

1 Jayne Belnap

INTERVIEW WITH: Jayne Belnap, United States Geological Survey
INTERVIEWER: Marsha Holland, Southern Utah Oral History Project
INTERVIEW NUMBER: One
DATE OF INTERVIEW: January 3, 2011
PLACE OF INTERVIEW: USGS Headquarters, Moab, Utah
SUBJECT OF INTERVIEW: History, Grand Staircase- Escalante National Monument
TRANSCRIBER: Marsha Holland
DATE: October 20, 2011

Sony IC Recorder, converted to .wav file, transcribed with Start Stop system.

A part of the Southern Utah Oral History Project: Oral histories from people who were involved with the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in the early days – from those who helped with designation of the Monument, to those who were the first to do research on the Monument after it was designated.

MH: Today is January 3rd, 2011. I am in Moab, Utah. I am meeting with Jayne Belnap. How are you doing today?

JB: OK.

MH: Thanks for meeting with me. Jayne if you can please introduce yourself, full name, date of birth, place, and a bit about the family you were born into.

JB: My name is Jayne Belnap. I was born February 2, 1952, in Salt Lake City where I grew up. I spent all my summers and weekends with my father who was a prospector looking for the eternal gold mine in Nevada and Southern Utah. My childhood was basically spent in Tonopah, Gold Hill, and Southern Utah.

MH: Was he successful?

2 Jayne Belnap

JB: No. (laughter) Actually he was, sort of. He found one, but he gave up trying to mine it and sold it to his partner and then his partner struck it rich and has a casino in Reno.

MH: So, you spent a lot of time digging around in the dirt?

JB: Spent a lot of time digging in dirt and have always been fascinated by environmental, the wrong word, but in the outdoors. So, I was a ski racer, swimmer, an athlete outdoors my whole life.

MH: That seems it would naturally lead to furthering your education that might be focused on something involving the outdoors?

JB: Not when I started. I just went to school, because that was what you were supposed to do. I started at Dartmouth College. My last year of high school was in Hanover, New Hampshire, then went to Dartmouth College cause I was right there, then went to Boston University, then I was like, I am just going to school, no idea what I want to do. So, I quit and moved back to Utah, to Alta where I was skiing and having fun. Then I felt a little guilty and so went to the University of Utah for a quarter. Then I thought, Why am I feeling guilty, I still don't know what I want to do. So I am actually wasting everyone's time by doing this. I stopped school, kept skiing and doing other things for quite awhile. One day I woke up, literally, and I said, I know what I want to do. I want to get involved in helping preserve the planet, it the best way to put it. I want to help do what I can to take care of plants and animals that are out there that seemed like we were running rough-shod over. I was at Santa Cruz at that point. Maybe in 1976. I went to UC Santa Cruz. I went there as a junior transfer, because I had all these credits to transfer. Plus, in those days you had the CLEP test, and you could test out of all your liberal arts stuff. I tested out of all the liberal arts stuff. I went in as a junior transfer and I took geology. I was going to be a geology major. I was one quarter short of finishing and I said I don't want to be geology, realizing that I

3 Jayne Belnap

would work for an oil company or the government, and I didn't want to work for either, so I started all over again and started biology, took every biology class I could get my hands on. I was fascinated and had so much fun. I spent a lot of time at UC Santa Cruz, going in as a junior transfer, I didn't graduate until 1980, did two majors really. I did two full majors, because I did natural history and biology and geology minus one quarter.

MH: Good background!

JB: Good background (laughter). And the best part is I ended up working for the government. Here we are. I then went on to get my Masters at Stanford. I became really fascinated by western landscapes. I was a Marine Biologist to start with. Santa Cruz part was reasonable. The Stanford part was reasonable, but then I really wanted to come back to the desert. I actually got my PhD from BYU in the range department studying the mosses and lichens that are referred to in the Proclamation, the crypto-gamic soil crust. (looking at the Proclamation for wordage.) Crypto-biotic crusts. That was what my PhD was on and it what I spent the next twenty-five years studying because it turns out that they are essential to the ecosystem well being of deserts.

