsive adjustments to changing conditions in order to achieve identified resource and operational objectives. We recommend that allowances to depart from permit or lease terms and conditions for purposes of operational flexibility also include objectives that identify when adjustments are appropriate and provide for a monitoring plan that tracks how progress is measured toward achieving those objectives. Cooperative rangeland monitoring is a key component of implementing strategically sound grazing flexibility as part of the BLM's existing outcome based grazing program.

The Department appreciates the bill's inclusion of the requirement for cooperative rangeland monitoring plans and would like to work with the Sponsor to develop more stringent monitoring requirements to ensure that the use of operational flexibilities results in benefits to the health of public lands and does not result in unintended harm to wildlife and other resources. The success of the BLM's current outcome based grazing program is due, in part, to the program's cooperative monitoring plans, which include monitoring methods and protocols; a schedule for collecting data; identifying the responsible party for data collection and storage; an evaluation schedule; and a description of the anticipated use of the data (e.g., adjusting season-of-use, assessing habitat, and determining trends). The Department recommends that the

monitoring plans contemplated by this bill also include these components and provisions for making any adjustments.

Finally, the bill prohibits the Secretary from terminating or failing to renew an applicable grazing permit or lease for violation if the use of an operational flexibility under the program violates the applicable permit or lease. It is unclear whether this prohibition could create tension with the BLM's obligations to enforce other applicable environmental protection and cultural resources laws, such as the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and others. The Department would like to work with the Sponsor on this provision to ensure that the appropriate use of the operational flexibility complies with other applicable laws and does not result in the termination or failure to renew a grazing permit or lease.

### **H.R. 10082, Oregon Owyhee Wilderness and Community Protection Act**

H.R. 10082 would designate approximately 926,000 acres of wilderness, modified to allow for certain uses generally prohibited by the Wilderness Act, while providing for increased grazing flexibility intended to meet rangeland health standards on public lands in Malheur County, Oregon. It would also release approximately 600,000 acres of existing wilderness study areas and direct that any lands in Malheur County not designated as wilderness no longer be inventoried for wilderness characteristics under section 201(a) of FLPMA or managed for "wilderness purposes." Further, the bill would transfer nearly 32,000 acres of BLM-managed, State-owned land, and create a Tribal Co-Stewardship Area overlapping the BLM's existing Castle Rock Wilderness Study Area, to be released by the bill, including approximately 2,500 acres of land to be held in trust.

Malheur County is located in the southeast corner of Oregon. It is the second largest county in the State, spanning 9,874 square miles or 6.3 million acres, and has a population of approximately 31,000 according to the United States Census Bureau. For many years, cattle ranching and agriculture have been the major economic enterprises in the county. Over 70 percent of the county is in public ownership, including 4.4 million acres of public lands managed by the BLM.

The BLM is committed to ensuring the long-term sustainability of healthy and productive lands, consistent with its multiple-use mandate under FLPMA. We believe partnerships and local public involvement are vital to managing sustainable, working public lands. This means respecting the ties that communities have to public lands, allowing state and local economies to prosper, and welcoming and valuing diverse views into our planning processes. As part of our commitment to healthy and productive landscapes, the BLM has recently amended the Resource Management Plan (RMP) for public lands within southeastern Oregon, including public lands managed by the BLM in Malheur County covered by H.R. 10082.

The BLM supports the designation of wilderness to conserve public lands and waters for future generations and efforts to improve the ecological health of working lands and to restore Tribal homelands to Tribal ownership, where appropriate. However, the BLM cannot support H.R. 10082 as written because it would erode the purpose of the Wilderness Act to preserve and protect natural ecosystems and provide opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation; invite

inconsistent management of the National Wilderness Preservation System; and restrict the BLM's ability to manage public lands under FLPMA.

### *Analysis*

#### **Malheur County Grazing Management Program (Sec. 3)**

Section 3 of the bill authorizes the Secretary to carry out the "Malheur County Grazing Management Program" to provide grazing permittees and leaseholders with increased operational flexibility intended to improve rangeland health. Under the bill, when renewing a grazing permit or lease under the program, the Secretary would develop and analyze at least one alternative to provide operational flexibility to permittees and leaseholders to address changing conditions on the ground. The proposed operational flexibilities would be developed pursuant to NEPA.

The Secretary would be required to develop cooperative rangeland monitoring plans to assess natural resource conditions and evaluate the impact of permitted livestock use on rangeland health and livestock management objectives in the applicable land use plan. The BLM recommends the inclusion of language requiring all monitoring plans to identify the responsible party for data collection and storage.

