

1 Bill Hedden

INTERVIEW WITH: Bill Hedden  
INTERVIEWER: Marsha Holland  
INTERVIEW NUMBER: one  
DATE OF INTERVIEW: January 4, 2011  
PLACE OF INTERVIEW: Hedden home, Castle Valley, Utah  
SUBJECT OF INTERVIEW: Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument  
TRANSCRIBER: Marsha Holland  
DATE: October 09, 2011

MH: It is January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2011. I am in Castle Valley, Utah, near Moab. I am with Bill Hedden. Thank you for meeting with me today.

BH: Happy to do it.

MH: If you wouldn't mind giving me your full name, the date of birth and where you were born, and perhaps a little about the family you were born into.

BH: My full name is Willard Land Hedden, Junior. I was born October 15, 1950 in Northern New Jersey to a family that has lived there since before the Revolutionary War. It is family largely of plumbers. I was the first in my family to go to an Ivy League school. I went to Harvard and got a doctorate in Biology. There I met Eleanor Bliss who became my wife. She was a lifelong Utah resident. We moved out here in 1976, to this piece of land where we are today and built our home here and raised our kids here.

MH: And it is a beautiful home, a beautiful location. You graduated from Harvard...

BH: I did my graduate and undergraduate there. I taught at Wood's Hole at the Marine Biological Labs in the summer and did research throughout my undergraduate years. Then I moved on into

## 2 Bill Hedden

the graduate school. At first I was interested in Marine Biology but I changed to Neurobiology in my third year of undergraduate school. My research was in the physiology and pharmacology of the vertebrate retinal system. My degree is in biology, but that is what I worked on.

MH: Some conjecture here, you liked being outside?

BH: I loved being outside. It is a great solace for me and I am a bit of a claustrophobe, so being in the wide open places in the West is something that feels right to me, makes me at peace.

MH: After Harvard you headed west, what sparked your interest in the West? Was it because Eleanor was from Utah...

BH: Yes, I had never been to the West before I came here. Like I said, I grew up in a family of plumbers and fuel oil merchants and did that all through high school as summer jobs. I was in a family that traveled all over the East, but not the West. We spent a lot of time canoeing on the east coast in the Middle Atlantic States and New England and early pioneers of the Virgin Islands and the Caribbean. Mostly we stayed close to home. It was in the 60s and 70s. I moved here in 1976.

MH: And how did you take to Utah?

BH: I loved it here. I came here because of Eleanor, but we got to the point where our love of place may have switched although I still have a tremendous fondness for oceans, big rivers and lakes. I am an avid fisherman. I go off on adventures to places where I can do that.

MH: And the Colorado River is right out here.

BH: It is not a great fishing river on this stretch. Once the Colorado River gets to the Colorado Plateau it picks up a lot more sediment. Upstream the Dolores River brings in a lot of salt. The

### 3 Bill Hedden

Grand Valley has big irrigation return flows that go back in the river. In the summer even when the river above Grand Junction is running clear, below Grand Junction it is always off color. That gets added to as it comes down into the desert country, so it is a pretty silty river that has got carp and catfish and suckers, and the remnants of the Colorado endemic species that still cling to existence here.

MH: In Utah what sort of business or profession did you find?

BH: When I first came here I worked on drill rigs and as a river guide and as a construction worker building new parts of the uranium mill. Eventually I ran environmental studies for a mining company, but I really supported the family for a long time being a custom furniture maker. I showed at galleries around the West.

MH: This table is a fine piece of furniture.

BH: I built that with my daughter as I was teaching her some woodworking. She is an architecture student at Berkeley now. So, furniture making for a long time was our main bread and butter. In the mid-nineties I began doing environmental work full time. I was a county councilman here, as well, in Grand County.

MH: So, you live a busy life. With furniture making you are also displaying it and selling it.

BH: It is a big job to make it and market it, adding a significant element to it, because you have to sell it.

MH: The goal of our interview is to discuss the early days of the Grand Staircase -Escalante National Monument. How did you become in touch with that movement, and people?