MH: Is it like the canary in the cage?

JB: Sort of and sort of not. The canary in the cage falls over and then everyone else falls over. It is a much slower process than that. It is not like you kill them off and everything and everything will fall over right away. It will degrade slowly. It will be a slow mediocrity slide. It is a good indicator. It is an indicator of soil stability for sure. That is the best one. Where you don't have them you will have accelerated soil erosion. Which is a really big deal for us since the soil is so shallow in so many places. The soil fertility; they are really important in contributing to soil fertility plus soil erosion means lose of nutrients. It is a double whammy for soil fertility part, too. They really have turned out to be very essential.

4 Jayne Belnap

MH: And the crypto bionic soil takes time to grow?

JB: It takes a lot of time.

MH: And we have a lot over where I live near the Monument, every time we hike it is, Oh no, watch out. I can hear little voices saying Ahhh!

JB: I have created a whole generation of paranoid people, it is great. (laughter) I am responsible for just that when I started this, all that people knew was the names of the organisms, the lichens and the mosses, but nobody knew what they did. No one had studied that. They recognized they existed. So, taxonomists were interested, but really no one had taken any sort of ecology or biology look at them in how they may function in the ecosystem. So, basically that is what this lab has done in the last twenty-five years, focus on what do they do. Now, in China, China has become the center of crust world. They are doing a phenomenal amount of work on the soil crust because they have huge stabilization problems, so they are really interested in them to stabilize landscapes. They are taking over the center of the crust world.

MH: Yes, I saw a presentation on that at the U; China and their landslide problems, was it Aswan dam that collapsed?

JB: Three Gorges. Their problems are sands bearing railroad tracks bearing roads; they have a lot of over utilization of their landscapes, high intensity of everything.

MH: Your doctoral was on Crypto bionic soils, right?

JB: I was already here, in Moab, working for the Park Service when I finished my PhD. I was already here and they just let me do it and it was great. It was very forward looking of them to let me do that.

5 Jayne Belnap

MH: How did you become involved with the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, when was that and what was your involvement?

JB: I got a phone call. NBS, National Biological Survey had just been formed, not long before. They were asked to be involved to be involved in where the boundaries would be for the Monument; they wanted to make sure the biological and geological and other sorts of 'ological resources were in the boundaries. I got a phone call from DC asking me if I would come back to make sure the resources that were in that area were actually being included in the Monument. So, they wouldn't just leave some plant over the boundary that was endangered, that we would really do this from a scientific viewpoint that the basis of this was that Monument boundaries should adhere to scientific principles and not just be random boundaries in space. That is what I did.

MH: So, at that point we assume that you are very familiar with the area?

JB: Right, I had been there a lot. I worked on different research projects and hiking and biking and backpacking. I had been there a lot. I knew a lot of their resources in general anyway. We have a lot of the same resources here as there. The reason is in desert landscapes the soil controls a lot of what happens. We have a lot of the same soil types here as occur there; the same geologic formations, two very similar regions. They are kind of small regions, but really similar. Being extra familiar with here, too, I would already know a lot about what was going on there.

The bigger thing was to really find basic scientific principles. So, for instance, you will notice that inside that monument there are three examples of all the major sub-strata. To do a scientific study, you need to have replicates, and you have to have at least three. So, if I want to look at some plane on sandstone, then I have got to have three special separate areas of sandstone. We made sure that we had three special separate areas of sandstone. You'll notice that funny blob going underneath Hwy 89; it is there because of the limestone. It was important to get the third

limestone, had to look around for it. It has to be separate, otherwise someone can say rightfully so, is all you know about is sandstone in that place, so it must be spatially separated so you can say, Look in all three places, miles and miles apart we have the same answer, or we got a different answer. That is the way you learn whether or not you knew something, is having the replication. Three is the minimum. Five is by far preferred, but that was just not going to happen, given the landscape there.

