National Association of Environmental Professionals
Be Connected

NAEP's Bi-Weekly
NATIONAL DESK

January 4, 2019

Lead NEPA Story: Interior advances Arctic National Wildlife Refuge drilling plan

(Greenwire, 12/20/2018) **Kelsey Brugger, E&E News Reporter**

The Trump administration's plans to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge are moving forward, with a Notice of Availability for a preliminary environmental review set to be published in the *Federal Register* later this month.

"We have undertaken a rigorous effort," Joe Balash, Interior's assistant secretary for land and minerals management, said in a call with reporters announcing the Dec. 28 release, kicking off a 45-day comment period.

Today's announcement comes on the one-year anniversary of the tax reform bill, which unlocked the prospect of drilling in the 19-million-acre Arctic refuge. Drilling would be limited to the 1.5-million-acre coastal plain.

Critics fought opening up the refuge, which spans Alaska's northeastern region, for more than 50 years. In 1980, Congress passed legislation protecting the refuge's coastal plain. The idea has strong bipartisan support in Alaska, and last year Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) spearheaded the effort to open up the coastal plain to drilling.

Continued on page 9

Clean Water Act: Would Trump's rule proposal really help farmers?

(Greenwire, 12/17/2018) **Ariel Wittenberg, E&E News Reporter**

When the Trump administration unveiled a new definition last week for wetlands and waterways that get Clean Water Act protection, American Farm Bureau Federation President Zippy Duvall was quick with praise.

"The Christmas present of a lifetime!" Duvall called the proposed "waters of the U.S.," or WOTUS, rule.

Farm groups had been outspoken foes of the Obama administration's Clean Water Rule, saying it would complicate farming by declaring dry ditches to be regulated waterways. And their "ditch the rule" campaign was so successful that President Trump used the slogan in a speech last year, saying, "We ditched the rule."

But while agriculture groups celebrate Trump's WOTUS proposal, legal experts say the rule could create more headaches for farmers. By excluding more ditches from the definition of WOTUS, they say, the proposed rule could mean ditches would instead be regulated by EPA as so-called point sources of pollution.

Inside This Issue…

"The agriculture community has been all about getting these called non-waters," said Mark Ryan, an attorney who spent 24 years at EPA as a Clean Water Act litigator. "I would tell them be careful what you wish for."

The Trump administration's WOTUS definition would exclude most ditches, including those connected to ephemeral waterways, which are wet only after rain or snow falls, as well as ditches built in uplands.

But the proposed rule would protect others that are dug within the banks of an intermittent or perennial tributary, or those that relocate those kinds of tributaries.

The proposal would also extend oversight to ditches built through wetlands with surface connections to intermittent or perennial tributaries.

The Obama Clean Water Rule categorized more ditches as regulated waters, because it included more waterways. But it exempted ditches that themselves had intermittent or ephemeral flows, as long as they had not relocated a natural tributary. Ditches dug in natural tributaries or relocating tributaries would be included in the Obama rule, regardless of how often water flowed through them.

The Obama rule also included ditches through wetlands it deemed jurisdictional, which encompassed many wetlands without surface connections to streams.

The Obama administration's inclusion of so many tributaries is just one reason the Farm Bureau opposed it so fiercely, said Don Parrish, the bureau's director of regulatory relations.

The group particularly took issue with the Obama rule's definition of ditches, considering them "tributaries" if they had rerouted them or were dug in them.

"It also blurred any distinction between ditches and erosion features — to the extent that only government delineators could know the difference," Parrish said.

He called the Trump proposal "a huge step in the right direction," but he added that the bureau would push for even more streams to be exempt from the final rule.

In particular, he said, the bureau believes only streams with a continuous flow of water for at least 90 days a year should be covered by the regulation. Such a definition would likely exclude even more ditches from being considered waters of the United States.

"For ease of clarity, they have to do more on that issue," Parrish said, arguing that it could be difficult to tell whether a stream that flows only a few weeks per year is fed by rain or groundwater.

"We don't think a mere trickle should be enough to sweep something into jurisdiction," he said.

Scott Yager, chief counsel at the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, agreed.

"The intentions are there for agencies to create exemptions that are functional," he said. "But we will be going over those with a fine-tooth comb to make sure they do function on the ground."

The Clean Water Act itself exempts a number of farm-related activities.

