



# United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
Washington, DC 20240

APR 16 2018

The Honorable Paul Gosar  
Chairman  
Committee on Natural Resources  
Subcommittee on Energy & Mineral Resources  
United States House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Enclosed are responses prepared by the Bureau of Land Management to the questions for the record submitted following the June 29, 2017, oversight hearing entitled: "*Examining Access to Oil and Gas Development on Federal lands.*"

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this material to the Committee.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Salotti  
Legislative Counsel  
Office of Congressional and  
Legislative Affairs

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Alan Lowenthal, Ranking Member  
Committee on Natural Resources,  
Subcommittee on Energy & Mineral Resources

**Committee on Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources  
Oversight Hearing  
1324 Longworth House Office Building June 29, 2017  
10:00 a.m.**

**Oversight Hearing on *"Examining Access to Oil and Gas Development on Federal lands"***

**Questions from Rep. Lowenthal** for Ms. Kate MacGregor, Acting Assistant Secretary for Lands and Minerals Management

**Q1. Ms. MacGregor, please provide the following information to the committee:**

- a. **The number of onshore oil and gas drilling permits approved but unused as of September 30, 2016, broken down by BLM State Office and Field Office, indicating how many are on Federal land and how many are on Indian land.**

Attachment 1a provides the number of onshore approved oil and gas drilling permits (AAPD) that are available, broken down by state for Fiscal Year 2016. From October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016, there were 1580 newly available AAPDs on both Federal and Indian lands. Note that while these applications may not yet have been drilled, they are still valid for two years from the date of approval as long as the associated lease does not expire during that time. Furthermore, an operator may request an extension of the AAPD for up to two years at the discretion of the BLM and the surface management agency. For every APD the BLM receives, regardless of whether it is ultimately drilled, the BLM collects an APD processing fee.

- b. **For the APDs pending as of September 30, 2016, a breakdown of the length of time that those APDs had been pending (i.e. the number that have been pending for less than 30 days, the number pending between 31 and 60 days, and so on), broken down by BLM State Office and Field Office.**

Attachment 1b provides the number of APDs pending for more than 90 days broken down by BLM state and field offices as of September 30, 2016. the BLM does not have the capability to provide the data broken down by APDs pending for 30 or 60 days by State and Field Office for FY 2016. The BLM, however, was keeping track of BLM-wide pending APDs longer than 90 days, which is provided in attachment 1b.

The BLM has recently established a more advanced internet-based APD

processing system. The new online system takes advantage of newer technology and enhanced processes, addresses stakeholder concerns regarding the speed and transparency in oil and gas permitting, and solves data integrity issues identified by the U.S. Government Accountability Office and the Department of the Interior's Office of the Inspector General. The new system automates workflow processes to allow the BLM balancing of the workload across all of its 33 oil and gas offices by increasing the BLM's agility to address shifting workloads without physically shifting its workforce.

The new system better tracks an APD within the workflow process. As a result, the BLM is able to provide more accurate metrics and increased transparency. This is having a positive impact for the operator and the BLM is currently seeing a reduction in processing timeframes for those APDs processed in the new system. The new system prompts the operator regarding submission elements of the APD, which should also result in less APD deficiencies and improved overall processing timeframes. As part of the system date stamping, the system currently tracks the time from when an operator first files a permit to when the permit satisfies a completed application. The BLM is adding features to enhance the available reports for tracking APD processing performance. Improvements to the system will provide decision-makers with a full accounting of the BLM filing process.

- c. **The number of APDs received and approved for each month in Fiscal Year 2017 for which data is available, as well as the number of pending APDs at the end of each month, broken down by BLM State Office and Field Office.**

Attachment 1c provides the best available data for the number of APDs received and approved for each month in FY 2017.

- d. **The number of wells on public land that have been drilled but uncompleted (or drilled but have not reported first production to the BLM), broken down by BLM State Office and Field Office, as well as by the number of months since those wells have been spud.**

Attachment 1d shows the number of wells drilled, but not completed broken down by state and field offices. As of July 18, 2017, there were 1,609 wells drilled, but not completed. Of these wells, 344 uncompleted wells the operator spudded the wells over five years ago; 348 uncompleted wells were spudded over two years ago; 199 uncompleted wells were spudded over one year ago; and 665 uncompleted wells that were spudded within the last year. The BLM

does not have a record of spud dates for the remaining 53 wells.

