

**ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT—RIVERSIDE, CA**

---

---

**OVERSIGHT HEARING**  
BEFORE THE  
**TASK FORCE ON ENDANGERED**  
**SPECIES ACT**  
OF THE  
**COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES**  
**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**ONE HUNDRED FOURTH CONGRESS**

FIRST SESSION

ON

**THE IMPACT OF THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT ON**  
**THE AREA AROUND RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA**

APRIL 26, 1995—RIVERSIDE, CA

**Serial No. 104-11**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Resources



PENNSYLVANIA STATE  
UNIVERSITY

AUG 21 1995

DOCUMENTS COLLECTION  
U.S. Depository Copy

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1995

91-616cc ≡

---

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office  
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402  
ISBN 0-16-047379-9

District could not proceed with the project once it finally obtained all the necessary approvals. The project area is still without water, even though the District has finally acquired the right-of-way and the permits required under the Endangered Species Act.

Thank you for your time.

Mr. POMBO. Thank you.

Mr. Ahrens, you may begin.

#### STATEMENT OF MIKE AHRENS, HEMET, CALIFORNIA

Mr. AHRENS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee for the opportunity to appear before you today.

My name is Mike Ahrens and I live in the city of Hemet here in Riverside County. I am the natural resources consultant for the National Natural Resources Coalition.

The NNRC includes approximately 50,000 citizens from four western states concerned about over-restrictive public land management. Today, I would like to shift the debate here just slightly over to public land management. I think appropriately the Committee has heard a lot of debate about the effects of the ESA on private lands, and we are very supportive of all the reforms that we have heard here today. But left out of this debate thus far, we believe, has been the effect of the ESA on public lands, and we would like to share some ideas about that with you today.

Our members include certainly private property owners, but also members who are just families and want to get out on the land to enjoy various forms of recreation including rock hounding, hunting, fishing, sightseeing, general camping, and ghost town exploration. All of these forms of recreation are dependent on the ability to access public lands. We believe our way of life is under assault, often for a noble cause but just as often in a manner that is ill-conceived and unlikely to achieve the desired results.

In the last year, in the California Desert Bill, hundreds of miles of roads were closed to public access. Mr. Pombo, you are very familiar with that.

Mr. Calvert was a big help with that also.

Now the public access to the region may be further restricted through recovery plans for the desert tortoise, fringed toed lizard and other endangered species.

In addition to being an important way to escape urban living, motorized recreation contributes greatly to the California economy. A recent study conducted by the Institute for Social Research found that in California, 14.2 percent of the households, or 3.5 million people are involved in some form of motorized recreation on a regular basis.

One example of how the ESA has inappropriately impacted motorized recreation is the desert tortoise. It is well known that the desert tortoise population has been decreasing, due primarily to disease, predation and what I am going to call poaching. Others try to call that public access. The numbers of tortoise impacted by recreational vehicles is actually so low that the figures are often lumped together with highway-related so that they would appear relevant.

But let us look at the recovery strategy for the desert tortoise. The plan essentially is to establish preserves, close off the land to

the public. How this will eliminate disease, predation, poaching, of the tortoise, I am not sure. While, in fact, there are those who will go out and pick up tortoise, to take them home, and there are even those that will indiscriminately injure and harass the tortoise, it is highly unlikely that a closed area sign would stop that same person. So again, I call that poaching, not a public access problem. I think we have ways of dealing with poaching and we need to do that.

Recreation is an easy target for recovery strategies because it tends to be such a large, intangible community and because it is often much easier to simply close an area off to the public than to, for example, reduce the exploding populations of ravens, the tortoise's principal predator.

We would like to see the ESA reformed in such a manner that the Fish and Wildlife Service would be required to address the major causes of a species' decline rather than the easiest ones.