Even if a ditch were considered a water of the United States under the law, farmers wouldn't need permits for pollution for stormwater that carried pesticides or fertilizer from their fields into the ditch.

But farmers or anyone else would need a permit to spray herbicides on weeds in a ditch.

The permit would likely require a farmer to adhere to best management practices for spraying and periodic water quality sampling, Ryan said.

Those permits wouldn't be needed if the ditch is no longer considered a WOTUS — a fact Sen. Mike Rounds (R-S.D.) celebrated during his remarks at the WOTUS signing ceremony at EPA last week.

"For me, this means that a county in South Dakota won't have to get a permit to spray on weeds in a ditch," he said.

Ditches as point sources

But if it's not a WOTUS, a ditch could be considered a "point source" if it conveys pollution to a water that is protected under the Clean Water Act.

That means it could require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit under the Clean Water Act — which could be even more of a headache for ditch owners.

"You could spray all the weeds you want to spray, but if any of that flows through the ditch into a jurisdictional water, you could very likely have to treat that wastewater," said Ken Kopocis, who led the Obama EPA's Office of Water. "Exempting all these ditches I don't think creates the kind of clarity they claim."

Larry Liebesman, a former Department of Justice attorney who is now a senior adviser with Washington water resources firm Dawson & Associates, agreed.

"It could potentially be a headache," he said. "If it's an upland ditch, you don't have to worry about it. But if it's in any way transmitting some flow — even only after rainfall — to a larger waterway, I would be concerned about the ditch being considered a discharge. It doesn't make landowners' lives any easier."

NPDES permits put limits on the amount of pollutants that can be discharged into a jurisdictional water. They often require the installation of treatment systems, which can be much more expensive to comply with than a permit for spraying pesticides into a water of the United States. "I'd much rather own a WOTUS," Ryan said.

The Clean Water Act does exempt discharges "comprised entirely" of agricultural stormwater and return irrigation water from needing NPDES permits. But a ditch wouldn't fall into that category if pesticides were applied directly to it and then made their way to a perennial waterway or other jurisdictional stream.

Not all ditches are owned by the farmers whose fields they abut. In the West especially, it's not uncommon for a municipal ditch to circumvent a farm and a city before discharging into a nearby waterway. Such a ditch would include stormwater and discharges from sources other than agriculture, meaning it would still require a Clean Water Act discharge permit.

The Trump WOTUS proposed rule explicitly states, "The status of ditches as 'point sources' ... would not be affected by today's proposed rule."

Ryan, who left EPA in 2014, said the Trump administration's rule is not alone in potentially converting ditches from WOTUS to point sources.

He said he was shocked in 2015 when the final version of the Obama administration's rule came out and exempted ditches built in uplands with an intermittent flow.

"It was an attempt to make agriculture interests happy, and I didn't think they thought through the point source issue back then, either," he said.

The Farm Bureau's Parrish noted that farmers have long had to comply with Clean Water Act requirements for point sources, and said he's "not sure about why some are now concerned."

"Ditches have been defined in statute as point sources since 1972," he noted. "What additional liabilities are they referring to or concerned about?"

He said the Obama administration's definitions for which ditches were considered jurisdictional were so confusing that farmers were worried that ditches would both be considered waters of the United States and require NPDES permits.

Under the Trump rule, he said, the distinction would be clearer. The administration's critics, he said, "are just trying to confuse the issue."

Yager hasn't yet reviewed the Trump proposal closely enough to say whether he's worried about ditches suddenly needing point source permits under the rule. But his association has been closely following litigation about whether discharges into groundwater that make their way to surface water require NPDES permits.

The Supreme Court is considering whether to take up the question, and Yager said his group is generally concerned about a situation "where you have a more narrow definition of WOTUS and a broader definition of a point source."

"That's something, as a general matter, that is definitely at the top of our minds," he said.

Clean Air Act: EPA targets Obama-era basis for mercury, toxics regulations

(Greenwire, 12/28/2018) **Sean Reilly, E&E News reporter**

In a move that could have profound consequences for future attempts to limit air pollution, EPA has proposed undoing the justification for one of the Obama administration's crowning environmental achievements: the 2012 regulations on power industry mercury emissions.

In a draft rule released this morning, EPA proposes to revoke the agency's prior determination that it was "appropriate and necessary" to curb releases of mercury, arsenic and other hazardous air pollutants from coal- and oil-fired power plants.

