

**COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES**  
**113<sup>th</sup> Congress Disclosure Form**  
**As required by and provided for in House Rule XI, clause 2(g) and**  
**the Rules of the Committee on Natural Resources**

***Oversight Hearing: Oil and Gas Activities within the National Wildlife Refuge System***  
***Tuesday, May 20, 2014***

For Individuals:

1. Name:
  
2. Address:
  
3. Email Address:
  
4. Phone Number:

\* \* \* \* \*

For Witnesses Representing Organizations:

1. Name: **Daniel Thomas Naatz**
  
2. Name of Organization(s) You are Representing at the Hearing:  
**The Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA)**
  
3. Business Address: **1201 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005**
  
4. Business Email Address: **dnaatz@ipaa.org**
  
5. Business Phone Number: **(202) 857-4722**

**For all Witnesses**

Mr. Dan Naatz - Independent Petroleum Association of America  
**Oversight Hearing: *Oil and Gas Activities within the National Wildlife Refuge System***  
***Tuesday, May 20, 2014***

a. Any training or educational certificates, diplomas or degrees or other educational experiences that are relevant to your qualifications to testify on or knowledge of the subject matter of the hearing.

None

b. Any professional licenses, certifications, or affiliations held that are relevant to your qualifications to testify on or knowledge of the subject matter of the hearing.

None

c. Any employment, occupation, ownership in a firm or business, or work-related experiences that relate to your qualifications to testify on or knowledge of the subject matter of the hearing.

None

d. Any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) from the Department of Interior that you have received in the current year and previous four years, including the source and the amount of each grant or contract.

None

e. A list of all lawsuits or petitions filed by you against the federal government in the current year and the previous four years, giving the name of the lawsuit or petition, the subject matter of the lawsuit or petition, and the federal statutes under which the lawsuits or petitions were filed.

None

f. A list of all federal lawsuits filed against you by the federal government in the current year and the previous four years, giving the name of the lawsuit, the subject matter of the lawsuit, and the federal statutes under which the lawsuits were filed.

None

g. Any other information you wish to convey that might aid the Members of the Committee to better understand the context of your testimony.

No

## Witnesses Representing Organizations

Mr. Dan Naatz - Independent Petroleum Association of America  
**Oversight Hearing: *Oil and Gas Activities within the National Wildlife Refuge System***  
***Tuesday, May 20, 2014***

h. Any offices, elected positions, or representational capacity held in the organization(s) on whose behalf you are testifying.

i. Any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) from the Department of Interior that were received in the current year and previous four years by the organization(s) you represent at this hearing, including the source and amount of each grant or contract for each of the organization(s).

None

j. A list of all lawsuits or petitions filed by the organization(s) you represent at the hearing against the federal government in the current year and the previous four years, giving the name of the lawsuit or petition, the subject matter of the lawsuit or petition, and the federal statutes under which the lawsuits or petitions were filed for each of the organization(s).

See attached material

k. A list of all federal lawsuits filed against the organization(s) you represent at the hearing by the federal government in the current year and the previous four years, giving the name of the lawsuit, the subject matter of the lawsuit, and the federal statutes under which the lawsuits were filed.

See attached material

l. For tax-exempt organizations and non-profit organizations, copies of the three most recent public IRS Form 990s (including Form 990-PF, Form 990-N, and Form 990-EZ) for each of the organization(s) you represent at the hearing (not including any contributor names and addresses or any information withheld from public inspection by the Secretary of the Treasury under 26 U.S.C. 6104)).

Information already filed with the House Natural Resources Committee

The following is a summary of those cases in which the Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA) has been a party that involved the Department of the Interior over the last five years.

1. **Defenders of Wildlife, et al. v. Jewell, et al.** (6/19/2013)
  - a. Statute: Endangered Species Act (ESA)
  - b. Action: Legal proceeding brought by environmental organizations challenging the decision of the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (“Service”) to withdraw a proposal to list the dunes sagebrush lizard) as an endangered species pursuant to the ESA.
  - c. IPAA moved to intervene in the case.
  
2. **Center for Sustainable Economy v. Sally Jewell, et al.** (10/25/2012)
  - a. Statute: Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA)
  - b. Action: Petition for review of the August 27, 2012 decision of the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management ("BOEM"), to approve the Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program for 2012-2017 and the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement relied upon to justify that Program.
  - c. IPAA moved to intervene in the case.
  