One flaw with the ESA is the inadequate analysis before listing. I would like to talk a little bit about this whole concept of best-available science. I think that sounds appropriate on the surface, but what it has become is a blank check for special interest groups who want to restrict access to public lands and stymie development. What we have seen is that by limiting the debate to strictly the best-available science, we have seen species listed with nearly no science. We do not think this can continue.

We strongly believe that there should be a more clearly defined criteria for listing of a species. The criteria must include the impacts of local economies, families, private property holders and public land users and also public land users. Furthermore, because a listing can have a far-reaching impact on private citizens, the ESA should put the burden of scientific analysis on the Service and not on the public.

Another problem with the ESA is that there is no formal recourse for our voice, the public, to be heard. The private property owners have every right to be real mad about the mitigation process for their uses of their land, but to some extent that process is better than no process at all. And that is what recreation has had to deal with. When recreation is found to be jeopardizing, or allegedly jeopardizing, the species, we are just out of there and there is no recourse.

In conclusion, the ESA, we feel, is in desperate need of reform. On behalf of the NNRC, we want to recommend the Committee consider the following reforms:

One, protect public access to public lands.

Require a complete scientific analysis including not only why the population has declined, but to what degree each cause of that decline is responsible.

And how listing a species may impact local economies, families, private property owners and public land users.

We think that the recovery plan should be developed before listing. We think recovery plans should be required to focus on the leading causes of decline rather than the easiest causes to restrict or eliminate.

And again, the establishment of some form of mitigation process for public uses on public lands we think needs to be addressed.

Finally, I cannot overstate the importance of leaving public lands open for recreation and how that activity enhances our financial and emotional standards of living.

Thank you very much for your consideration. I would be happy to answer any of your questions.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, also with your permission, I have some testimony I would like to submit for the record from some other individuals.

Mr. POMBO. Yes, absolutely, without objection.

[The statement of Mr. Ahrens may be found at end of hearing.]

Mr. POMBO. Mike, in your testimony, you stated that maybe sometimes—not maybe, but that it should be—that we should look for what the decline in species, what the major cause in the decline in species is, as part of the recovery plan, versus just what is the easiest or politically acceptable way to do that, where you affect the people.

I guess the interesting thing about that is that in Vancouver on Monday, we heard that exact same thing from a number of the members of the environmental groups up there, that they felt that in that area the exact thing was happening, to the benefit of others. I think that as we strive to reform the ESA and put some common sense into what the actions are, maybe by removing politics from the science side of it, maybe we can accomplish that.

Mr. AHRENS. Right. I am actually glad to hear that. I think that some of that common ground that we talked about that we actually probably have, can often become polarized and do not recognize it. We think, without a doubt, the biggest flaw in this plan is the lack of science, real science, that is involved in listings and the recovery strategies for different species.

Mr. POMBO. Yeah. A lot of times, unfortunately, in this debate people have responded negatively to someone they may disagree with versus actually listening, and maybe there are common grounds that we can reach here to find some solutions. I appreciate that.

Mr. McCrohan.

[Verbal comment from the audience.]

Mr. POMBO. I am sorry.

Your story is very interesting and I think that as a person who is fourth generation on my farm, I can relate to how your family feels about what you have in your ranch. It is interesting what you have gotten into, the different plants and the new markets that you have tried to open up. And I think that that is really one of our solutions to a lot of the problems that we have with the ESA, is that people like you ought to be encouraged to go out and open new markets and find uses for native plants that grew here naturally. I think that that is a big part of the solution, but there is one thing that I want to ask you about, and it is something that has come up at a number of our hearings.

It was mentioned earlier in testimony about the woolly star cactus type plant. What would happen if in the mitigation—I think one of the gentlemen earlier was from an irrigation district and they talked about them being stopped from development because a couple of these plants were there. What would happen if the mitigation money that they are putting up in their attempt, or the

Finally, I cannot overstate the importance of leaving public lands open for recreation and how that activity enhances our financial and emotional standards of living.