Attachments:

- 1a. Available Approved Oil and Gas APDs as of September 30, 2016
- 1b. FY 2016 APDs Filed and Pending BLM Review
- 1c. FY 2017 APDs Received and Approved Monthly
- 1d. FY 2016 Wells Drilled but Not Completed by State and Field Office

**Q2. Certain witnesses supported the idea of granting states the primary responsibility for managing federal oil and gas operations within their borders? Under such a system, how would the federal government assure compliance with the myriad federal laws and other requirements that apply to public lands including, for example:**

- **The Mineral Leasing Act and its regulations, which charge the Secretary of the Interior and BLM with managing federal minerals leasing and permitting. See 30 U.S.C. § 226(a); 43 CFR § 3162.3-1(c).**
- **The National Environmental Policy Act and its requirements for environmental impact analysis;**
- **The Endangered Species Act including its requirements for consultation with the FWS;**
- **The National Historic Preservation Act including its requirement for consultation with State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation;**
- **The Secretary's trust responsibility to Native American tribes;**
- **The Federal Land Policy & Management Act and its requirements for land use planning, for management of the public lands to "protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archaeological values," and for the prevention of unnecessary and undue degradation of public lands.**

**Response to Q2:**

The BLM manages the Federal oil and gas program according to all applicable laws enacted by Congress. As stated in my testimony, public lands are integral to the Administration's America First Energy Agenda and Secretary Zinke's priority to maintain U.S. energy dominance by growing domestic energy production, generating revenue, and creating and sustaining jobs throughout our country. In FY 2016, the BLM's oil and gas program alone generated more than \$1.68 billion in royalties, rental payments, and bonus bids, all of which were split between the U.S. Treasury and the states where the development occurred.

The Department manages the Federal oil and gas resources on public lands on behalf of all Americans and has made it a top priority to strengthen its positive, productive working relationships with state and tribal partners. Under Secretary Zinke's leadership, the BLM is reviewing existing policies and examining new ideas on how best to increase efficiency, streamline processes and enhance working relationships with state, tribal, and local officials in

managing oil and gas operations within Federal areas while complying with applicable Federal laws. The Department believes that restoring full collaboration and coordination with our state and local stakeholders can help effectively resolve issues and increase efficiencies by developing productive relationships with an open flow of information, one that encourages the sharing of best practices.

**Q3. Several witnesses testified about the need to "streamline" oil and gas permitting on public lands? How would you streamline the process in light of the myriad legal requirements that apply to activities on public lands as noted in question 2 above?**

**Response to Q3:**

The Department is committed to finding ways to improve efficiency and provide more consistency while complying with all applicable laws. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 currently requires that the Department and the BLM to process APDs within 30 days and the BLM will issue a decision on the APD approval, denial, or defer until completing the permit review. On July 5, 2017, Secretary Zinke signed Secretarial Order (S.O.) 3354, directing the BLM to develop an effective strategy to address permitting backlogs and delays, and identify solutions to improve energy and mineral resources access and permitting on Federal lands. The BLM is diligently working to implement S.O. 3354. Currently, the BLM's strategy includes harnessing internet-based solutions, establishing APD targets, and increasing interagency coordination. In January 2017, the BLM had 92 vacancies in key areas attributed to workflow areas that support APD processing and 40 vacancies related to processing Expressions of Interest. To date, the BLM filled approximately 43 of these vacancies. Further, the President's FY 2018 budget request includes additional funding for staffing and support for the busiest permitting offices.

**Q4. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 sets out five categories of categorical exclusions from NEPA for certain limited types of oil and gas activities. In 2011, the GAO found that the BLM was abusing these exclusions by using them for activities that were outside their scope. How has the BLM responded to this report and what more, if anything, should be done to avoid the abuses of these categorical exclusions as found by the GAO?**

**Response to Q4:**

The 2011 U.S. Government Accountability Office's (GAO) report, *BLM's Use of Section 390 Categorical Exclusions for Oil and Gas Development* (GAO-11-941T), was a follow-up to a GAO September 2009 report, *Energy Policy Act: Greater Clarity Needed to Address Concerns with Categorical Exclusions for Oil and Gas Development under Sec. 390* (GAO-09-872), and included updated information related to court decisions reached after the 2009 report was issued. In May 2010, in response to a court settlement, *Nine Mile Canyon Coalition v. Stiewig*, and the GAO's 2009 recommendations, the BLM issued a new Instruction Memorandum, IM 2010-118, *Energy Policy Act Section 390 Categorical Exclusion Policy Revision*, stating that the BLM would not use section 390 categorical exclusions where extraordinary circumstances were present.