#### 4 Bill Hedden

BH: I was just newly installed as the Utah Director of the Grand Canyon Trust when the Monument was created. I had no role in the creation of the Monument. I watched Clinton's announcement on TV at a friend's house in Moab. Afterward, though, I was quickly given the task of examining the complex situation in which the BLM was entrusted with the management of a special piece of ground and at the same time told that they would honor the pre-existing mining claims and the roads and the grazing and so on. The outrage in the local communities made that job look doubly hard. It sort of fell to me and people like me to work with the BLM to try to develop, by doing it, what that vision for the BLM was going to be and what the Monument was going to be like. It was exciting; there was a real palatable sense of excitement within BLM in those early days. They felt that they had some of the best people within the agency who had come there attracted by this big new idea and they had budgets to work with to try to do research and analysis that they didn't have in other parts of the BLM. That was a very interesting time where it was quite a bit of partnership between outside parties who wanted to help assure that this new vision for the first BLM National Monument was going to turn into something good.

MH: And you said they all came together, was there a physical place they met?

BH: It was in Escalante and Kanab, at the Monument headquarters.

MH: Then this was after the designation of the Monument.

BH: Right, after the Proclamation in '96.

MH: I know the Monument had some goals, just after the Proclamation and the planning. Would you talk a little more about implementation?

BH: It was before the planning, I was involved very early on during the time when they were developing the plan. There were a number of issues that seemed ripe for outside help or

intervention. They were trying to figure out what to do about all the oil and gas leases that were out on the Kaiparowits. I worked with the Kidd Family Partnership and we realized that they would be willing to give up those leases and they had an appetite for tax abatement, so they made a charitable donation for their leases on fifty thousand acres out on the Kaiparowits. We then let those expire with the BLM. So, we saved the Kaiparowits from having people access the remote backcountry to drill on existing oil and gas leases there in the Monument.

Grazing is a pretty tough business in that part of the world. Not many people make much of a living at it. Some of them were interested in selling their grazing permits. We managed to put together some deals where we bought out all the ranchers who had leases in the Escalante River Canyon and a lot of the tributaries to that. BLM analyzed that and said it would obviously be a desirable thing to close the central riparian system of the Monument to grazing. They did that in 1998. We worked with them on grazing in other places that were identified as having real resource conflicts. Unfortunately that got caught up in the local politics and there were a number of lawsuits filed by the County. The approach we were using was eventually validated in court, but it took years. In the meantime, under tremendous pressure from local people, there was endless turnover in the staff at the Monument, and their budgets were radically trimmed during the Bush administration. We are now back to the question of asking what do BLM National Monuments mean? Is the BLM capable of managing a special place and managing it like a special place or will they always cave in to the locals and sort of run it like any other piece of BLM land?

MH: Isn't it typical that many Monuments turn over to National Park, a different agency?

BH: Before the Grand Staircase, when presidents used the Antiquities Act to establish a national monument, they were generally National Park monuments, managed by the National Park Service. It was Secretary Bruce Babbitt's idea that you can't just identify the special parts of the public estate and as soon as you say "this is really important," take it away from the BLM and give it to the Park Service. It is demoralizing for the BLM. Babbitt's idea was to give BLM a new challenge, a new charge. He said, "We are going to identify special places that will become part of the National Landscape Conservation System and BLM will manage them and this will show what BLM is capable of doing." If you look at the organic acts for the BLM and the Park Service and the Forest Service, they are not that different. The Park Service has the charge of preserving places unimpaired for future generations, but both the BLM and the Forest Service have mandates to protect the long term sustainability of the public resources and manage them in a way that provides the most good for the greatest period of time to the American people. They can be read very similarly. It was Babbitt's idea that this would be the place where that happened within the BLM. Grand Staircase was the flagship.

MH: Immediately upon designation there were conflicts with mining claims and leased grazing lands. Those had been identified previously in the planning phase, or?

BH: These had been identified before the plan was completed. The plan came later. These were obvious things that everybody was aware of. For example there were ten parcels of commercially zoned land right where Highway 12 crosses the Escalante River at Calf Creek. It is where the Kiva Koffeehaus is. They had sold off the rest of the land to people who had dreams of building motels and tee shirt shops and cafes. The Monument managers were very concerned about that. All the input from the local communities had said, "We do not want the development to be out in the Monument; we want it to be in our towns, in our communities."

The Monument managers felt that it really would line up with everybody's desires to not have that big development happen there at the Escalante River. I managed to wrangle all the property owners together and get them to agree to sell and raised the money to buy them all out. Now we hold all that land there at the Grand Canyon Trust. We have been willing and anxious to sell it to the BLM for an extraordinarily reasonable price coupled with the assurance that we will take any funding that we get and roll it over into acquiring other holdings in the Monument where the owners no longer want to have the property. That has so far been thwarted by the Utah Congressional delegation and by local people who say we can't have any net increase in public ownership here, even though at the same time they say, "Please don't build a tee-shirt shop out in the middle of the Monument, or a motel that could easily out compete the motels in our towns because if you had a choice wouldn't you rather stay in a place looking at the Escalante River than looking at Escalante Town?"