While the proposal would leave the actual emission limits in place, it concludes that the Obama administration erred in heavily relying on "co-benefits" attributed to reductions in pollutants besides those targeted in the regulations to justify the expected compliance costs.

The proposal, which was immediately greeted with scathing criticism from public health advocacy groups and a prominent Senate Democrat, takes its cue from a 2015 Supreme Court ruling that EPA should have considered compliance costs in making the "appropriate and necessary" determination to proceed with creation of what are formally known as the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS).

The agency responded the next year with a supplemental finding reaffirming its decision to regulate power plant emissions of mercury and other toxics in light of their health risks, but that analysis was "flawed" because of its reliance on the co-benefits expected from reductions in particulate pollution, according to the proposal released this morning.

EPA had previously forecast that the quantifiable annual health benefits of reducing power plant releases of mercury and other hazardous pollutants were $4 million to $6 million, compared with expected compliance costs of at least $7.4 billion, the agency said in an official summary today.

Despite tens of billions of dollars' worth of expected co-benefits, acting EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler "has concluded that the identification of these benefits is not sufficient, in light of the gross imbalance of monetized costs and [hazardous air pollutant] benefits to support" the appropriate and necessary finding, the agency said.

Widespread criticism

The proposal comes as no surprise. As early as this spring, EPA air chief Bill Wehrum had signaled his interest in revisiting the appropriate and necessary determination. But it also brings potential peril to the Trump administration, both because of mercury's well-documented role as a neurotoxin that can affect children's brain development and because the power industry is now largely in compliance with MATS.

In July, a consortium of industry trade groups took the unusual step of publicly urging EPA not to tamper with the standards. Since MATS went into effect in 2012, electric companies have cut mercury emissions by nearly 90 percent, Brian Reil, a spokesman for one of those groups, the Edison Electric Institute, said in a statement today.

"EPA should leave the underlying MATS rule in place and unchanged, and should not finalize any action that would undermine the existing MATS rule," Reil said.

In a separate statement, Sen. Tom Carper (D-Del.) criticized both the draft rule and Wheeler's decision to make it public only hours before EPA is expected to suspend operations because of a lack of funding.

"By releasing this proposal today, Acting Administrator Wheeler can only be attempting to rush an egregious policy before EPA staff are furloughed that is not only wildly unpopular, but

also rolls back years of critical protections that keep toxic emissions out of the air we all breathe," said Carper, the ranking member on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.

In news releases, advocacy groups similarly assailed the proposed rule.

"Wheeler is doing this in spite of the fact that almost no one wants it done," Environmental Defense Fund President Fred Krupp said. Despite EPA's assertion that the actual standards would be left untouched, "no one can truthfully claim they are demolishing the foundation of a building but they still expect the building to stand," Krupp said.

"There is no legitimate justification for this action," American Lung Association President and CEO Harold Wimmer said, adding that mercury can cause brain damage in babies.

Also watching with dismay were Obama-era EPA officials involved in MATS's creation. In a conference call last week held in anticipation of the proposal's release, former EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy told reporters that the Trump administration also wants to target the use of co-benefits more broadly, a step that could undercut efforts to justify future limits on air pollution.

"The main reason why they want to do this is to cut the legs off of EPA in terms of our ability to protect public health and the natural resources from toxics that are impacting our kids' lives today," McCarthy said. She also portrayed the planned rollback as another attempt to aid one of President Trump's favorite industries.

"I think it's no secret that the administration's agenda for EPA was really written by coal companies and in particular by Bob Murray," McCarthy said. "He's interested in making sure that this was relooked at because he saw it as a burden to the coal industry in terms of its ability to compete."

Murray heads Ohio-based Murray Energy Corp., the nation's largest privately owned coal company. An enthusiastic Trump supporter, Murray last year unsuccessfully pressed the administration to suspend MATS, even though implementation by then was nearly complete. At the time, Wheeler was a contract lobbyist for Murray Energy.

In a statement today, Murray Energy welcomed what it called an "important development in reversing the illegal policies and programs of the Obama administration and the Obama-era EPA." In response to emailed questions from *E&E News*, company spokesman Jason Witt slammed McCarthy for undertaking those policies that "so divisively and decisively disadvantage the United States coal industry's ability to compete in energy generation markets."

Although the company has monitored the Trump-era rulemaking, Witt said, it has not actively lobbied for the proposed rule in recent months "because the vast majority of our utility customers have already come into compliance" with the standards.