Additionally, H.R. 10082 directs the Secretary to enact additional interim flexibilities, such as allowing a variance to the terms and conditions of the existing applicable grazing permits, adjusting the season of use by no more than 14 days, and modifying dates of pasture rotation by no more than 14 days. These adjustments would not extend the overall season of use but would allow the days permitted to be changed based on weather, forage production, or the effects of fire or drought. The BLM would like to work with the Sponsor on language providing the BLM with additional advance notice of the use of these flexibilities and to ensure the use of flexibilities does not exceed the amount of active use specified in the permit or lease.

Further, the bill allows the permittees to change the placement of water structures for livestock or wildlife, subject to water rights laws, but not within 100 yards of any existing roads. The BLM supports interim flexibilities to adjust season of use and pasture rotation, noting that the seasons of use will not be extended but altered in response to changing conditions on the ground. The BLM also welcomes the opportunity to work with the Sponsor on additional legislative text to ensure the proposed movement of water structures does not impact sensitive natural resources and complies with the requirements of other State and Federal laws, including section 106 of the NHPA, the Archeological Resources Protection Act, the ESA, and water rights concerns.

Our nation's rangelands provide and support a variety of goods, services, and values important to all Americans. In addition to being a key source of forage for livestock, healthy rangelands conserve soil, sequester carbon, store, and filter water, serve as a home for an abundance of wildlife, provide scenic beauty, and are the setting for many forms of outdoor recreation. We appreciate the Sponsor's effort to provide the BLM with the grazing flexibility outlined in H.R. 10082 for grazing to meet rangeland health standards and conserve resource values in the face of climate change and extreme drought. Further, the BLM appreciates the opportunity to continue working with the Sponsor to strengthen Tribal consultation and opportunities for Tribal participation in land management decisions and ensure the health of the public lands while still

allowing them to be used for grazing, recreation, and other uses.

#### **Malheur C.E.O. Group (Sec. 4)**

Section 4 of H.R. 10082 establishes the Malheur C.E.O. Group that includes representatives appointed by the Secretary, based on recommendations from the BLM's Vale District Manager and the County commissioners, including county grazing permittees and lessees, businesses, conservation organizations, the Burns Paiute Tribe, and the Fort McDermott Tribe. Under the bill, the Malheur C.E.O. Group shall propose eligible projects to be carried out by the Malheur C.E.O. Group or a third party. Projects carried out on Federal land or using Federal funds must be approved by the head of the applicable Federal agency within 14 days. Lastly, the bill directs any Federal agency with authority and responsibility in the county to provide technical assistance to the Malheur C.E.O. Group on request of the Malheur C.E.O. Group.

The BLM notes that timeframes for approval of range improvement projects under BLM's regulations include time for protests and appeals that exceed the 14 days currently allotted. The BLM recommends extending the 14-day timeframe to ensure sufficient time to make a decision based on applicable law and science.

The BLM also notes that the Southeast Oregon Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) currently provides advice and recommendations on all aspects of public land management to the BLM's Burns and Vale District Offices, including lands in Malheur County. The bill assigns the Malheur C.E.O. Group a role that is dedicated to developing and funding restoration and management projects that could complement the efforts of the Southeast Oregon RAC, and as such, the BLM supports the creation of the Malheur C.E.O. Group, but welcomes the opportunity to work with the Sponsor to ensure that the Group's role is consistent with existing law and complements, rather than duplicates, the roles of other groups such as the Southeast Oregon RAC.

#### **Wilderness & Land Designations (Sec. 5)**

H.R. 10082 establishes more than 926,000 acres of wilderness (modified to allow for enumerated motorized and mechanical uses) and releases approximately 601,300 acres of wilderness study areas from non-impairment management under section 603 of FLPMA. The bill also directs that any lands not designated as wilderness, including approximately 1,065,600 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics, no longer be inventoried for the presence of wilderness characteristics under section 201(a) of FLMPA or managed to maintain, preserve, or protect those wilderness characteristics as part of the land use planning process under section 202 of FLPMA. The BLM recognizes that the wide-ranging lands of Malheur County encompass scenic canyons, volcanic rock formations, and rolling hills that serve as habitat for a diversity of plant and animal life and provide important opportunities for hiking, camping, horseback riding, and other forms of outdoor recreation.

As written, H.R. 10082 allows for the continuation of motorized use on certain routes in designated wilderness areas by the Burns Paiute Tribe for cultural purposes; the BLM for administrative purposes; grazing permittees, their agents, and invitees for road maintenance, weed control, fire suppression, and grazing-related activities; private landowners and their agents and invitees for access; and lastly County and State employees to access State land and county



roads. Additionally, the bill allows for the use of mechanical equipment for wildfire suppression, invasive species control, and activities necessary for management of livestock.