MH: And so I am putting the pieces together of what you do with the Grand Canyon Trust. What would you say your mission is?

BH: The mission is to protect and restore the Colorado Plateau; a suitably gigantic grandiose mission.

MH: So, how do you go about doing that? How does the Trust go about preserving and securing lands of the Colorado Plateau?

BH: We have about thirty employees scattered in offices around the Plateau. They are experts in science and conservation biology, experts in sustainable economic development, attorneys, people who are experts in conflict mediation. We do pretty much all the things that different conservation groups do. We buy land, like the Nature Conservancy. I just described the transaction where we bought the pieces in the Grand Staircase. We have an 850,000 acre cattle ranch on the North Rim of the Grand Canyon. It has a 120 mile boundary with the Grand Canyon

National Park. We own the private land, the base property there and hold the federal grazing permits on all the rest of that where we do science and restoration on a big scale as well as running a cattle operation there.

We work a lot with the Native American tribes on helping them to effectuate their vision of conservation work on their lands and also helping them with sustainable economic development, like helping them build a solar energy company at Shonto that will now provide solar installations for the hogans that are un-electrified in western Navajo. We have a seat on the Colorado River Adaptive Management Program where we work to restore the function of the Colorado River through the Grand Canyon. We are very active in the Utah National Forests working to restore the streams and riparian habitats and reintroduce beaver to those streams, and deal with the damage caused by over grazing in the most sensitive riparian habitats. We have been involved a lot with BLM resource management plans. We litigate when we think the federal government is breaking the law and have a very strong track record of generally winning. We do not go to court happily, but when we do we are very effective. In Northern Arizona we are the people who have created the nation's largest forest restoration project in partnership with counties and industry and it will do restoration of the Ponderosa Pine forest across 2.4 million acres of Northern Arizona, produce about 600 jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in annual activity while restoring the forest at a scale that has not been feasible in the past. We are generally looking for solutions and not for controversy, but when we think the health of the land is really at stake, then we are willing to be as strong as necessary to do that.

MH: You mentioned creating jobs, which is so key, but isn't it the type of jobs? And we are at a great time in history now where some of those jobs can be different than we are used to a generation

or two before. Like alternative energy source development and conservation versus resource extraction.

BH: I think we do ourselves a real disservice by not understanding our economies in a lot of these rural communities. We think we are based on ranching and mining and logging and construction and when you actually get down to it and begin to look, those things are so much in decline because these are crappy places to produce commodities. All of our transportation costs are off the charts, there are not generally rich deposits of anything in the sedimentary deposits of the Colorado Plateau, or at least none of much quality.

Even where I live, my next door neighbor down here is marble sculptor and his wife is a psychotherapist and facilitator for the Canyon Country Partnership, which is an ecosystem management group for the four eastern counties of Utah and the public lands here. I am an environmentalist. My next door neighbor on the other side is America's leading gun engraver, who sells high-end engraved guns to people all over the country. The next people are sound experts who do recording of natural sounds for the Park Service all over the West. People all over these communities earn their living in ways that are very different from what we traditionally think. Years ago for a brief time in San Juan County the Forest Service published a booklet called *The View from the Ridge*, a grazing cooperative concerned with Elk Ridge. On the back cover one time they listed the pillars of the economy in San Juan County. The pillars of the economy they listed were mining and livestock grazing and construction and logging. On the right hand column they had the leading employers in San Juan County and the number one employer was the Department of Energy Superfund Clean-up of the Monticello Uranium Mill. The number two leading employer was the school system, and then the federal government and state employees. The first private enterprise that was actually on the list was the seventh largest

employer and that was Goulding's Trading Post in Monument Valley and number eight was all construction combined, which was the only thing that had any relevance to what people traditionally thought was part of the economy. How can you plan and determine what is important for your community if you have got such a wacky idea of where the money is coming from? And all of that does not even factor in transfer payments which are probably the biggest thing of all in those counties.

MH: It is the same story in Garfield County. And the county commissioners consistently protect ranching to the detriment of economic development.

BH: All of agriculture combined is about two percent of the economy in Utah.

MH: When I talk with the ranchers, they know it is not a money maker, it is a hobby. And I believe the commissioners don't want to admit that because it is heritage of ranching they want to protect. They are afraid they are losing their culture; one of the reasons the Southern Utah Oral History Project has been successful. The people we interviewed when they were close to one hundred years old, ten years ago, they remember ranching differently, scrapping out a living. And in the Proclamation it clearly states that preservation of cultural heritage is foremost.