Thank you very much for your consideration. I would be happy to answer any of your questions.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, also with your permission, I have some testimony I would like to submit for the record from some other individuals.

Mr. POMBO. Yes, absolutely, without objection.

[The statement of Mr. Ahrens may be found at end of hearing.]

Mr. POMBO. Mike, in your testimony, you stated that maybe sometimes—not maybe, but that it should be—that we should look for what the decline in species, what the major cause in the decline in species is, as part of the recovery plan, versus just what is the easiest or politically acceptable way to do that, where you affect the people.

I guess the interesting thing about that is that in Vancouver on Monday, we heard that exact same thing from a number of the members of the environmental groups up there, that they felt that in that area the exact thing was happening, to the benefit of others. I think that as we strive to reform the ESA and put some common sense into what the actions are, maybe by removing politics from the science side of it, maybe we can accomplish that.

Mr. AHRENS. Right. I am actually glad to hear that. I think that some of that common ground that we talked about that we actually probably have, can often become polarized and do not recognize it. We think, without a doubt, the biggest flaw in this plan is the lack of science, real science, that is involved in listings and the recovery strategies for different species.

Mr. POMBO. Yeah. A lot of times, unfortunately, in this debate people have responded negatively to someone they may disagree with versus actually listening, and maybe there are common grounds that we can reach here to find some solutions. I appreciate that.

Mr. McCrohan.

[Verbal comment from the audience.]

Mr. POMBO. I am sorry.

Your story is very interesting and I think that as a person who is fourth generation on my farm, I can relate to how your family feels about what you have in your ranch. It is interesting what you have gotten into, the different plants and the new markets that you have tried to open up. And I think that that is really one of our solutions to a lot of the problems that we have with the ESA, is that people like you ought to be encouraged to go out and open new markets and find uses for native plants that grew here naturally. I think that that is a big part of the solution, but there is one thing that I want to ask you about, and it is something that has come up at a number of our hearings.

It was mentioned earlier in testimony about the woolly star cactus type plant. What would happen if in the mitigation—I think one of the gentlemen earlier was from an irrigation district and they talked about them being stopped from development because a couple of these plants were there. What would happen if the mitigation money that they are putting up in their attempt, or the

mitigation money that any of these people have put up, any of the developers have put up—if we used that money and went to you and said develop as many of these plants as you possibly can with this money and replant them in natural settings throughout their natural habitat. What would be wrong with doing that?

Mr. MCCROHAN. I have two replies to that. First of all—and I do not mean to be flippant here—you would not offer that money.

Secondly—and we could even take it one step farther—you are referring to—I cannot remember all of the specialized species we were talking about here today, but let us get back to the flower-loving fly. Could we use the same analogy?

Mr. POMBO. Yes.

Mr. MCCROHAN. OK. Just prior to Dr. Gentry's death, he received a letter from an agronomist at I believe it was Fort Collins at the germplasm bank that they have there—and this could go back to Idaho—I understand you are from Idaho.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Yes.

Mr. MCCROHAN. Yes. They grow a lot of beans in Idaho, they grow seed beans. They are the most valuable beans. There was a problem with a virus in the beans. And this researcher went back to the germplasm and tested thousands of beans. He came up with one bean that was resistant to that virus. And Dr. Gentry had collected that bean in the 1950's and it remained at the germplasm bank all those years and that was the first time it was used.

That area where he collected that bean is now under a dam, that valley is no longer there, nor is that bean there. The amount of money that was saved by that virus that was previously attacking beans was astronomical, far greater than any amount of pesticide—in fact, it even helped the environment.

So I submit to you that these individual species have their value, we may not have found out what it is yet.

Mr. POMBO. And I do not think we disagree. I do not think what I am saying to you is in disagreement. What I am trying to say is how can I use your talents and your abilities so that we can keep the woolly star from becoming extinct. How can I use your talents—

Mr. MCCROHAN. OK, I understand your question now.