The intention at the beginning was not to go below the highway, because it makes it more difficult to manage. That is why, for instance why that blob is there. The other basic principle is connecting low elevations to high elevations so animals like deer can migrate, you want these corridors and you want more than one because something could happen to that corridor. So, two or three or four or five, so you can get up from high to low. Those basic principles that we were trying to make sure were involved in the boundaries, that they contained those, then plants of concern and animals of concern. After spending some time in DC and came back here and went to the TNC Heritage data base, which by then had turned it over to Utah, went through which plants that were endangered, were in there, that we weren't leaving something out say, by half a mile. It was important to have good solid boundaries in terms of the plant populations, so we didn't run right through one. Again, it was an attempt to make this a place where you could really do good science. It was coming from not how big you could make it or how small you could make it, but what could you do there that would make science defensible, come in from a management viewpoint and say we really know this about that. Then, of course, where there was the paleontology and archeology and other things that come in on top of that which I had less to do with. I was really from the biological, geological point of it.

MH: Are you working with a set of maps specific to vegetation, were there overlays to it?

7 Jayne Belnap

JB: Well, no. You have the corridors, the topography, biology, geologic sub-straits, all these different things you are trying to think of. The Kaiparowits is dinosaur heaven, and got a good hunk of Kaiparowits in there. But, they are unknown, not discovered yet, so you can't say, unlike the plant populations, where we had some good locations, you couldn't say, well there are some dinosaurs there we need to have in there, because you didn't know where they were yet. In that case you had to take sub-straits that you knew were of the right age, and say OK, we need a lot of that.

MH: And don't you think the paleontologists think they have hit a gold mine now?

JB: Oh, man, it is an incredible gold mine. But there were hints that the Kaiparowits had a lot of good stuff in it. Certainly, it was the right age. It wasn't a complete mind blowing surprise, but the extent and number of species had certainly been a major surprise. I think that was the most important thing that was attractive to me, to be involved, to actually design something intentionally. Our Parks are not designed intentionally, other things are not designed intentionally,,; it is a political battle over what landscapes can you get included or not. This was so nice to be able to think about it in a scientific way and say we really need this blob, or we don't really need that blob in order to make this area scientifically defensible.

MH: In all, this was a unique blob.

JB: It was.

MH: Still pristine in some ways or is that an overstatement?

JB: Yes. It is not pristine at all. It has been heavily used. There are not many parts of it that haven't been heavily utilized.

MH: Ranching, mining, recreation?

8 Jayne Belnap

JB: Mostly ranching.

MH: I read an interesting historic analysis of the landscape which stated by the turn of the century, the 1900s, the land was desiccated, overgrazed.

JB: That is common throughout the west; the big herds hit here in 1850 and really really hammered this place until the huge die-off in 1898. It was ubiquitous, everywhere. There was an estimate of one hundred and fifty thousand animals just down the street from here, where right now the allotment is six hundred. The number of animals in Utah was over four million in 1900, and now less than a million domestic animals. It is staggering the number of animals that were here and it was true everywhere. What happened was there was a deep freeze in the 1898 that killed all the animals off.

They just started to build the herds back and in 1920, or so, they realized they had ruined the place; they had converted the grassland to sagebrush. Most of central Utah was grasslands, so when you drive from Salt Lake to St. George, that was all grassland. That was converted in fifteen or twenty years, that was written in the journals. They realized they had lost the forage base for the animals that they had destroyed their resources, and so that was when the Taylor Grazing Act came in, the ranchers asked for it. They said we can't manage this landscape, we need help. It was the tragedy of the commons, nobody owned it, and nobody had to be responsible for it, so nobody took care of it. If there was one blade of green left the next guy would come and put his animals on it. By 1898 the gig was up and so over the next twenty years there were people building their herds back up, but it really wiped everyone out. Except for a few really rich people who could bring in larger herds right away, everyone else had to build back up from the beginning. We had the Taylor Grazing Act in place to rearrange our priorities.