On August 12, 2011, a court decision reached in *Western Energy Alliance v. Salazar*, resulted

in the BLM issuing IM 2012-110, *Rescinding Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2010-118, Energy Policy Act Section 390 Categorical Exclusion Policy Revision*, as well as IM 2012-146, *Rescinding Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2010-118, Energy Policy Act Section 390 Categorical Exclusion Policy Revision*. The court held that the IM 2010-118 constituted a regulation that the BLM adopted without using proper rule-making procedures and issued a nationwide injunction blocking the memorandum's implementation. The current policy of the BLM is to follow IM 2012-146, which states that BLM field offices should follow the Section 390 CX guidance outlined in the BLM 2008 NEPA Handbook when considering the use of the Section 390 CXs.

Attachment 1a

Approved Application for Permit to Drill (AAPD) - Available October 1, 2015 - September 30, 2016				
State	Field Office	Federal	Indian	Total
<b>Alaska</b>		1	0	1
	Statewide	1	0	1
<b>California</b>		18		18
	Bakersfield	18	0	18
<b>Colorado</b>		125	9	134
	Canon City	47	0	47
	Craig	5	0	5
	Durango	19	9	28
	Grand Junction	6	0	6
	Glenwood Springs	4	0	4
	Meeker	44	0	44
<b>Eastern States</b>		8	0	134
	Jackson	4	0	4
	Milwaukee	4	0	4
<b>Montana/North Dakota</b>		130	54	184
	Miles City	5	3	8
	Dickinson	125	51	176
<b>New Mexico</b>		605	13	618
	Carlsbad	285	0	285
	Farmington	50	4	54
	Hobbs	244	0	244
	Roswell	3	0	3
	Rio Puerco	2	0	2
	Tulsa	21	9	25
<b>Nevada</b>		1	0	1
	Reno	1	0	1
<b>Utah</b>		175	86	261
	Moab	2	0	2
	Price	2	0	2
	Vernal	171	86	257
<b>Wyoming</b>		355	0	355
	Buffalo	148	0	148
	Casper	139	0	139
	Green River	8	0	8
	Kemmerer	1	0	1
	New Castle	3	0	3
	Pinedale	35	0	35
	Rawlings	19	0	19
	Worland	2	0	2
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>1418</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>1580</b>

Note: Approved Application for Permit to Drill expire after 2 years with one extension of an additional 2 years for a total of 4 years

The BLM assesses a fee of each APDs it receives even if they do not get used. The total fees assessed for AAPDs in FY was \$13.5 million

## Attachment 1b

FY 2016 APDs Filed and Pending BLM Review		
State	Field Office	APDs Pending (> 90 days)
<b>Alaska</b>		1
	Anchorage	0
	Fairbanks	1
<b>California</b>		34
	Bakersfield	33
	Clear Lake	0
	Folsom	0
	Hollister	1
	Palm Springs Coast	0
	Ridge Crest	0
	Ukiah	0
<b>Colorado</b>		87
	Cañon City	12
	Kremmling	2
	Little Snake	5
	San Juan	37
	Glenwood Springs	19
	Grand Junction	6
	White River	6
<b>Eastern States</b>		7
	Jackson	7
	Milwaukee	0
<b>Montana</b>		444
	Dickinson	361
	Great Falls	2
	Miles City	81
<b>Nevada</b>		5
	Battle Mountain	0
	Carson City	0
	Elko	2
	Ely	2
	Mineral Res. Div.	0
	Tonopah	1
	Winnemucca	0
<b>New Mexico</b>		293
	Carlsbad	145
	Farmington	43
	Hobbs	73
	Albuquerque	15
	Roswell	5
	Tulsa	12
<b>Utah<sup>++</sup></b>		621
	Moab	42
	Monticello	9
	Arizona Strip (AZ)	0
	Cedar City	1
	Richfield	0
	Salt Lake City	3
	Four Rivers	0
	Price	35
	Vernal	531
<b>Wyoming</b>		609
	Buffalo	117
	Casper	340
	Rock Springs	6
	Kemmerer	12
	Lander	1
	Newcastle	23
	Pinedale	84
	Rawlins	25
	Cody	0
	Worland	1
<b>Nationwide</b>		2,101

## NOTES:

Due to the ongoing transition from the AFMSS platform to the NFLSS platform, this is the best available FY 2016 permit and well data.