Mr. POMBO. I do not think you are being flippant when you say that I would not offer you the money, because actually that is one of the options that we have in front of us in reforming ESA, is what we do with the money. There are billions of dollars that go into mitigation throughout this country every year and I, quite frankly, do not feel like it is going to the best use.

Mr. MCCROHAN. Right, OK. I think one thing we could do that could help both farmers and individuals who are trying to preserve the ESA would be to develop a program that does research on crops, be they new crops or established crops, to where these crops have a minimum amount of impact on endangered species. For instance you could have crops—if you were to do some research on crops that were more arid adapted, that could be very helpful. There was a farmer I believe at your last hearing, who was complaining about not having enough water, some of his water was cut off and therefore he could not grow, I believe it was cotton, I read a testimony. Well, we should be doing research so that this farmer

is not displaced, this farmer knows that the Federal Government is taking funds to find ways to replace cotton as a crop and have a crop that still brings in a profit for this farmer. And that would just be some type of research program that could be set up.

Mr. POMBO. And I think that if we put aside all the rhetoric for a few minutes and actually talk about what is going on and what you are suggesting, I think we have got some room to go here. I think that there is some common ground that we can work on, because the problem is, the way ESA is working right now is reactionary, is totally reactionary. And we need to be much more proactive in dealing with endangered plants and animals and maintain what you describe as biodiversity.

I think we can do that, but, you know, if anybody digs in their heels and says we are not going to touch it, we are not going to touch it, we will never get there. And we need to open up these discussions so that testimony like yours can come out, so that we can say OK, how can we develop new crops, new products, how can we use your talent so that the woolly star never does become extinct? How can we do that without digging in our heels and saying we are not going to touch it, we are not going to touch it. That is what is happening.

You know, we have tried to listen to some of these ideas that are coming out, and quite frankly what you are saying is not that much different than what the cotton farmer said.

Mr. MCCROHAN. Right.

Mr. POMBO. It is not that much different. The only difference is in the middle of a water contract, he got his water taken away. The bank took away his ranch and he was broke. And his fourth generation farm that had been in his family for all those years—he was the guy that lost it. And I know that you being on the ranch and knowing what that feels like, it does not feel very good to be the generation that lost the ranch.

Mr. MCCROHAN. No.

Mr. POMBO. And we need to figure out a way so that that does not happen again, so that we can stop that.

Unfortunately my time is gone and I know I went over and I apologize to the Committee.

Mr. Faleomavaega.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think since we started the hearing this morning from the other two panels as well as this one before us, the phrase that always seems to stick in my mind, and something that I want to challenge the members of the panel as well as the members of the Committee, is always where do we find a balance, a sense of balance, or striking that balance between developing an ecosystem—and I will be frank with you, I am not an expert in saying that we have the answer, that is why we are here.

There is some concern, and I want to compliment your testimony, Mr. McCrohan, I am familiar with what you said about this, the value of plants. Who would ever say that polio, the cure for polio came from a plant. If I was wrong about that, correct me. There are currently in my own district approximately 200 herbal plants that are being studied right now by the Cancer Research Institute for possibility that this could be a cure. I think all of us here, mem-

bers of the Committee, are very much favorable to the very thing that you have shared with us, about the value of plants and species. At the same time, there is also concern about what happens to that little farmer out there that just does not get any sense of justice from the bureaucrats in Washington. We have to express that concern as well.

I want to ask Mr. Thornton about the questions you raised about the gnatcatchers. I want to compliment your very comprehensive brief on the issue, and certainly you raise some very interesting questions about Dr. Atwood's findings on the gnatcatcher. In fairness to Dr. Atwood—I am not defending him but I wish he were here to respond to the questions that you raised on this.

But be that as it may, you eventually were able to obtain data from Dr. Atwood's research. And I wanted to ask you, what was the Fish and Wildlife Service's response to these findings that you discovered about Dr. Atwood's research?