3. **Oceana, et al. v. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, et al.** (6/18/2012)
  - a. Statute: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), ESA, Administrative Procedure Act (APA)
  - b. Action: Challenge brought by environmental organizations, against DOI, related to Lease Sale 216/222 in the Central Gulf in the aftermath of Macondo. Petitioners alleged BOEM did not follow NEPA by relying on a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) that failed to adequately consider the impacts of the Macondo spill. Petitioners also raised claims under OCSLA, ESA and APA.
  - c. IPAA moved to intervene in the case.
  
4. **Oceana, et al. v. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, et al.** (12/13/2011)
  - a. Statute: NEPA, OCSLA
  - b. Action: Challenge brought by environmental organizations, against DOI, related to Lease Sale 218 in the Central Gulf in the aftermath of Macondo. Petitioners alleged BOEM did not follow NEPA by relying on a SEIS that failed to adequately consider the impacts of the Macondo spill.
  - c. IPAA moved to intervene in the case.

5. **Center for Biological Diversity v. Salazar, et al.** (10/22/2010)
  - a. Statute: NEPA, OCSLA
  - b. Actions: Challenge by environmental groups against DOI's decision to lift the Secretary's July 12, 2010 suspension on deep water drilling. Complaint alleged that DOI failed to adequately consider NEPA requirements.
  - c. IPAA moved to intervene.
  
6. **Wildearth Guardians v. Salazar** (8/31/2010)
  - a. Statute: ESA
  - b. Action: Challenge brought by environmental groups against DOI's determination that the Lesser Prairie-Chicken, warrants listing under the ESA but that the immediate proposal and timely promulgation of a final rule listing the species "is precluded by pending proposals" to determine whether any higher priority species is an endangered or threatened species and that the Secretary is making "expeditious progress" in adding and removing species from the endangered or threatened species list.
  - c. IPAA moved to intervene in the case.
  
7. **Natural Resources Defense Council Inc., et al. v. U.S. Dept. of Interior** (6/30/2010)
  - a. Statute: NEPA
  - b. Action: Environmental organizations challenged BOEM's July 1, 2004 decision to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact for geological and geophysical exploration for mineral resources in the Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf ("OCS"). Plaintiffs are challenging BOEM's conclusion that no Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") is required to assess the impact of such exploration activities under NEPA among other issues.
  - c. IPAA moved to intervene in the case.
  
8. **Hornbeck Offshore Services, et al. v. Salazar, et al.** (6/24/2010)
  - a. Statute: APA, OCSLA
  - b. Action: The complaint alleged that the May Directive and the Notice to Lessees were not adequately explained and justified in violation of the APA. District court sided with industry, issuing an injunction that prohibited the moratorium for going into effect. Defendants, Sec. Ken Salazar; the United States Department of the Interior; Administrator "Bob" Abbey; and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement, appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit from the decision of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana that granted plaintiffs (i.e. industry's) request for injunctive relief against government's moratorium on drilling of new deep water wells in the Gulf of Mexico.

- c. IPAA filed an amicus brief in support of the injunction against the Administration's moratorium.
9. **Center for Biological Diversity v. Ken Salazar, et al.** (6/01/2010)
- a. Statute: NEPA, OCSLA, APA
  - b. Action: Environmental petitions challenged DOI decision to approve Initial Exploration Plan Control No. 9503 (OCS-G 27099, Block 23, Eugene Island Area). Environmental groups alleged that DOI failed to adequately consider the potential impacts of the decision on the sensitive Gulf of Mexico ecosystem and wildlife. Additionally, environmentalists argued they had been deprived of procedural rights affording public participation in decision-making.
  - c. IPAA filed a motion to intervene in the case.
10. **Gulf Restoration Network, Inc., et al v. Ken Salazar, et al.** (5/18/2010)
- a. Statute: National Environmental Policy Act, Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, Administrative Procedure Act
  - b. Action: Case involves environmental organizations' challenge to Notice to Lessees issued by the DOI. Environmental petitioners argue that DOI violated the Outer Continental Shelf Leasing Act OCSLA by issuing a Notice to Lessees without requiring the company (BP) to conduct blowout-out and worst case oil spill response analysis; NEPA (failure to undertake an EIS); and the APA (failure to allow notice and comment on Notice to Lessees).
  - c. IPAA filed a motion to intervene.
11. **Defenders of Wildlife v. Minerals Management Service, et al.** (5/17/2010)
- a. Statute: NEPA, APA, OCSLA
  - b. Action: Environmental organization action against DOI alleging that DOI by issuing categorical exclusions under NEPA related to exploratory drilling operations in the immediate after of Macondo. Environmental petitioners argued that and Environmental Impact Statement is warranted.
  - c. IPAA moved to intervene in this case.