Cumulative Report - Consists of AFMSS Year-to-date data, captures on-going adjustments to APD Back Log. Therefore, this report will not tie to a tally of the Year-to-date Monthly reports, hence this is a more accurate APD status.

<sup>++</sup> - Utah's Approved APDs include 4 APDs reviewed and approved by the Salt Lake City Office, UT



Attachment 1c

APDs Approved & Received - October 2016*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		0	0
	Anchorage	0	0
California Total		0	2
	Bakersfield	0	2
Colorado Total		11	32
	Canon City	0	20
	Craig	0	3
	Durango	0	0
	Durango - Indian	0	0
	Glenwood Spgs	11	3
	Grand Junction	0	6
	Meeker	0	0
Eastern States Total		0	0
	Jackson	0	0
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		7	52
	Dickinson	7	52
	Dickinson - Indian	0	0
	Great Falls	0	0
	Great Falls - Indian		
	Miles City	0	0
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		0	0
	Reno	0	0
New Mexico Total		36	39
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	34	31
	Farmington	1	5
	Farmington - Indian	0	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	0	0
	Tulsa	1	3
	Tulsa - Indian	0	0
Utah Total		11	1
	Moab	0	1
	Price	0	0
	Salt Lake	1	0
	Vernal	10	0
	Vernal - Indian		
Wyoming Total		43	57
	Buffalo	2	2
	Casper	7	25
	Green River	0	0
	Kemmerer	0	0
	Lander	0	0
	Newcastle	1	0
	Pinedale	32	20
	Rawlins	1	9
	Worland	0	1
Totals		108	183

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition, pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

APDs Approved & Received - November 2016*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		0	0
	Anchorage	0	0
California Total		2	0
	Bakersfield	2	0
Colorado Total		18	8
	Canon City	8	0
	Craig	1	0
	Durango	0	0
	Durango - Indian	0	0
	Glenwood Spgs	3	2
	Grand Junction	6	6
	Meeker	0	0
Eastern States Total		1	0
	Jackson	1	0
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		10	29
	Dickinson	10	28
	Dickinson - Indian	0	0
	Great Falls	0	1
	Great Falls - Indian	0	0
	Miles City	0	0
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		0	0
	Reno	0	0
New Mexico Total		37	102
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	21	76
	Farmington	12	23
	Farmington - Indian	0	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	0	0
	Tulsa	4	3
	Tulsa - Indian	0	0
Utah Total		26	0
	Moab	0	0
	Price	0	0
	Salt Lake	0	0
	Vernal	26	0
	Vernal - Indian	0	0
Wyoming Total		63	89
	Buffalo	1	0
	Casper	10	79
	Green River	0	0
	Kemmerer	0	0
	Lander	0	1
	Newcastle	5	1
	Pinedale	47	0
	Rawlins	0	8
	Worland	0	0
<b>Totals</b>		<b>157</b>	<b>228</b>

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

APDs Approved & Received - December 2016*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		0	0
	Anchorage	0	0
California Total		0	0
	Bakersfield	0	0
Colorado Total		11	31
	Canon City	0	0
	Craig	0	3
	Durango	0	5
	Durango - Indian	0	0
	Glenwood Spgs	11	23
	Grand Junction	0	0
	Meeker	0	0
Eastern States Total		0	0
	Jackson	0	0
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		7	40
	Dickinson	7	40
	Dickinson - Indian	0	0
	Great Falls	0	0
	Great Falls - Indian	0	0
	Miles City	0	0
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		0	0
	Reno	0	0
New Mexico Total		36	50
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	34	39
	Farmington	1	7
	Farmington - Indian	0	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	0	0
	Tulsa	1	4
	Tulsa - Indian	0	0
Utah Total		11	2
	Moab	0	0
	Price	0	0
	Salt Lake	1	0
	Vernal	10	2
	Vernal - Indian	0	0
Wyoming Total		43	122
	Buffalo	7	6
	Casper	2	94
	Green River	0	0
	Kemmerer	0	0
	Lander	0	4
	Newcastle	1	0
	Pinedale	32	9
	Rawlins	1	8
	Worland	0	1
Totals		108	245