MH: Yes, to regulate and limit.

9 Jayne Belnap

JB: Yes, but you have to ask the question of those prior landscapes and what they looked like. I think we have plenty of evidence of what we think is natural, especially where the sage brush is, was grass, not sagebrush. It was grassland with some sagebrush, not sage brush with some grasses. Other areas, we have probably tipped them over into a new state, and they are going to remain that way, unless we want to go in and mechanically remove something and put back what was there, which isn't going to happen on a west-wide level, ever.

MH: Wasn't there then chaining, or raiiling to rid the land of sage?

JB: Yes, but then they planted crested wheat grass, which doesn't quite count as natural restoration and then they graze it again. So, that is really different than saying, Ok, could we get this place back where it was, and I am not saying that this is even a desired endpoint, but as an intellectual exercise, I don't know if it would even be possible, because you have all these things now. If you do that to a small area, you now have all the sagebrush raining seed in to an area where only grass seed was raining into. There is pressure pushing against that area that you just chained out anyway, that wouldn't have been there.

MH: The genie is out of the bottle.

JB: The genie is out of the bottle, and that is just assuming you would want to get there. We are in the time of desired landscapes and have to decide what it is that we want. We are pretty good at doing things when we have money and pretty bad at doing things that way when we are broke. We treasure endangered species when we are not up against the wall, and the minute we are, they are out the window.

The Monument by no means was pristine and some areas were just hammered beyond belief when the Monument was formed. There was a wonderful range assessment done on the

Monument right after it was formed, where they went out and rated areas poor, medium, fair, good and very good condition. Almost all of it was poor or fair.

MH: From a scientific standpoint on the Monument, what was the draw?

JB: Some science doesn't need lack of grazing, in fact lots of it doesn't depend on it at all. People think of deserts as rocks and dirt anyway, so they don't know when they see it, what condition it is in. When you know what it ought to look like you see how degraded it is from what it should be in terms of about any value you can think of; forage, aesthetics, whatever, if you know what you are looking for and you go out there and think, Whoa! It is not just the Monument; it is most of the Western US. Whoa! There is plenty of science that can be done without it and always there is the really interesting question of how do you use landscapes sustainably. Now we have these areas that are in similar tanked condition, what do we do about it, both in terms of getting them back to a more desirable state, I won't say restoration because we won't ever be able to do that, back to a more desirable state or using them as they are now so they do not degrade further. There are all sorts of grazing utilizations questions that are there. But there are tons of science questions that have nothing to do with that kind of state, that are of great interest to people.

MH: Such as things that have never been studied before, unique...

JB: Or the same things somewhere really different. That is how you learn whether you know what you think you know or not. I travel all over the world for the express purpose of seeing if I know what I think I know. I have to go somewhere really different, go to Russia and decide that it is true there too then I can decide I really know something. It is the same thing; it is very valuable to go there with something you think you know whether it be an ecological process or whatever and find out if you really know it or not.

11 Jayne Belnap

MH: What a great job.

JB: Yes.

MH: What was your affiliation with the Grand Staircase, not really an entity then, but more of a vision then...

JB: Then I came back when it was the entity, but first there was the vision part of the boundaries, getting everything in there. Once it was formed ...

MH: And this is all happening in Washington D.C.?

JB: This is all happening in Washington. Once it was formed then, I can't remember why, but a group of USGS people, well, the Monument invited a group of us, mostly geologists, then me as a biologist, to come over and look at the place. I can't remember why, but we were all there and we did this tour of the place and talked about the kinds of science that would be really interesting to do there from a geologist's viewpoint and an ecologist's viewpoint. We talked about a lot of the issues that were facing the place.

MH: For example?