Mr. THORNTON. The response was to relist the gnatcatcher. As I indicated in my testimony in eight pages of FEDERAL REGISTER text, they largely ignored the detailed technical comments that were submitted. Dr. Barrowclough's name was not mentioned once in the Fish and Wildlife Service response, so to a great extent the comments were ignored, which led to my recommendation that there has to be a more open process that frankly involves a more rigorous procedure for challenging the experts on both sides. And you know, frankly, I think it is fair that the experts on both sides be subject to the same scrutiny.

Mr. FALCOMA. I think Mr. Eaves and Mr. Messersmith also make emphasis of that fact, that perhaps from the bureaucracy that we have in Washington, we need a little more scientific and thorough examination of the species before their listings. Am I correct in hearing this from both of you, gentlemen? Are you suggesting that there just is not enough available scientific data to justify the listings that these scientists are—

Mr. EAVES. We feel that way, but we also feel that there needs to be blind review. That the peer pressure in the scientific community at times puts undue pressure on various scientists. If you do a blind review where there is no fear of any kind of peer pressure, then you get a lot better results and you have a true scientific evaluation of both sides.

Mr. FALCOMA. I am having this very serious problem with the recognition of American Indian tribes to be federally recognized. You would not believe the criterias and the kinds of things that these poor tribes have to go through, after going through the procedure that the BIA, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has devised for the past 10 years. So I can appreciate where you are coming from on that line.

Mr. Ahrens, I am very interested about your motorized recreation and how this translates into the economy of the state. I was wanting to know if you feel that ESA is not doing justice to your organization's needs, am I hearing this correctly? I mean, what seems to be the problem?

Mr. AHRENS. Absolutely, you are right. Primarily again, the problem is a lack of science. Oftentimes, and I cite several species in my written testimony that probably have some real problems, there

is not a lot of science, but there probably are some problems. One that comes to mind is the peninsula big-horned sheep where the sheep's population is isolated, and that is a problem because we built freeways and we built communities. It has also got a problem with predation. We decided in the state to protect the mountain lion and now 22 percent of the takes on big-horn sheep are because of mountain lions.

And what we are talking about now in a habitat conservation plan is again restricting public access. How that will keep mountain lions from eating sheep or solve this gene pool problem, I do not understand that, and it seems very unreasonable.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I wanted to ask the members of the panel how would we address the burden of saying OK, we do not have enough scientific studies, we do not have this, we cannot do that. And if we are going to cut the budget that is going to limit the resources available for these agencies to do their—to fulfill their responsibilities by law. How do we make an equation so that we balance that concern, to say that we cannot do this and we do not have the resources, but then what if in fact the Congress cuts the resources from these agencies to do their work?

Mr. AHRENS. Sir, I would say that in my mind anyway, you ask a difficult question and I am frankly glad I do not have to make that decision. But I would also say that in my mind what that tells me is just in my own budget, I do the things that really have to be done, not the things that feel good to be done. And from our perspective anyway, if you want to help big-horn sheep or desert tortoise, you go after those key causes of the decline, where your money is probably the best spent, rather than trying to lock up private property or restrict public access, which is easy and feels good, but it does not help the species.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. My time is up, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. POMBO. Thank you.

Ms. Chenoweth.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Thornton, I would like to ask you—by the way, your testimony was extremely interesting and I know that the law requires that we make these listings based on gene pool science. Based on Figure 3 and Figure 4 of Dr. Atwood's work, it does not appear that gene pools were used in the listing of this species. I mean how can we equate the color of breast feathers to gene pools?

Mr. THORNTON. Well, that is an excellent point, and one of the suggestions that we made and our experts made was that there had to be some genetic testing conducted in this instance, and for reasons that we cannot understand, the Service resisted doing that, although they have done that in other instances. Because attempting to define whether there is a distinct genetic stock on the basis of very indirect inferential references from the coloration of breast feathers, frankly is quite a subjective business and one of the underlying problems here.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. I would personally be interested in working with you further on this and getting some of the data on that for our further work.