The draft rule released today also encompasses the results of a legally required "residual risk and technology review," which found that no changes to the original 2012 standards are warranted. When published in the *Federal Register*, the proposal will carry a 60-day public comment period; EPA also plans to hold a public hearing.

Wehrum, who became EPA air chief in November 2017, previously worked as an industry lawyer and served in the air office from 2001 to 2007 under President George W. Bush. In 2005, EPA had previously revoked the "appropriate and necessary" determination in a bid to regulate power plant mercury emissions under a different section of the Clean Air Act. In 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit voided that attempt.

Jeff Holmstead, who headed the air office at the time of the 2005 revocation, said today that the agency had “managed to walk a very fine line” in seeking to leave the emissions standards in place while again attempting to reverse the justification for issuing them.

Holmstead, now an industry lawyer and lobbyist, said in an emailed statement that EPA officials aren’t saying that the co-benefits of expected particulate reductions can’t be considered in making new regulatory decisions. Rather, “they’re just saying that in this case … we can’t use these co-benefits to justify a

regulation that is supposed to be about hazardous air pollutants," according to his statement.

NEPA: Trump poised to renew Minnesota leases for controversial project

(Greenwire, 12/21/2018) **Dylan Brown, E&E News reporter**

The Trump administration is set to renew two controversial leases critical to a Minnesota copper and nickel mining proposal.

The Bureau of Land Management released an environmental assessment yesterday setting out updated terms and conditions for leasing a total of 4,865 acres to Chilean copper giant Antofagasta PLC near the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.

BLM will not make a decision until after a 30-day public comment period, but the assessment would clear the way for the Twin Metals project near Ely. The Forest Service updated stipulations that are meant to prevent possible damage to water resources and wilderness areas.

"Twin Metals looks forward to the timely and proper completion of the lease renewal process," Antofagasta's U.S. subsidiary said in a statement. "We continue to look forward to the opportunity to present a formal Mine Plan of Operations for review by the federal government."

The leases dating back to 1966 were only reinstated this year. In 2016, the Obama administration rejected Antofagasta's renewal, citing concerns about water pollution impacts from mining.

The Interior Department issued a temporary mining ban on 234,000 acres of the Superior National Forest as the Forest Service reviewed a 20-year mineral withdrawal.

Under President Trump, however, the Forest Service halted the review, and Interior killed the withdrawal mineral application.

In a legal opinion, the Interior Office of the Solicitor argued the department did not have a choice in renewing the leases. That directly contradicted an Obama-era opinion from the same office.

Environmentalists challenged the Trump interpretation in federal court, arguing the lease conditions required renewal only if mining had begun during the initial 20-year lease or the first 10-year extension that ended in 2004.

"The Trump administration is trying to do an end run around the environmental review process and ram through federal approvals while they still can," Campaign to Save the Boundary Waters National Chairwoman Becky Rom said in a statement.

The campaign and other groups said new environmental and economic studies submitted during the comment period were ignored when the Forest Service canceled the mining ban review "based on what we learned over the last 15 months."

"The science, economics and public's position are well-established: Permitting sulfide-ore copper mining near the Boundary Waters is simply too great a risk," said Alison Flint, litigation manager for the Wilderness Society.

The project has support in the former Iron Range mining region, while a survey by Save the Boundary Waters found 70 percent of state residents oppose mining near the wilderness.

"We strongly support each step of the highly regulated process for mining projects to come to fruition including the timely renewal of Twin Metals leases following this process," business and labor coalition Jobs for Minnesotans said in a statement. "This proceeding sets a strong precedent for future non-ferrous mining projects on how the federal government works with mining companies not just in Minnesota, but across the country."

But outgoing Minnesota Gov. Mark Dayton (D) blasted the Trump administration's "greed and willful ignorance."

"The Boundary Waters Canoe Area is a priceless, irreplaceable environmental asset for our State and Nation that must be protected," he said in a statement. "Endangering its pristine waters and natural wonders for the sake of foreign corporate profits is shameful and wrong."

This map shows the proposed site of the Twin Metals mine in northern Minnesota. Claudine Hellmuth/E&E News

---

Clean Air Act: Years-in-the-making ozone litigation hits D.C. Circuit

(Greenwire, 12/18/2018) **Ellen M. Gilmer, E&E News reporter**

EPA offered a steady defense today of Obama-era ozone standards the agency previously considered scrapping.