BH: Down along the Colorado River here, there was what used to be a ranch, now owned by a guy who made a fortune selling fire damaged electronic goods, made a lot of money, bought the ranch, built a big inn all over it and still had some animals around, for the tourists to look at. People will drive up the road past all this spectacular scenery of the gorge and the Colorado River and the second you come around the corner to see the former ranch here is a field, irrigation is all screwed up, the whole field is dying, filled with Russian Olive, but the second a tourist comes around the corner and see cows or horses in the field they will slam on their brakes and jump out in the middle of the road and start taking pictures. We have a national

fantasy about this. The reality of this is very different from the fantasy. When I was working with ranchers, it was pretty widely known in the grazing community that we might be interested in buying grazing permits if it was an area with biodiversity or important habitat, they would call me all the time. The reasons they gave for wanting to sell out were as varied as saying, "I hate the Monument; BLM is constantly giving us new regulations, and I'm going to Oregon and buy a private lands ranch, completely away from the government." Others would say, "The environmentalists are on my back, every time my cows go down the river and get trapped in a drift fence the damn Great Old Broads come out and find them there, go in and protest." Then there are the ones that say, "I am seventy eight years old, my son has no interest in taking over the business and I have no other heir, no one wants to buy my ranch because everyone knows it is just a hobby, and if you guys won't buy it, it is worthless." Another variation was, "My wife and I are living up here in Salt Lake so we can be near the hospital for her chemotherapy and if you guys won't buy our grazing permit we will lose our home ranch." I heard the entire gamut. It is as individual as the ranchers' individual situations. That terrifies the Cattleman's Association because they actually know that ranchers would, in individual cases, want to sell their permits.

MH: But it comes off, the buying of permits, as much more subversive.

BH: In every case the ranchers are the ones who contacted us or we responded to an ad they were running in the newspaper where they were trying to sell their grazing permits.

MH: Now, knowing a little bit more about what you do, it sounds like you are very good at what you do, have a great staff, diverse and knowledgeable about the resources, is that why the Grand Staircase contacted you because of your organizations success acquiring special parcels of land?

BH: I think they considered us a useful resource to help them achieve some of the management objectives that they had or to solve some of the problems they had in trying to do a lot more

protective sort of management of a piece of public land. The Grand Canyon Trust still owns all those properties. There are other people who have expressed a desire to sell their land in the Monument, because there are quite a few in-holdings in the Monument, and the BLM obviously would like to acquire those. They have a prioritized list in their heads. They would like to acquire some of them rather than see them get turned into a remote sub-division or some other mess. I think the county would too. Because if somebody goes out in the middle of nowhere and builds a wildcat sub-division then all of a sudden the sheriff has to go out there on patrol and the school has to figure out how to get those kids to school, and the ambulance may get called. You have an expensive little blight in the middle of what otherwise is a pretty special place. You then start compromising the ability of the tourist business to sell the place. You end up essentially with nothing, not free for all extractive industry anymore, but it is not as neat as it was before bringing in tourists either.

MH: Do you remember much about the coal, Andalex, I think, wanting to go out on the Kaiparowits.

BH: Yes, it was out on Smoky Mountain. The thing that is interesting, if you look at our time right now, we are reaching out all over the globe and consuming all the oil and coal we can get and other countries are starting to do it now as well, and at the same time we are conducting several wars and putting it all on the credit card, leaving the financial problems for the future. During Reagan's time we went from being world's largest creditor nation to the world's largest debtor nation. We still haven't really recovered from that very much, and yet we have this notion that it is OK for us to gobble up everything there is and let the kids in the future worry about themselves. The question about something like the Andalex coal mine seems to me to be, "are we going to leave anything in the savings account for the future? Do we feel the slightest bit of responsibility to our children to do that?" I remember once when Wayne Owens was one of

Utah's congressmen and he had proposed the Utah Wilderness Bill. People said, "Well, jeez, the Republicans would insist on hard release language, that would say in the bill, if you designate this wilderness, then anything that is not designated is off the table and can't be considered for wilderness again. Wayne Owens said, "You know hard release, smart release. If you have been a member of Congress knowing that it takes an act of Congress to change it doesn't seem like an insurmountable barrier." And, if in the future someday we were so desperate for coal that we felt like we had to have that difficult to access coal on the Kaiparowits, wouldn't those people be glad it still existed and hadn't been all torn out and burned up during our time? It is not as though you are foreclosing all your options for the future, where in fact, we are keeping the options for the future open, not, for once, using up everything for our brief time here.