JB: The thing that stands out in my mind was the Burr Trail. It has been a huge source of contention for Capital Reef and the County forever. And, we are driving down the Burr Trail, years ago in the early 90s, like '96, right after the Monument was formed, driving down the Burr Trail and I hadn't been there for years and thinking to myself, this isn't dirt anymore, they have done something to it. The County would always claim they had done nothing to it, just a stabilizer that they sprayed on it. One of the geologist guys got out with this little machine and put it down on the road and looked at it and said, "No, no, this has magnetite in it." And here we are in a sedimentary landscape. He goes over to the rock and shows there is no magnetite here and said,

“They have brought in road base, with magnetite in it.” That was actually a great thing and I have been working with him ever since and have done all sorts of really cool stuff as a result of that trip. It was going around and having him say, We can tell inputs of dust from other places with this little box, so we can go to these different places and tell about how much dust has come into your system, how much soil you are losing from wind erosion with that box. That is an example of something that you could do.

We went down to the Cockscomb and talked about how you could do all this cool stuff with biology looking at the controls of sub-strait because you have the same exposure, the same everything, same climate, you just have these adjoining sub-straits sandwiched right there. It was that kind of thing, brainstorming with all the different kinds of things you could do with the resources there.

Then I reviewed some documents that were probably science plans for them. But it wasn't anything formally named. The only formal thing I was engaged in was the boundary drawing. The science plan review, they were sending it to me and I was reviewing it and sending it back with comments, but was not part of an advisory group.

MH: Initially, however you were part of an advisory group to establish the boundaries.

JB: Yes.

MH: And your main work objectives, again then, were to make sure the proper boundaries were identified.

JB: Again, it was with those scientific principles being used to identify the boundaries. I can't tell you how cool that was because it was the only time it has ever happened. No one has been able to, I can't think of an instance when that was the driving [force]. This monument was for

13 Jayne Belnap

science, it is the Proclamation, it was the intention of it and we really did it that way. It was awesome; I thought it was so cool. It was the right time and to be able to do that...There were a few things that would have been nice to include that we didn't get to, like Johnson Canyon, to have both sides of it. It is crazy to have a boundary run up the middle of a canyon, but there was too much private property in there and too much mind-boggle to make it work.

MH: There was some aspect of the Proclamation I remember reading where there was an exchange of School Trust Lands and Tropic had a little piece in the middle of the Grand Staircase and that was traded, or some kind of exchange. But now it is city land, but the point is there were little islands sort of land-locked all over, weren't there?

JB: The islands, well one, the idea was later to glomming stuff and trading it, and other islands were included for different reasons, that weren't biological, so I don't know the reasons for them. Rob Hellie is the man to tell you why every blob that is there, is there. He was the person who worried about every single scribble and how wide was the pen that made the boundary.

MH: And what was your working group like?

JB: It was mostly attorneys. (laughter) There were two biologists and Bob and another BLM person in the conservation group and attorneys. The attorneys obviously had a huge part here, it was a good thing and it was important to have this monument not be any bigger than it needed to be to accomplish the purpose and not any smaller than it needed to be to accomplish the purpose. It was really questioning every square inch of the boundary, about why this is here, or why this isn't in here. It was an incredibly valuable exercise... Why is this box excluded and this box included? It was a lot of back and forth about making sure it was defensible. I appreciated it because it should have been.

Every monument we have made has turned into a national park. They don't disappear and they become real national treasures. It should be thought about really carefully. It is sort of sad having had this experience and looking back on how other parks have been created and think it was all politics, mostly. You get as much as you can and then you run away. This was such a much nicer thoughtful exercise, doing what we really think we need to do and try to get the really best thing because it will be, more or less in perpetuity. It was really taking this responsibility seriously and we are talking about something that will be around a really long time. I actually appreciated their very pointed questions, especially, Why is that in there? My little limestone loop, they hated my limestone loop; I said, It has got to be there, you can't not have it.