Mr. THORNTON. Be happy to do so.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Thank you very much.

Mr. Eaves, your testimony is absolutely incredible. How in the world can they measure—I mean, I like flowers too, but I am not a Delhi Sands flower-loving fly. How in the world can they possibly measure the population of these flies?

Mr. EAVES. They have about six people out on the sand dunes looking for them.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. And that is their way of collecting the science?

Mr. EAVES. Yes.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. That is their way of counting the flies?

Mr. EAVES. Yes.

[Laughter.]

Mr. EAVES. We are paying about \$90,000 a year for them to go out and spend time, a number of observers, spending time on this 1.92 acres that we have set aside, and this past year, I think they did sight—they had 20 sightings, but again, they cannot—I mean you cannot grab a fly and put a tag around it or put a homing device on it—

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Or a radio tracking collar.

Mr. EAVES. Right. So they had 20 sightings, but that was over a period of like the six hours that they were there every day for like seven days. But they do not know whether that was—they did sight four or five at one time, so I mean there was a minimum of four or five, but it could have been those four or five that they sighted on a number of occasions.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Have they done gene pool analysis on these flies?

Mr. EAVES. No, we do not think they have. We do not think there is any scientific data on the larvae or the pupae or whatever they are. They are burrowed in the sand for 11 months out of the year and it is very difficult for them to do—and we are concerned about the credibility of the study that was done.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Well, you certainly have a heavy responsibility, because when it does come to public health crisis versus a fly, I vote for you and making sure that we have the facilities for a public health crisis.

[Applause.]

Mr. EAVES. Part of the response to this though, and some of what I have heard, we have started trying to set up a multi-species habitat conservation plan, and we are talking about taking all of the land that is existing, the flood control land, the land that has already been dedicated for natural parks and Edison easements, all the easements that we have got, and try to—our proposal is 41 species—that is animal species—and 32 plant species, to protect them, to have an ongoing plan. The problem is it is probably going to cost us about \$1.8 million to do the study, another million to set the plan up and about probably \$15 million to \$20 million to purchase enough land to do this.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Eaves, I really appreciate your forward thinking concept, but again, I would urge you to go slow on this. I would urge you—

Mr. EAVES. We are going real slow.

Mrs. CHENOWETH [continuing]. to take a look at the Supreme Court case which emerged out of the Claims Court, by the way, entitled Dolan v. The City of Tigart, because it is really the local

units of government with regards to the impact that their decisions make on private property that have to pay. And that is the most recent Supreme Court decision with regards to the taking of property.

I do want to ask Mr. Messersmith, you indicated that you had received a notice on November 16, 16 months after the district submitted the right-of-way application to the BLM to Fish and Wildlife Service, and that they had designated a wild desert tortoise population in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Did they show you any science or any work that they had done to make sure that they had done the proper work before not allowing you to proceed with what the public trust asks you to do?

Mr. MESSERSMITH. No, we just received a copy of a letter from BLM stating the fact.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Let me read to you a section of the Endangered Species Act, it is out of Section 7, it is under (c)(1), which says "To facilitate compliance with this Act, each agency, with respect to any action of the agency for which no contract for construction has been entered into and for which no construction has begun, on November 10, 1978, request of the Secretary information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of such proposed action." Now listen, "If the Secretary advises..." and this is their words "...based on the best scientific and commercial data available, that such species may be present, such agency shall conduct a biological assessment for the purpose of identifying any endangered species or threatened species which is likely to be affected by such action." And your project was stopped not by a biological assessment, but by a simple letter, right?