MH: Then could you give me the time period you worked with the Monument?

BH: It began in late '96 and continued through about 2001 or 2002. That is when Bush came in and Gayle Norton actually endorsed some of the grazing things that we were doing and Chris Cannon, one of Utah's Representatives at that point, endorsed what we were doing. He worked with us to expand Arches National Park. I was contacted by people from the Administration who were developing George Bush's first State of the Union address and told that they were considering featuring the work we were doing with the ranchers in the Monument, as an example of market based environmental work that they were very excited about. Then 9/11 happened and the State of the Union was about something completely different at that point, but that was how highly regarded this stuff was, and yet the county commissioners couldn't believe that a bunch of Republicans were in power in Washington and were saying things like that. They went back there filled with outrage and telling them it was going to be the end of their way of life. There were ridiculous lawsuits, but they had a huge amount of funding from

the State of Utah. State Representative Mike Noel sent money down to push all the lawsuits; they took them through the Interior Court of Land Appeals, a full big lawsuit with a week of hearings and on and on. When they lost their suit they took it to the Federal District Court and lost there. One thing they hadn't reckoned on was that, at the IBLA, they will let anybody be part of the lawsuit, but in Federal District Court there is a much tougher standard. The court agreed with us when we asked, "What interest does the county have in who holds a grazing permit?" They have no legitimate interest in that. The court threw the county out of the suit for lack of standing. This was important because the Utah Supreme Court has issued many rulings that say a public entity cannot fund a lawsuit that it is not part of. Once the county was not part of the suit anymore, we were able to shut off their funding from the Legislature. The county commissioners loved it as long as there was free money for them. They were willing to push that lawsuit forever because they said, "Oh the Grand Canyon Trust has to pay for this out of their own pocket, but Kane and Garfield Counties have free money from the State so they can push the lawsuit." They had brought in all sorts of ridiculous experts; they had a guy they flew around for days. He was a range scientist from Nevada and they spent an hour qualifying him as an expert witness, then the big question they asked him was, "Professor, will you define for us what a drought is?" He said, "Well, a drought is when it don't rain as much as usual." It was during the drought times, when we had been told by the Monument, along with all the other permittees, not to run our cows. We were keeping the cows off the range for the health of the land, and they wanted to make the point that we could have ignored the Monument managers and run cows out there even if we had been instructed not to do so. Then they asked the expert witness, "Can you graze cattle during the drought?" and he said, "Yes, you will probably have to cut your numbers way back but you can put some cattle out there." That was the level of inquiry. They had hired Karen Budd-Falen's law firm, but they decided their lawyer wasn't mean

enough to question me on the stand. So, when they had me on the stand they brought in a personal injury trial lawyer from Denver whose first question to me was, "So, Mr. Hedden, you are under oath, does that mean that for once in your life you might try to tell the truth?" That was how we started.

MH: Oh, my goodness. Did the courtroom gasp?

BH: No, the court room was in Kanab and it was filled with all the ranchers thinking "Yeah, we have a guy going for it here." Trouble was he didn't know anything about the issue and I knew a lot about the issue and he was so offensive that he really irritated the judge who was a very decent guy. Our attorneys called a halt to it after about a half an hour and pulled me over and said, "Look ,he is completely out of line, we can stop it whenever you want, but frankly he is pissing off the judge big time, so if you are Ok with it this is not helping their case." I said I was fine and we went on. That was the atmosphere and when they lost in the District Court they appealed it to the Tenth Circuit and lost again. It was unfortunate for the ranchers because there is no other source of help to try to solve their problems, no other market for ranchers who would like to sell their permits. If it is dry and the market for cattle is crappy no one can sell their permit to another rancher, no other rancher would want it. When they get in trouble, having environmentalists willing to buy permits would provide them with a whole different market that wasn't subject to the same ups and downs as they are. If the government ever figures out a way to deal with voluntary permit retirement that creates a clear path for how you can do it, then the market would intervene and this could happen. Until the government can straighten that out no one is going to do it unless it happens occasionally in legislation, as in the Owyhee legislation, and the Boulder/White Clouds bill; but that is some federally funded buyout where they give the ranchers ten times what any other rancher would ever give them for their permits.