During long-awaited oral arguments at the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, government lawyers defended the agency's 2015 thresholds for the air pollutant as "forward progress" aimed at protecting vulnerable people.

"The revised ozone standards here represent notable forward progress in protecting the health of all Americans across this country," Justice Department attorney Justin Heminger told a three-judge panel this morning.

The Trump administration's defense of the 2015 rule, which marked 70 parts per billion as the highest acceptable amount of ground-level ozone under the Clean Air Act, comes after more than a year of uncertainty over whether EPA would try to loosen the standard to please industry players.

Ultimately, EPA agreed to stick with 70 ppb, a decision that prompted today's unlikely standoff between the agency and some of the president's

most ardent supporters, including Murray Energy Corp.

Lawyers for the agency fended off complaints from industry parties and mostly conservative states that the ozone standard is simply impossible to achieve, given existing levels of background ozone that states cannot control. EPA also pushed back on environmentalists' claims that the threshold is not strong enough.

The question of whether EPA should accommodate background levels — that is, ozone that has drifted across borders or formed from natural sources — when setting National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone is especially relevant now as the agency conducts its next five-year review of the threshold.

Arizona Solicitor General Dominic Draye, representing litigants who think the 2015 levels are too tough, argued today that EPA's decision to ignore background ozone levels when setting the 70-ppb standard is irrational and unfair to states and companies trying to comply. Places suffering from high levels of background ozone beyond their control are deemed "nonattainment areas" under the NAAQs and then saddled with onerous permitting requirements.

"EPA could ... set a standard that's defined as background-plus-20 parts per billion or whatever," he said, noting potential alternative approaches. "The point is that this lack of creativity is a function of sloppy and hasty rulemaking."

At least two judges on the panel aired skepticism about the argument. Judge Thomas Griffith asked Draye to point out what provision in the Clean Air Act requires EPA to build in background levels to ozone standards.

Griffith, a George W. Bush appointee, noted that certain parts of the law address EPA's consideration of background ozone at a later stage, in implementation regulations that follow the agency's determination of a threshold, "which suggests that that's where you pay attention to background ozone and that it's not necessary to do so when you're establishing NAAQS in the first place."

Dominic said he reads the provisions the opposite way, as evidence that Congress didn't intend for states to be on the hook for ozone they can't control.

Judge Nina Pillard, an Obama appointee, challenged Dominic with EPA's key argument: "The agency is saying it's not considering background ozone as an excuse not to come up with a level requisite for the public health."

Simi Bhat, another DOJ lawyer representing EPA, maintained that the Clean Air Act doesn't require the agency to select easier ozone targets to accommodate background levels, but rather requires the agency to protect public health and welfare.

She sidestepped a question, however, about whether EPA is permitted to consider background ozone, responding that the issue simply isn't before the court at this time. EPA is weighing that question for its next five-year standard, and the courts can decide the issue after that, she said.

Earthjustice attorney Seth Johnson urged the court to take this opportunity to resolve the debate. He argued that the Clean Air Act gives EPA "no authority whatsoever" in setting standards.

"That's not an issue we need to reach in this case, though?" Griffith asked. "You'd like us to."

"It would be efficient," Johnson said to laughter. "And it would be proper."

Pushing for a stricter standard

The D.C. Circuit also grappled with arguments today that EPA's 2015 ozone levels are not tough enough.

Environmentalists say the agency failed to justify its decision to opt for the least stringent level of a range recommended by outside experts advising the agency on the issue. They question EPA's methodology and say its approach results in adverse health effects, including allowing areas to greatly exceed permitted levels of ozone many days or weeks each year.

Ozone contributes to the formation of smog, which can cause severe breathing problems in children and people with asthma.

The judges pelted Johnson, the Earthjustice lawyer, with technical questions about EPA's

analysis. Judge Robert Wilkins, an Obama appointee, pressed him on the limits of environmentalists' arguments.

"Are you saying that the statute requires them to set the standard such that ... to be in compliance, the area can never exceed that standard on any given day?" he asked.

Johnson skirted a direct answer but maintained that the Clean Air Act requires EPA to set a standard that ensures the "absence of adverse effects" on public health.

"EPA hasn't done that here," Johnson said. "EPA has set a standard that it knows allows adverse health effects."

The court appeared somewhat more receptive to environmentalists' claims that EPA did not adequately justify its secondary ozone standard — the threshold for protecting plants and animals, which is also set at 70 ppb.