I wish we could have included a corridor going over to Bryce, to link stuff for animals but there was just too much private property. We have this really nice connection between Canyonlands, Glen Canyon, down here to the Monument and then we have a gap and Bryce and a gap and then Zion. It would have been so nice to have animal corridors, even if they were little, to connect those areas.

My job was to present the biological best and that was a biological best, was to connect to Zion, then we have the animal corridors. From a biological best, absolutely, from a political reality best, it ain't gonna happen.

MH: In your working group you had Rob Hellie...

JB: I can't remember the BLM guy and there were a couple of people who came in and out, and I don't remember their names. Rob will know, he knows all.

MH: It sounds you feel confident the product you produced, you were successful at that?

JB: Yes. The only thing we failed on was getting the third corridor. And that was not from a replication viewpoint, but for making sure the migrations going up and down really would work. We also don't have the three riparian areas, low to high gradients, which would have been nice to have. That is of course where people are, so that is the hardest of all. Given the landscape and the time and all the constraints totally, it is actually pretty stunning what got pulled off. The sad part was that the grazing was put back in; it was out until 2 am the night before. Again I got back to this perpetuity thing. We are talking about something that has been decided it was a national treasure. Here is where you get to the values; it is such an interesting thing to be in the middle of dialog all the time, because I work on soils. Soils are impacted by live stock grazing. Watching people's value systems crash so violently around livestock, and having people really believe that using the land is God's will. And using it means livestock to them, it doesn't mean hiking and whatever. It means agriculture, plowing it. It is God's will, really deeply religious. It took me years to understand this, that it wasn't just them being flippant or needing that livelihood, it was deeply held religious belief that it is God's will for man to use the earth.

MH: And to make it better, dams and roads.

JB: I understand the angst of the folks down there, for some of them. I also know that there are a lot of people here, that if you took away the national parks, they would be extremely unhappy. The reason they have a livelihoods is because of the national parks. Most towns that have a national park next door ...think of removing Yellowstone and say we are going to un-national park this place with all the communities, and all the economies that have built up around that. That will happen over there, it will take a while, but it is going to happen. People have been resistant to letting it happen...

MH: I believe it is generational thing as well. It is something you have to become accustomed to it.

Based on the histories we have taken from the 90, 80 and now the 60 year old rancher, there is now a slight acceptance and tolerance whereas for the ninety year old, their land was stolen away.

JB: That land was stolen when the statehood came. I was raised Mormon and I was raised that this is our land, this is not federal land. This land has been stolen for a really long time but, not by the Monument.

MH: Exactly, it is cultural heritage, that they teach and it is there.

JB: It is still my knee jerk reaction; this is our land, not the federal government's land. What delusion are you under? (Laughter)

MH: It is nice to hear someone verbalize these different ways of seeing the land. Many urbanites that have never been to these areas, with no relationship to the land, who support conservation efforts have a much different perspective than a rancher whose family was called here. You said it perfectly, a God given duty to take care of this land; two different definitions of environmentalism.

JB: I think it has a lot to do with the dialog should be how do you take care of the land? Everyone, I think, no matter what their vision of God it, say it is God's will that we take care of the land. Then we get into this discussion about what does that mean? That is where I watch people fall apart, thinking the only thing you can do it hike in it. Sand Flats was in fine condition with the cows. It was mountain bikers that killed it off. When I saw that I thought, Now isn't that interesting. I watched it several times, people riding everywhere, making a mess. I tried to talk to some of them about it and they were the most arrogant, I am a well educated

environmentalist who sends my money to Sierra Club, you have nothing to tell me. I would way rather deal with a rancher, frankly. But it made me appreciate that fact it is all about our construct; what does taking care of the land mean? That is just a social value, not a right or wrong. This is where we get down to social values. Now if we are struggling over an endangered species, OK. Different topic, different thing, we are going to wipe this thing off the face of the earth, yeah. Then I get a little more, I know what is right or wrong. I have right and wrong and know what is not right to do.