Mr. MESSERSMITH. Well, the project really was not stopped by the simple letter, but the intent of the letter, in order to obtain the biological opinion from the Service and the 2081 permit from the California Department of Fish and Game, because of the time involved with obtaining those permits, that is what stopped the project.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Well, I think that it is important for all local units of government to make sure that the necessary assessments and scientific data has been accumulated, to make sure you do not assume the liability.

And you know, I just want to thank all of you and the people of Riverside County. It was the Secretary of Interior who at one time said "Private property is that antiquated Anglo-Saxon concept that has passed its time." And that we must identify our enemies and drive them into oblivion. And little did I believe—

[Verbal expression from the audience.]

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Thank you very much.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Calvert.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thornton, in your testimony, you go into detail with the frustrating process that you had to obtain the data that Dr. Atwood used to come to his conclusion regarding the gnatcatcher. Through your experience, do we find that same type of activity getting data that is being used to make a case for an endangered species being proprietary and that that data is not public information?

Mr. THORNTON. Well, I think frankly the position that Dr. Atwood took was outrageous and obviously the Court found that it was unlawful. My view of that is when someone enters the regulatory arena, the data that they are relying on has to be made available to the public. If Dr. Atwood wanted to remain an academic researcher and to keep his data proprietary, he certainly had the right to do that in my view. But when he entered the regulatory arena by petitioning the listing, then it seems to me that his data is fair game.

I think the underlying message of this story is that you cannot have these decisions made simply on the basis of published articles. He published two articles; they were peer reviewed articles; they came to diametrically opposite conclusions. None of the so-called peer reviewers of his articles identified the fundamental underlying problems that we have subsequently discovered. And that says to me that you have to have access to the data. And frankly, this is not a novel concept. I mean, the principle of law that we relied on in our litigation frankly goes back 15-20 years under the Administrative Procedures Act. It requires Federal agencies to make the underlying information available to the public.

Mr. CALVERT. Then would you say this was an isolated incident or are there other cases, information, data that has been obtained to make a case for an endangered species that has been hidden from public view?

Mr. THORNTON. Well, this is certainly the most egregious example that I am aware of. I think it says that in all instances you really have to have that underlying data that is made available for scrutiny one way or the other.

Mr. CALVERT. I think that is excellent advice and I would think as we move toward changing the Endangered Species Act that data used by either side, either pro or con, that information in its entirety should be able to be reviewed by the public and by other members of the science community. So I appreciate your testimony.

Mr. McCROHAN, I found your testimony interesting and I agree that there are plant species and animal species that need to be preserved. Do you realize that under the Act as it is written today, that if you collect species from the national forests and subsequently one of those species becomes listed, you are not able to obtain that species any longer?

Mr. MCCROHAN. Right.

Mr. CALVERT. Do you not believe that if in fact a species becomes listed as endangered, you should be able to take that species and collect it in a reasonable manner to propagate that species or to encourage its continued existence?

Mr. MCCROHAN. I think anything like that should be done under some scientific control through a university or through U.S. Department of Agriculture. I do not think a private citizen should have the right to go out there and do that.

Mr. CALVERT. But under those situations, you believe that it should be able to be done?

Mr. MCCROHAN. Yes.

Mr. CALVERT. Through a controlled situation, either the University of California, for instance, if that is chosen, or others, that should be an allowed practice.

Mr. MCCROHAN. Well, there certainly is going to be a difference between populations if you are going to have eight flies to collect; no, you probably should not. If you have 8000 of another species—I think the question is a little too broad for a competent answer.

Mr. CALVERT. Now as you know, there are many endangered species.

Mr. MCCROHAN. Yes, I do.

Mr. CALVERT. And as you go out collecting those species, does it concern you that sometimes you might make a mistake and by accident—not anything on purpose—collect a species that has been listed?

Mr. MCCROHAN. I know the species I am looking for and I know which ones in the area are endangered when I go into the area.

Mr. CALVERT. So you are confident when you do that, that you will absolutely make no mistakes at all?