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

APDs Approved & Received - January 2017*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		0	2
	Anchorage	0	2
California Total		0	2
	Bakersfield	0	2
Colorado Total		28	39
	Canon City	0	16
	Craig	0	0
	Durango	0	5
	Durango - Indian	0	0
	Glenwood Spgs	22	3
	Grand Junction	6	7
	Meeker	0	8
Eastern States Total		0	0
	Jackson	0	0
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		43	67
	Dickinson	42	66
	Dickinson - Indian	0	0
	Great Falls	0	0
	Great Falls - Indian	0	0
	Miles City	1	1
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		0	0
	Reno	0	0
New Mexico Total		35	51
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	21	37
	Farmington	8	9
	Farmington - Indian	0	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	0	0
	Tulsa	6	5
	Tulsa - Indian	0	0
Utah Total		7	21
	Moab	0	0
	Price	3	0
	Salt Lake	0	0
	Vernal	4	21
	Vernal - Indian	0	0
Wyoming Total		73	143
	Buffalo	11	4
	Casper	46	47
	Green River	2	3
	Kemmerer	0	0
	Lander	0	0
	Newcastle	0	1
	Pinedale	10	86
	Rawlins	4	2
	Worland	0	0
Totals		186	324

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

APDs Approved & Received - February 2017*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		0	0
	Anchorage	0	0
California Total		0	2
	Bakersfield	0	2
Colorado Total		15	16
	Canon City	13	14
	Craig	0	1
	Durango	0	0
	Durango - Indian	0	0
	Glenwood Spgs	1	0
	Grand Junction	1	0
	Meeker	0	1
Eastern States Total		0	0
	Jackson	0	0
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		38	31
	Dickinson	38	31
	Dickinson - Indian	0	0
	Great Falls	0	0
	Great Falls - Indian	0	0
	Miles City	0	0
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		0	0
	Reno	0	0
New Mexico Total		58	73
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	46	60
	Farmington	7	8
	Farmington - Indian	0	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	0	1
	Tulsa	5	4
	Tulsa - Indian	0	0
Utah Total		22	12
	Moab	0	0
	Price	7	0
	Salt Lake	0	0
	Vernal	15	12
	Vernal - Indian	0	0
Wyoming Total		70	112
	Buffalo	8	13
	Casper	37	85
	Green River	0	6
	Kemmerer	0	0
	Lander	0	3
	Newcastle	1	1
	Pinedale	19	4
	Rawlins	5	0
	Worland	0	0
<b>Totals</b>		<b>203</b>	<b>246</b>

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

APDs Approved & Received - March 2017*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		0	1
	Anchorage	0	1
California Total		1	11
	Bakersfield	1	11
Colorado Total		31	45
	Canon City	22	0
	Craig	0	0
	Durango	0	2
	Durango - Indian	0	0
	Glenwood Spgs	1	43
	Grand Junction	0	0
	Meeker	8	0
Eastern States Total		0	0
	Jackson	0	0
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		38	74
	Dickinson	38	74
	Dickinson - Indian	0	0
	Great Falls	0	0
	Great Falls - Indian	0	0
	Miles City	0	0
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		1	0
	Reno	1	0
New Mexico Total		67	158
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	49	133
	Farmington	16	16
	Farmington - Indian	0	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	0	0
	Tulsa	2	9
	Tulsa - Indian	0	0
Utah Total		35	15
	Moab	0	0
	Price	0	0
	Salt Lake	1	3
	Vernal	34	12
	Vernal - Indian	0	0
Wyoming Total		83	133
	Buffalo	12	30
	Casper	11	29
	Green River	0	0
	Kemmerer	0	0
	Lander	0	11
	Newcastle	4	0
	Pinedale	50	61
	Rawlins	6	2
	Worland	0	0
Totals		256	437

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition, pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

APDs Approved & Received - April 2017*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		2	0
	Anchorage	2	0
California Total		1	21
	Bakersfield	1	21
Colorado Total		6	17
	Canon City	5	4
	Craig	0	3
	Durango	0	0
	Durango - Indian	1	0
	Glenwood Spgs	0	0
	Grand Junction	0	10
	Meeker	0	0
Eastern States Total		0	0
	Jackson	0	0
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		41	2
	Dickinson	25	1
	Dickinson - Indian	16	0
	Great Falls	0	0
	Great Falls - Indian	0	1
	Miles City	0	0
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		0	0
	Reno	0	0
New Mexico Total		82	61
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	55	42
	Farmington	0	4
	Farmington - Indian	14	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	1	1
	Tulsa	7	14
	Tulsa - Indian	5	0
Utah Total		11	1
	Moab	3	1
	Price	0	0
	Salt Lake	0	0
	Vernal	6	0
	Vernal - Indian	2	0
Wyoming Total		51	115
	Buffalo	1	8
	Casper	39	62
	Green River	0	23
	Kemmerer	0	0
	Lander	4	0
	Newcastle	2	4
	Pinedale	4	10
	Rawlins	0	4
	Worland	1	4
<b>Totals</b>		<b>193</b>	<b>217</b>