When I talk about this versus that, I don't think we have the right to degrade the landscape to the point it loses its potential to grow plants. I have one boundary out here. I don't think it is right either to lock everyone out, and I mean everyone, and say you can't go in there. The Russians do that. They have these things called zapovedniks, no one can go in. I think that is pretty strange too. It is meant to protect it. It is very cool. In their parks they have an inner core, the zapovedniks where no one can go in. This came from Stalin's days when they were trying to protect their mink populations. They were using them for fur coats, they didn't want anyone hunting. Actually, they are sables. Occasionally they will let wildlife biologists in, not even regularly. Around that they had their back country, backpacking zones, and around that they had their casual-use, not day use zones, and around that they have day-use zones. But these cores, you did not go in because you would be shot. The whole idea was to protect the mink populations. They are huge.

I was working for the Park Service at the time, and the Soviet Union brought us over to talk about parks, how to manage them. I took one look; we don't have anything to teach you guys, you have done it way better than we have. It was the perfect concept, a core that was your source of populations of things that you valued. You have more and more impacts to those

sources as you go out. I see these two opposites and I know there is an answer in the middle, everyone will have a different take on it and that is where the dialog has to happen and some compromises made.

Most humans don't recognize, first of all, the cultural background of the people here and how we really think this is our land. And secondly, God gave it to us, which is deep inside, not willy-nilly. Brigham Young just didn't come to a willy-nilly place; he was destined to this place. It is really hard for people to understand that.

My family was actually sent down to Springdale. My great great grandfather settled Springdale.

MH: I interviewed the Crawford's from down there; their family had property in the park they farmed, ranched.

JB: His last name was Petty, hence the Petty Point in Zion National Park that was part of their land. The cousins got together about ten years ago and took all the aunts and uncles in a big bus and took everyone down to Springdale, Rockville, that whole area. We drove through Zion in this big bus; everyone wanted a drink so we got out at the IMAX. My aunts and uncles saw all these old photos along the walls, all of them and their friends. They were saying, "Look ! It is Ida Mae. Remember that day we went on that..." It was unbelievable, it gave me chills. They were stunned; no idea that this would be what was waiting for them inside the IMAX. Really neat.

MH: My last question is what is your current assignment? Do you continue to have affiliation with the Monument?

JB: No, my only affiliation was when we were drawing these boundaries. I was having a great personal struggle saying to myself, I am either doing the worst thing possible for this piece of landscape or the best thing possible, there is no middle ground. If we put a ring around this

place and say it is a really cool place, and the management doesn't follow then we have done the worst possible thing. If we put a ring around this place and the management follows then we have done the best possible thing.

My only real involvement at this time is looking from afar waiting to see what the answer is going to be.

MH: How do you think it is going?

JB: I have been pretty dismayed at the lack of attention paid to the condition of the resource. Given the data I know they have. I know the person who did it, one of the best scientists I have ever encountered in my life who did the health assessment for the whole monument; soils, vegetation, hydrology. They know where the problem areas are and where they are not. I am not only seeing no action on that, I am seeing a desire to see it go away, which is like anti-management. That is dismaying to see that. To watch the science part fall apart, they had a really strong science program, a lot of funding and it just got... There were discussions about whether to leave this monument in the BLM or move it to the Park Service. This was during Newt Gingrich days, when everyone was bashing all the agencies and saying they were bad. These were the days when they wanted to cut all the agencies' budgets to nothing, it was a real threat and the contract with America was a very scary thing being a Federal employee. All the agencies were scrabbling trying to prove their worth; no one was coming forward to defend the BLM.

MH: And their mandate is multiple uses?