It will occasionally happen if there is a big endangered species issue, a grazing allotment with grizzly bears on it. In those cases occasionally somebody will do it because no one will oppose it. In regular parts of the BLM, where you don't have those kind of issues, it is not happening at all.

MH: School Trust lands. Did you have any experiences with those transfers?

BH: The Grand Canyon Trust has done a lot of that in recent years but we were not really part of that trade with the Monument. That one was very interesting because Bill Clinton told his people at Interior that they were going to get that exchange done, and don't worry about the niceties of making sure that values are really balanced in the exchange. Utah got a very good deal out of that. In fact, that created a unfortunate backlash, because exchanges like that probably should happen all over the place. There is no point in school and institutional trust lands holding sections out in the middle of nowhere, where there is no coal, oil and gas, there is no access, and yet if there were development it would really compromise the management of a wild place. You can easily imagine if you were to exchange those sections for ones where there could be an oil and gas development or a coal field, and SITLA gets a hold of that land and generates revenue for the school kids, and at the same time BLM consolidates its management of other lands, everyone comes out ahead. Yet it became very difficult to do that in Utah anymore because people in the Congressional Offices and the Committee staffs in Washington had such a bad taste in their mouths about the Grand Staircase exchange; because the Feds obviously got taken in that one. So we worked very hard over the last six years to develop the new version of the land exchange, one where the values really do have to be equalized. That happened the year before last with the Utah Recreational Land Exchange Act that traded about forty-eight thousand acres along the Colorado River here, from SITLA to the BLM, and SITLA got land up in

the Uinta Basin, a gas field, and in the town of Green River and at the Moab airport, where there is some potential for return.

We have worked a lot on those afterward, but it wasn't a part of that one in the Grand Staircase.

MH: I know that happened near the town of Tropic, whereby the land was given to the town of Tropic. Was there some of that?

BH: What they discovered after the boundaries were drawn and the Proclamation was issued, especially around Tropic and Cannonville, was that there were some things that really needed to be adjusted where the boundary was capturing things in the edge of the Monument that really shouldn't have been in there. It is funny, if you have a federal grazing permit you need to have qualifying base property, either land or water rights. In Utah many ranchers have base property that consists of State sections. When those lands were traded out of the Monument then what people had for base property was really the ghost of a former State section which was now BLM ground, about the sketchiest base property available. When the Grand Canyon Trust has acquired some of the grazing permits we had actual State sections, current ones, that were outside the Monument that were the base properties for those permits and at one point during the trials the attorney for Budd-Falen started to go after our base property as though it was inadequate, and around the courtroom you could see people going, "Wait a minute, this opens up a big can of worms for other people, whose base property looks pretty sketchy compared to theirs."

MH: The original idea with the Monument was the inclusion of some bands of property where there was too much private land, like between Zion and the edges of the Vermillion Cliffs, thinking of terms of corridors for wildlife, just for the natural flow between these Parks, Canyonlands and

Arches, through the Monument and over into Zion. Did you have any interaction with that grand vision?

BH: It seemed like enough of a pipedream that it was not anything we really worked on. It has been the job of the Wild Utah Project and other groups who specifically have that conservation biology mission. In a way, it is one thing when you have a herd of bison or antelope that come from a winter range and travel down a long ways to a summer range and you need to protect their ability to do that, but it is not as important in this country. You have winter feeding grounds on the flanks of the mountains and the plateaus where they summer and as long as they can go up and down they are OK on their islands, but it is another thing to protect long migration corridors.

MH: So, again, your tenure dates were from '96 until...

BH: I am still working on it for the Grand Canyon Trust. It was '96 until the present, but the heyday of it, when the Monument was exciting for this kind of stuff, was through about 2002, then it went into a much tougher period where there were still good people there but they were really embattled and they felt as though anytime they tried to do anything remotely progressive that they were going to have hell to pay with the county commissioners and people. That is changing again at the present. I am quietly hopeful about the future of the Monument.

MH: So, give me hope.

BH: We have been meeting with people from the Monument recently and I am hearing some hopeful things. They are playing this out internally at the present time.

MH: Some of the people I have interviewed for this project relayed a definite excitement for the Monument Project for various reasons from the scientists, the planners, people who worked in public lands organizations for their whole career, this was exciting. Did you feel that too?