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition, pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

APDs Approved & Received - May 2017*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		1	0
	Anchorage	1	0
California Total		10	4
	Bakersfield	10	4
Colorado Total		70	3
	Canon City	32	0
	Craig	0	0
	Durango	0	2
	Durango - Indian	0	1
	Glenwood Spgs	38	0
	Grand Junction	0	0
	Meeker	0	0
Eastern States Total		0	2
	Jackson	0	2
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		44	77
	Dickinson	23	43
	Dickinson - Indian	21	33
	Great Falls	0	1
	Great Falls - Indian	0	0
	Miles City	0	0
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		1	0
	Reno	1	0
New Mexico Total		63	57
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	57	56
	Farmington	2	1
	Farmington - Indian	0	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	0	0
	Tulsa	0	0
	Tulsa - Indian	4	0
Utah Total		49	7
	Moab	0	1
	Price	0	0
	Salt Lake	0	0
	Vernal	47	0
	Vernal - Indian	2	6
Wyoming Total		101	26
	Buffalo	7	8
	Casper	50	3
	Green River	5	0
	Kemmerer	0	0
	Lander	0	0
	Newcastle	1	2
	Pinedale	38	0
	Rawlins	0	6
	Worland	0	7
Totals		339	176

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition, pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.



APDs Approved & Received - June 2017*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		0	0
	Anchorage	0	0
California Total		22	0
	Bakersfield	22	0
Colorado Total		58	44
	Canon City	20	17
	Craig	0	0
	Durango	9	0
	Durango - Indian	9	2
	Glenwood Spgs	10	25
	Grand Junction	10	0
	Meeker	0	0
Eastern States Total		0	1
	Jackson	0	1
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		26	41
	Dickinson	11	25
	Dickinson - Indian	14	15
	Great Falls	0	0
	Great Falls - Indian	0	1
	Miles City	1	0
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		1	1
	Reno	1	1
New Mexico Total		53	92
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	31	76
	Farmington	3	4
	Farmington - Indian	10	2
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	1	0
	Tulsa	0	1
	Tulsa - Indian	8	9
Utah Total		16	9
	Moab	0	0
	Price	0	0
	Salt Lake	3	0
	Vernal	12	0
	Vernal - Indian	1	9
Wyoming Total		65	124
	Buffalo	0	23
	Casper	14	49
	Green River	9	0
	Kemmerer	0	2
	Lander	6	0
	Newcastle	0	1
	Pinedale	27	36
	Rawlins	8	13
	Worland	1	0
Totals		241	312

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition, pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

APDs Approved & Received - July 2017*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		0	0
	Anchorage	0	0
California Total		9	4
	Bakersfield	9	4
Colorado Total		9	89
	Canon City	6	51
	Craig	0	0
	Durango	1	8
	Durango - Indian	2	12
	Glenwood Spgs	0	18
	Grand Junction	0	0
	Meeker	0	0
Eastern States Total		0	2
	Jackson	0	2
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		33	21
	Dickinson	20	12
	Dickinson - Indian	13	7
	Great Falls	0	1
	Great Falls - Indian	0	0
	Miles City	0	1
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		0	2
	Reno	0	2
New Mexico Total		56	80
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	45	73
	Farmington	0	0
	Farmington - Indian	3	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	0	0
	Tulsa	0	1
	Tulsa - Indian	8	6
Utah Total		9	20
	Moab	7	5
	Price	0	3
	Salt Lake	0	3
	Vernal	1	1
	Vernal - Indian	1	8
Wyoming Total		119	134
	Buffalo	0	25
	Casper	64	9
	Green River	6	1
	Kemmerer	0	0
	Lander	4	0
	Newcastle	0	6
	Pinedale	25	87
	Rawlins	13	3
	Worland	7	3
Totals		235	352

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition, pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