JB: So they piss everyone off. Forest Service had the loggers to defend them. The Park Service had the public to defend them. USGS had everyone who loves a map to defend them. Nobody was

stepping up to defend the BLM. The reason it was left in the BLM was give the BLM the opportunity to build a constituency by having them show that they, too, could do conservation in a way that the Park Service and the Forest Service and other people could do. I have not been impressed by their ability to manage that way or build a constituency, or the desire in BLM to do it at all. It is pretty clear having that money disappear, having the money that was given to the Monument to do science and have it be a big emphasis and managed it based on since, the fact the money disappeared tells you a lot about what it means to the agency. If it meant a lot to the agency they would have preserved it no matter what and they did not.

I understand, I live in an agency, the pressures are huge. When you are talking about people's salaries versus saving this bucket of money, the pressure is huge. The Bush Administration came down with thus, you have thirty days to get oil and gas permits out the door, everyone had to be turned into gas and oil permittees, the pressures were huge. So, I am not ignoring that, I get it. To get this constituency and start doing business in a new way in certain landscapes, not all by any means, but certain landscapes. They let it go, they didn't have it happen. They are trying to start again. There is a new director for the Landscape Conservation System. They are starting to think about it again, but it is certainly not been what I had hoped. Part of it was timing. If Gore had won, the whole story, I'm sure, would have been different. Sometimes you get pushed over a threshold and you never get back, sometimes you can get back. It will be interesting to see what becomes of it, but it is certainly not a model for a national monument at this time.

MH: Are there many monuments under BLM jurisdiction. Wasn't the Grand Staircase one of the first ones?

JB: It was the first one. The other units under the National Landscape Conservation System were called other things. They were done with the same spirit; they were to be special landscapes.

Let's put it that way. They were put there for different reasons; each monument is a very different thing because it is dependent on the proclamation. You can have a monument like Golden Spike Train Station, and the point is to preserve the train and the train track because that is what the proclamation says. They are not all about landscapes and all natural conservation, it totally depends on what the proclamation says.

National Landscape Conservation is just that, the idea was to pick these special landscapes and treat them differently than most BLM lands. I have not seen that come to fruition. The Monument is hardly treated any different than any other BLM lands around there. The whole idea was it would be. That is the part that has been disappointing to me. People tell me I am too impatient and that I need to wait twenty years.

MH: As I said before some ideas about the Monument are changing with the generations, but I was thinking as you were speaking, this will take another ten years...

JB: I can tell you right now the people in Monticello are still pissed off about Canyonlands National Park, and that was 1964. And they are really pissed off. Moab has benefitted economically because Moab got right behind it, saying we are going to do this, we will welcome visitors, we are going to change our lifestyles, we are going to go for it. Monticello said, We want the people but we don't want them to come here, we don't want to change our lifestyles, we don't want anything to change. They have not benefitted at all and they are still pissed. There has to be an economic benefit, but you have got to make people feel welcome. I don't feel welcome when I go to Monticello, and I am one of them. It is a two way street.

MH: We have those challenges in Garfield County

JB: I spent Thanksgiving in Tropic. It was so cold. It was twenty-nine in Panguitch.

22 Jayne Belnap

MH: Always the coldest place on earth.

JB: Yes, but twenty-nine below? We were driving around the Monument actually, and it was cold. It was Thanksgiving Day and we wanted something to eat, everything was shut down, so we ended up at Ruby's. We did have hot chocolate in Tropic. The servers were from Romania.

MH: Any other comments, hopes, dreams? What are you doing currently?

JB: Trying to save the world. (laughter) I am trying to decide what I will do when I grow up. It is time to do something different now. That feeling has been going on for about three years and I haven't quite figured out what to do next. I have been running a huge research operation for twenty-five years; I know I don't want to do that anymore. I am working for USGS, as the ecologist. I will stay with that, but part of it has to do with the Administration not fulfilling my hopes and dreams either. Part of it has to do if they will change their tune or get re-elected.

MH: Jayne, I would like to thank you for your time, I appreciate it so much.

End of Interview 1:05:36