Mr. MCCROHAN. I am never that confident about anything, I will admit that.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to also thank all the witnesses and everyone who attended this hearing today and I want to thank the Chairman for coming to Riverside and I want to thank Don Young, our Resources Chairman, for allowing us to have these Task Force hearings. And again, welcome all to Riverside, and thank you very much.

Mr. POMBO. Thank you.

Mr. Faleomavaega.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I neglected to express earlier also my appreciation for the good people of Riverside allowing me the opportunity to visit your good city and the good citizens of this county, and also meeting with Congressman Calvert.

I would like to ask Mr. Chairman's indulgence—and I realize that because of the factor of time situation that perhaps there were others that may have wanted to testify before the Task Force, that if the record could be kept open and allow other members of the Community to submit statements to be made part of the record. And certainly allow others so that we will have a thoroughly comprehensive record of the Task Force as we set about our task in trying to sift through the tremendous amount of testimony and the kind of constructive, I believe, suggestions that have been offered by several panelists. And I certainly appreciate their time and their effort. If the Chairman would not object, I would like to offer that as a motion to the Task Force on behalf of our side of the aisle, since I am the only one here, so that we could make that allowance for the other members of the community here to submit those statements.

Mr. POMBO. Without objection, and I will point out that in every other hearing we have had, as in this hearing, the official record of this hearing will remain open for 14 days. We have received literally hundreds of requests for people to testify and time does not allow us to take oral testimony from everyone. But the Task Force official record will be held open for 14 days. If you have testimony that you would like to present, ideas, solutions, anything that we can put of value into this debate, I would not only welcome but encourage you to submit that testimony for the record. It will be

treated exactly the same way as the testimony that was given orally, it will be included in the official record of the Task Force and will be included in the official record.

I would also like to point out that you can mail in testimony to 1320 Longworth, in Washington, D.C. and the zip code is 20515. So if you did not have the opportunity to bring testimony with you today or if there are things that you heard that you want to make comment on or anything that pertains to the Endangered Species Act, you can mail in the testimony to 1320 Longworth, Washington, D. C. 20515.

Mr. FALDOMVAEGA. If the Chairman would yield further.

Mr. POMBO. Yes.

Mr. FALDOMVAEGA. I believe perhaps the members of the Committee are not aware that the ranking Democrat on the Task Force is Congressman Jerry Studds from Massachusetts and that the ranking Majority member of the Democratic side of the Committee is Congressman George Miller. So if there are any problems in submitting the statements directly to the Task Force, you can certainly submit your statements directly to these gentlemen, and I would like to offer that as an additional suggestion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POMBO. Absolutely.

In closing, I would like to thank all of you for being here today. A special thanks to all of the people who were here to testify, for the work that you put into your testimony. I appreciate it a great deal.

I would like to say that one of the reporters before this all started asked me if we were concerned about the number of people that showed up today. And I think that Congressman Metcalf from Washington probably said it the best on Monday when we were asked the same question in Vancouver. He said, "I have spent my entire political career trying to get people interested in what was going on and now that they turn out, I am not about to complain about it." I think that this is a great sign that we are on our way toward a very profitable debate over what changes need to be made and what needs to be preserved and what we can do in trying to make an Endangered Species Act that is going to be supported by the people, that we can really work with, that will work in the real world.

I appreciate a great deal the hospitality of the people of Riverside, of our host, Congressman Ken Calvert, and to the other members of the Task Force for being here with me today.

Thank you very much. The meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 2:17 p.m., the Task Force was adjourned; and the following was submitted for the record:]

Source: United States. Congress. House. Committee on Resources. Task Force on Endangered Species(1995). *Endangered Species Act--Riverside, CA: oversight hearing before the Task Force on Endangered Species Act of the Committee on Resources, House of Representatives, One Hundred Fourth Congress, first session, on the impact of the Endangered Species Act on the area around Riverside, California, April 26, 1995--Riverside, CA.* Washington: U.S. G.P.O.