APDs Approved & Received - August 2017*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		2	0
	Anchorage	2	0
California Total		14	8
	Bakersfield	14	8
Colorado Total		41	93
	Canon City	17	4
	Craig	1	0
	Durango	1	2
	Durango - Indian	2	2
	Glenwood Spgs	18	47
	Grand Junction	0	18
	Meeker	2	20
Eastern States Total		0	2
	Jackson	0	2
	Milwaukee	0	0
Montana Total		87	29
	Dickinson	64	14
	Dickinson - Indian	23	14
	Great Falls	0	0
	Great Falls - Indian	0	0
	Miles City	0	1
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		0	0
	Reno	0	0
New Mexico Total		48	115
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	32	92
	Farmington	2	7
	Farmington - Indian	9	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	0	2
	Tulsa	2	4
	Tulsa - Indian	3	10
Utah Total		8	34
	Moab	1	0
	Price	0	0
	Salt Lake	0	0
	Vernal	0	11
	Vernal - Indian	7	23
Wyoming Total		89	100
	Buffalo	15	16
	Casper	42	10
	Green River	0	2
	Kemmerer	2	4
	Lander	0	0
	Newcastle	0	9
	Pinedale	16	44
	Rawlins	12	13
	Worland	2	2
Totals		289	381

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition, pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

APDs Approved & Received - September 2017*			
BLM State Office	Field Office	APDs Approved	APDs Received
Alaska Total		0	0
	Anchorage	0	0
California Total		6	4
	Bakersfield	6	4
Colorado Total		54	17
	Canon City	0	1
	Craig	1	0
	Durango	0	0
	Durango - Indian	0	0
	Glenwood Spgs	53	15
	Grand Junction	0	1
	Meeker	0	0
Eastern States Total		2	2
	Jackson	2	0
	Milwaukee	0	2
Montana Total		24	49
	Dickinson	15	24
	Dickinson - Indian	7	24
	Great Falls	0	0
	Great Falls - Indian	0	1
	Miles City	2	0
	Miles City - Indian	0	0
Nevada Total		0	0
	Reno	0	0
New Mexico Total		91	107
	Carlsbad + Hobbs	74	100
	Farmington	2	0
	Farmington - Indian	3	0
	Rio Puerco - Indian	0	0
	Roswell	0	0
	Tulsa	0	1
	Tulsa - Indian	12	6
Utah Total		13	29
	Moab	1	0
	Price	2	1
	Salt Lake	1	1
	Vernal	0	0
	Vernal - Indian	9	27
Wyoming Total		211	82
	Buffalo	43	12
	Casper	161	15
	Green River	0	0
	Kemmerer	0	0
	Lander	0	0
	Newcastle	0	2
	Pinedale	0	47
	Rawlins	3	6
	Worland	4	0
Totals		401	290

\*The BLM is currently transitioning from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2. Due to the transition, pending APD numbers are not available, and monthly totals are estimates.

\*\*Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.

**Attachment 1d**

<b>Wells Drilled But Not Completed FY 2016</b>	
<b>State/ Field Office</b>	<b>Number of Wells Drilled but incomplete</b>
<b>Alaska</b>	<b>6</b>
ANCHORAGE	6
<b>California</b>	<b>126</b>
BAKERSFIELD	126
<b>Colorado</b>	<b>193</b>
CANON CITY	46
CRAIG	4
DURANGO	4
GLENWOOD SPRINGS	47
GRAND JUNCTION	26
MEEKER	66
<b>Eastern States</b>	<b>3</b>
JACKSON	3
<b>Montana</b>	<b>242</b>
DICKINSON	237
GREAT FALLS	1
MILES CITY	4
<b>Nevada</b>	<b>2</b>
RENO	2
<b>New Mexico</b>	<b>297</b>
CARLSBAD	121
FARMINGTON	29
HOBBS	130
RENO	10
ROSWELL	2
TULSA	5
<b>North Dakota</b>	<b>8</b>
DICKINSON	8
<b>Utah</b>	<b>168</b>
MOAB	2
PRICE	12
SALT LAKE	6
VERNAL	148
<b>Wyoming</b>	<b>564</b>
BUFFALO	144
CASPER	90
GREEN RIVER (ROCK SPR	13
KEMMERER	3
LANDER	20
NEWCASTLE	8
PINEDALE	267
RAWLINS	17
WORLAND	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1609</b>

Field offices listed may differ between charts 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d due to the ongoing transition from AFMSS 1 to AFMSS 2.