The BLM notes that the Wilderness Act provides for valid existing rights in section 4(c), access to state and private inholdings in section 5(a), equipment use in the control of noxious weeds under conditions specified in section 4(c), and the use of motor vehicles and equipment by grazing permittees in section 4(d)(4)(2) and as further outlined in the Congressional Grazing Guidelines (Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress, H. Rept. 101-405 dated February 21, 1990). Given these provisions of the Wilderness Act accommodating access and administration of wilderness, the allowance of motorized and mechanized tools and transportation set forth in section 5 of H.R. 10082 is both overly broad and unnecessary. Further, the BLM has a well-established process to evaluate whether administrative action may be necessary in wilderness and guidance for determining the minimum technique, timing, or amount of a prohibited use necessary to address the wilderness stewardship issue. The bill's blanket allowance for motorized and mechanized tools and uses in section 5(b) is inconsistent with the intent of the Wilderness Act, and the BLM opposes these provisions.

Wilderness is a key component of conservation. The Biden-Harris Administration recognizes that wilderness is a fundamentally important part of the American landscape, not only for cultural, economic, and scientific values, but also for the beauty, majesty, and solitude it provides. The BLM would support the designation of the proposed wilderness areas in a manner consistent with the Wilderness Act.

Additionally, the BLM cannot support the bill's direction in section 5(c) that public lands in Malheur County that are not designated as wilderness will no longer be inventoried for the presence of wilderness characteristics or managed for the maintenance, preservation, or protection of those characteristics as part of the land use planning process. As noted above, this includes approximately 601,300 acres of existing wilderness study areas that would be released by the bill as well as approximately 1,065,600 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics and other public lands. Section 5(c) of H.R. 10082 provides that these lands be managed for principal and major uses as defined in section 103 of FLPMA and specifies that the lands be managed for values unrelated to wilderness. Section 201(a) of FLPMA requires the BLM to maintain an inventory of all public lands and their resources and other values, which includes wilderness characteristics. The inventory of all public lands directed under section 201(a) of FLPMA is a critical underpinning of the land use planning process. It is the local planning process through which the BLM makes important decisions on management of these lands, including, among other things, mineral development, grazing, off-highway vehicle use, hunting, and the conservation of natural values. The BLM cannot support eliminating wilderness as a resource from the inventory of public lands that informs the land use planning process, particularly when over 1.6 million acres at issue are known to possess wilderness character. The BLM also notes that it is not aware of any precedent for legislation that directs the agency to avoid inventorying public lands for certain resources, and the Bureau believes that such direction would contravene FLPMA's mandate to manage the public lands based on science and reliable information.

Section 5(d) of H.R. 10082 requires the BLM to initiate a process to amend the Southeast

Oregon RMP and include a Wilderness Plan and a Travel Management Plan. Further, this section directs the BLM to not restrict the use of motorized vehicles on certain roads for specific categories of users. The BLM's Comprehensive Travel and Transportation Management program aims to provide reasonable and varied transportation routes for access to the public lands and also provide areas for a wide variety of both motorized and non-motorized recreational activities. By improving trail and off highway vehicle management through land use planning, the BLM minimizes impacts to wildlife habitat; reduces the introduction and spread of invasive weeds; lessens conflicts among various motorized and non-motorized recreation users; and prevents damage to cultural resources resulting from the expansion of roads and trails on public lands. Legislating specific roads to remain open to certain uses indefinitely would prevent the BLM from adequately addressing changing conditions on the ground.

#### **Land Conveyance to the Burns Paiute Tribe (Sec. 6)**

Under section 6, approximately 21,000 acres of BLM-managed public lands, 6,686 acres of certain private land, and 4,137 acres of State land would be held in trust for the benefit of the Burns Paiute Tribe to protect and conserve cultural and natural values, and to be part of the reservation of the Burns Paiute Tribe. Additionally, the bill creates a Tribal Co-Stewardship Area overlapping the Castle Rock WSA.

The Department recognizes, through Secretarial Order 3403, *Joint Secretarial Order on Fulfilling the Trust Responsibility to Indian Tribes in the Stewardship of Federal Lands and Waters*, which was signed jointly with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, that it is the policy of the United States to restore Tribal homelands to Tribal ownership and to promote Tribal stewardship and Tribal self-government. The Department supports consolidation of Tribal landholdings within reservations, including Tribal acquisition of Federal lands and private inholdings. The BLM has conducted an initial review of existing land uses on the lands affected by the provision and supports the proposed conveyance of lands to be held in trust for the Burns Paiute Tribe. The BLM would like to work with the Subcommittee and bill Sponsor on technical modifications to the land transfer provisions, and language addressing grazing, and standard conveyance language.

#### **Conclusion**

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide this Statement for the Record.