BH: Oh, yes. There were great people there. Kate Cannon, who is now here with the Park Service, was a star and she felt for awhile there she had the support of the Secretary and the President and everybody, to try and do something good. That was something that people didn't have during the Bush Administration. It was very obvious that he hated all of the Clinton Monuments; or rather Cheney hated the Monuments so they were going to exact retribution. People now at BLM are totally different from the Norton-Kempthorne years. Bob Abbey is a great guy and has a real interest in the National Landscape Conservation System, and so does Secretary Salazar. It is a little slower translating it to the ground. You take someone like Dick Cheney who, from all those years in the oil industry, knew so exactly what he wanted to do and who he was going to throw out of his way within the agency. He got to it immediately, whereas both the Republican holds on all the nominees and the Democrats' fecklessness about public land issues have slowed things up in the Obama administration. This is not anything Joe Biden or Barack Obama know anything about or care about deeply. I think they probably told Ken Salazar, "Look don't make any big problems for us," so the whole Gulf oil spill was a disaster for all of them, "but keep the oil and gas flowing, you can make some changes around the edges, don't let them drill right on the edge of Arches National Park or in Dinosaur." The Utah politicians made Salazar pay heavily for that, and now the House is trumpeting these statements by the oil and gas companies claiming that they have been prohibited from spending four billion dollars in the west that they would have spent if not for the Obama Administration. (Bullshit) They have about four times as many leases as they have ever used. Those are the leases they wanted before the ones that Obama prevented them from developing. It was a mere seventy seven

leases out of thousands and many unused, but they blame the downturn on Obama and not the recession. They are such liars that it is really flabbergasting.

MH: It is frustrating to hear those comments, and knowing it is pure ignorance.

BH: I repeatedly make that point that no matter what side of things you are on, wouldn't it be more helpful to try and deal with the real facts than to make up bogus ones. For example, it is all the Obama Administration's fault that we are not drilling and rolling in oil and gas money. The fact is, when gas prices went down internationally, they moved out of the Uinta Basin. That is an industry that has no loyalty, no anything to a place. They just go after the money. All these marginal fields are the first ones to get shut down when the price goes down. If we understand these things we might actually see the problems coming and have a chance to try and deal with them, try to deal with the real causes. Instead, angry people in Vernal pack a room when David Hayes went there to explain why it wasn't a great idea to drill in the middle of Dinosaur National Monument. They blamed the Obama for the bust that started before he was ever elected. Meanwhile they'd give their house to the oil companies.

MH: I just have to hope it a generational way of thinking, we deal with it in our own county. The idea that a job owes you a pension, health insurance, job security, which is not there anymore.

BH: We have just been watching this annual spectacle of the Utah Legislature; "we are going to take all the money away from the schools, take away the federal stimulus money for the teachers." What I have always felt when people in the rural towns say, "We have got to have some economic activity or our children will not be able to find work here, they will leave," is that there are all kinds of people in these small rural towns that are figuring out how to make money, telecommuting, all the things that are part of the modern economy, not all just flipping burgers or making beds. People are making a good living doing these other things, but to do that you

need to be incredibly well educated and connected. We should be working as hard as we conceivably can to educate our kids. Instead, we conclude that we don't need any money in the schools, we can have thirty-five kids in a classroom, push them through high school and let them collapse. At the end of that, those kids don't really have any options.

MH: Which brings up the responsibility parents have to raise their children with a good education and a good work ethic.

BH: It would help if they just had a good education and more ideas about the ways you could put that hard work to use to make a living. About fifteen years ago when I was in county government, every year we would study the Utah Office of Economic Development report to the governor. There is all sorts of interesting stuff in there about all the counties and the State generally. At that time Utah was number one or two in the nation in terms of the rate of graduation of kids from high school. Then we were the last or second to the last in terms of higher education in the nation. We want to get the kids through high school, but don't want them to go away from home, go off to college and get high-falutin' ideas. People would rather have their kid bagging groceries at the store in town than go away and get educated and become a doctor or a lawyer somewhere else.

MH: But what could they bring back to the small community, offer something to their community with their education is an idea.

BH: I grew up in a state that for every dollar in tax money they send to Washington, they get back about eighty cents. In Utah, the last time I checked, for every dollar that we send to Washington in tax revenues we get back a dollar sixty-one, yet Utahans are always griping about how we are short changed by the government. We have these incredible public lands around us that we can use to do all sorts of stuff.