The judges repeatedly questioned DOJ lawyer Heminger on why EPA opted for a methodology that differed from the approach recommended by outside advisers at the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee.

Heminger explained that the agency looked at various measures of vegetation effects and used one — tree growth loss — as a surrogate to analyze broader impacts of ozone. It did not consider another measure — leaf damage — to be detailed enough to inform the standard. Pillard questioned the approach.

"I just don't see where EPA has grappled with that," she said. "Given the damage, given the determination that this is an important element of the public welfare, it reads as if it's dropped off the table."

Lead NEPA Story (*continued from page 1)*

"This is not the choice between energy and environment," Murkowski said at the time. "We're past that."

Democrats outside the Last Frontier State largely disagree. Rep. Raúl Grijalva (D-Ariz.), who is expected to chair the House Natural Resources Committee next year when Democrats take over the chamber, has said the effort equated to "naked greed and corporate favoritism" that runs rampant in the Trump administration.

The details of the draft environmental impact statement have not been released. But on the press call, Balash explained the report offers a range of four leasing alternatives. Although one is a "no leasing" option, Balash dismissed it as unrealistic given Congress' direction.

The first lease sale is expected to occur in 2019, according to Balash. After BLM receives public input on the draft, the agency could release the final EIS as early as next summer, he said. Then BLM will issue a call for nominations to determine where oil companies might be interested in drilling.

At that point, BLM will decide when and where to hold the lease sales.

Exactly how much recoverable oil lies beneath the coastal plain is unclear. In 1998, the U.S. Geological Survey estimated between 4.3 billion and 11.8 billion barrels. But that survey's data are outdated, and drilling proponents have called for more seismic testing.

"It has always been known to be an elephant," said Kara Moriarty of the Alaska Oil & Gas Association.

In a separate process, Interior is finalizing the seismic program to discern exactly where the oil and gas are located. The process is waiting on a final step and should advance soon, Balash said.

Unknown interest

Critics charge oil companies may not even be that interested in drilling in the refuge. In a report released today, the Wilderness Society highlighted that pre-existing infrastructure does not exist there, rendering drilling costly and risky. The report doubted the government could collect $1 billion in lease revenues; the Center

for American Progress, which opposes drilling in ANWR, estimated $37 million over a decade.

"Drilling in the Arctic can be up to 10 times more expensive than drilling in the Lower 48," according to the Wilderness Society report.

But Moriarty of the oil association argued companies never indicate their level of interest in advance of lease sales. "They don't want their competitors to know if they are interested in the North Sea or Gulf of Mexico ... or ANWR."

Two recent oil lease sales nearby in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska drew little interest from oil companies. But an oil lease on state lands last month saw some of the highest industry attention in 20 years, Moriarty said.

Critics also charge that oil drilling in the Arctic refuge would devastate untouched ecologically rich land and harm wildlife, including the porcupine caribou and polar bears, which have been forced to move to the coastal plain as sea ice has quickly melted.

Balash said he has approached such critics, including members of the Gwich'in Nation.

"I was not there to convince them or to change their mind," he said. "But I wanted to know everything they could share to craft a better plan than we could without them."

He acknowledged the region is important not just for the caribou but also for migratory birds that regularly fly overhead.

"There is no place that has higher standards or does it better than Alaska," he said. "Alaska really is the gold standard when it comes to development activity. You can expect to see the greatest care taken."

A USGS report recently found a quarter of greenhouse gas emissions come from fossil fuel extracted from public lands. When asked about pollution, he said, "Those are questions for a different forum, not this one."

Reporter Pamela King contributed.

The NAEP *National Desk* is published every two weeks using content originally published in *Greenwire*. The NAEP *National Desk* is emailed directly to approximately 1,000 NAEP General, Associate, Student, and Senior members, and indirectly to more than 3,100 chapter-affiliate members through 17 state or regional affiliate chapters. News articles are provided through a licensing agreement with Environment and Energy (E&E) Publishing, LLC (www.eenews.net). E&E's five daily online publications are ClimateWire, EnergyWire, E&E Daily, Greenwire and E&E News PM. ***Subscription discounts are available to NAEP members. Sign up for a subscription by sending an email to cchinyata@eenews.net***.

This edition of the National Desk was compiled by Harold Draper. For more information on NAEP, please contact the NAEP office at office@naep.org.