# United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Washington, DC 20240

APR 20 2018

The Honorable Doug Lamborn  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans  
Committee on Natural Resources  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Chairman Lamborn:

Enclosed are responses prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to questions submitted following the Subcommittee's February 27, 2018, legislative hearing on H.R. 2947 and H.R. 4880.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this material to the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Salotti  
Legislative Counsel  
Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Jared Huffman  
Ranking Member

**Legislative Hearing before the Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans on Two Bills to Revise the Boundaries of Certain Units of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System: H.R. 2947 and H.R. 4880**

**February 27, 2018**

**Questions from Rep. Doug Lamborn** for Mr. Gary Frazer, Assistant Director for Ecological Services, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Mr. Frazer, several times throughout the hearing, a 2002 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service report [was cited] that documented projected savings through 2010 and Stafford Act-related savings through 2050.

- 1) In 2002 it was projected that CBRA would save \$1.3 billion. Was that target met?

Response: It is likely that the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) saved far more taxpayer dollars than projected by the 2002 study. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) 2002 economic study projected that CBRA would save American taxpayers approximately \$1.3 billion between 1983 and 2010 by restricting Federal spending for roads, wastewater systems, potable water supply, and disaster relief. This study did not include taxpayer savings from avoided expenditures through the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and many other Federal programs. The \$1.3 billion was an estimated savings from avoided Federal expenditures, not a target. The Service has not conducted any updates to this report, but we know the savings estimated in the 2002 study is probably conservative for the following reasons, which are stated on page three of the report<sup>1</sup>.

First, the Federal programs Congress directed us to examine comprise but a fraction of the Federal programs, policies, and funding sources that promote, protect, and rebuild development along our coasts. For example, Federal funding for bridges and shoreline stabilization -- beach nourishment, jetties, bulkheads, and other structural and non-structural mechanisms -- are notable expenses we did not consider. Second, the methods we used to estimate Stafford Act savings assume the cost per developed acre in the entire disaster area is constant, but this is not generally the case. Coastal barriers often experience more damage from hurricanes and other coastal storms because they are made of sand and on the front lines of storm surge. Third, costs for infrastructure did not consider the geology of coastal barriers. It is more expensive to build in these places because they are unstable and flood prone. Fourth, we assumed no construction occurred on wetlands; if 14 percent of System wetlands were developed, the savings calculated in this study would double. Fifth, we only considered initial, on-site construction costs, but did not assess the costs of operating and maintaining infrastructure or connecting development to existing facilities.

- 2) Can you provide the most updated numbers regarding savings to date and any future projected savings?

Response: We do not have an updated assessment of taxpayer savings associated with CBRA since the 2002 economic report. However, we can assume the savings are substantial. We know that hurricane response, recovery, and rebuilding are extremely expensive. Eight major hurricanes and several tropical storms have made landfall along the U.S. coast since 2010. Federal funding for Hurricane Sandy recovery is estimated at \$50 billion (including \$3.4 billion for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) coastal construction projects alone).

Following the 2017 hurricane season, Congress appropriated \$15 billion to the USACE for constructing flood and storm damage reduction projects (including shore protection) and about \$50 billion to FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund, which states and local communities use to rebuild infrastructure damaged in federally declared disasters, including hurricanes and wildfires. The NFIP is on GAO's "High Risk List" after reaching the \$30.4 billion debt ceiling following the 2017 hurricanes. Congress subsequently forgave \$16 billion of debt in 2017.

With the NFIP deeply in debt and billions of dollars allocated to the USACE to construct and reconstruct beach and flood risk reduction projects along the Atlantic coast, the Federal costs associated with protecting developed shorelines are increasing. The devastating 2017 hurricane season, with three major hurricanes making landfall in the U.S. within one month, will cost taxpayers billions in disaster response, flood insurance payouts, and long-term recovery efforts. The cost savings resulting from CBRA—by discouraging development in these high risk areas—likely far exceeds the 2002 estimate.

The Service recognizes the value of an updated economic assessment but is unable to conduct such an assessment at this time due to other program priorities.

- 3) Do you have an update on the projected savings through 2050 for Stafford Act-related activities?

Response: The Service's 2002 economic study found the total savings of Stafford Act disaster relief in the CBRS was about \$20 million from 1983 through 1996 and \$64 million from 1997 through 2010. The study estimated Stafford Act savings of \$5 million every year after 2010 (the year the CBRS was assumed to be built out), for another \$200 million savings by 2050. The study assumed future Stafford Act expenditures would be similar to those from 1983 through 1996. Although we do not have an update on the projected savings through 2050 for Stafford Act-related activities, the savings is likely higher than that projected in the 2002 report for the reasons explained above.

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. The Coastal Barrier Resources Act: Harnessing the Power of Market Forces to Conserve America's Coasts and Save Taxpayers' Money. Arlington, VA.