I have wanted to arrange a county commissioner exchange. I thought it would be interesting to address the people who say we can't do anything because we have all this public land in our county, we are so handicapped by that. I want to put them on an airplane and fly them to Newark airport, say, get them in a rental car so they can get lost or killed immediately on those freeways, have them go out and spend a week with the freeholders in some county where a person who has a house and a half of acre of ground is paying \$15,000 a year in local property taxes. These are people who believe we can't afford enough services because we don't have enough people, but really we can't provide services because we are so cheap. People in other parts of the country pay real property taxes, we don't. Let them go out and see how the freeholders running that eastern county deal with the situation when the mafia with a trucking contract is taking a whole lot of hazardous waste from the big chemical factory, and rather than paying to dispose of it in a legal landfill, they are dumping it down the storm drains in the town, poisoning all the creeks. So, then perhaps they might see how simple things are when you don't have all this public land wreaking your life. It is farcical, people are so provincial, with no idea how easy things are in public land counties. We actually have more private land per capita than people in most parts of the country, by a lot. On the Colorado Plateau the average of private land held is four or five acres per person. Most people in other places have an acre if they are lucky. Again, if we get real about understanding our situation, we can improve our lot substantially rather than hanging on to all these fantasies about how hamstrung we are.

MH: It would a good idea to float with the State Legislature. They are about to go into session...

BH: Hide the women and children. Once again we will have a whole bunch of ridiculous statement bills or resolutions. I can remember when Jim Hanson was in Congress, he introduced a bill that would give the public lands to the states. Mike Leavitt was Governor. Leavitt's people spent one

day analyzing the economic consequences of that and went to Hanson and said "DO NOT THINK ABOUT IT." The Cowboy Caucus in the Utah Legislature will have all sorts of resolutions that take the public lands for the state and Rob Bishop or Jason Chaffetz will introduce another apple bill to take part of the Federal estate and give it back to Utah.

MH: They have access to the same numbers... not wanting federal money any more, they have to have access to those numbers. No federal money for our schools, we don't like the rules. It seems like the lame brain statement bills are just insightful, they are not conducting any real business for Utahans.

BH: Taking Federal lands back by eminent domain, the grandstanding idea, all the people were fired up thinking that now we are going to show this federal government we are getting tough. They did nothing about it. They know if they press it, it will be found unconstitutional and they will waste a whole lot of money on the law suit. Even their attorneys were telling them that.

MH: Yes, I was concerned when we first moved to Garfield County several lawsuits as you mentioned were in the courts. I wondered how a economically poor county can spend tax money on such expensive and then frivolous lawsuits. Now, I learned it was the State funding the suits.

BH: If you actually attend the legislative session, all those things happen off the record. They'll introduce a motion to include money for all that in a spending bill, someone on the committee will say, "Why are we spending all this money on this lawsuit for Garfield and Kane Counties?" and right away Mike Noel will adjourn the meeting and say, "Let me educate to you privately about that." They adjourn and go out the back door and come back in ten minutes later and sit down and the person votes for it, and that is the end of that. There is never anything on the record about that, never a discussion, something for the press to look at.

MH: Last year there was a bill run through to segment out scenic byways so that billboards may be put in. The special interest group lobbying, the billboard industry, were the heavies, serious business. Philpot and Reagan industry...very powerful people.

BH: Philpot was pretty remarkable.

MH: One last question, in your current position is the Grand Canyon Trust's executive director?

BH: That is correct.

MH: As far as the Monument goes, you are still doing work with the Monument?

BH: We are still working with them. The Grand Canyon Trust has a large volunteer program. We take out hundreds of people every year doing about 15,000 hours of volunteer work on projects that are developed in collaboration with the BLM or the Park Service or Fish and Game Department in Arizona. We are bringing that program to Utah. We did some projects this past year up on Boulder Mountain and in the Southern Utah National Forests. We are talking with the managers at the Grand Staircase about really making up teams of well trained and well managed volunteers available to do things that are a priorities for them, on the ground.

MH: I know there are ongoing projects to remove invasive species from the Monument.

BH: We do a lot of that. If someone has a big science project going and they need a lot of monitoring, people to go out and take repeat photo points, we can do that. There will probably be a lot of people coming down from the University of Utah, retired people in the State. These are the projects that people really love because they get to go out in beautiful places on well organized trips and do something useful with other people. Be part of a community effort. We are beginning discussions about that and are hopeful that things will take a turn there so they can really be more constructively engaged.

25 Bill Hedden

MH: The generation of people you are working with now are keen on those activities.

BH: Yes. I have good relationships with the current Monument management. Not to make any of this seem demeaning to them, they have a tough job. It is hard when people must think if they do anything for the Monument the local people can go to Washington and take their scalp.

MH: It is Rene Berkhout now, as manager?

BH: Yes.

MH: Well, thank you so much for your time.

End of Interview. 1:16:57