

# Endangered Species & Wetlands

By Jim Beers,  
Refuge Manager, Special Agent, & Wildlife Biologist  
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, retired.

All the ongoing hoopla about wetlands and the need for "more" federal authority, "more" public funds, "more" government land acquisition, and "less" Constitutional protection for private property owners, is like the endangered species con game.

The Endangered Species Act was sold to the politicians and the public by socialists, bureaucrats, and university professors, on false assumptions. Critters, like isolated minnows (snail darters), and birds (spotted owls) in reputed need of vast un-logged woodlands, and warm and fuzzy creatures like elephants, whales, and eagles were touted (irresponsibly) as on the verge of disappearing forever. Draconian new federal authorities, massive government expenditures, and bloated bureaucracies were created to "save" species. Today, we list as endangered: species, also endangered subspecies, races, populations, distinct populations, and distinct population segments. The concept of species was only a sales pitch, and it worked. Today, billions of dollars, and thousands of lost citizen's rights later, no species can be shown to have been saved by fettering the rights of American citizens, and taking millions of dollars worth of property rights without compensation. But hey, it has created lots of government jobs. Thousands of bureaucrats have retired

with bigger pensions. Universities have stopped graduating natural resource managers, and now churn out regiments of "evaluators," "planners," and researchers capable of utilizing satellites and computers to justify everything from government land acquisition, to centralized control of human activities, and global warning. Federal jurisdictions and authority have quadrupled, while state, local, and property owner authorities have dwindled, and in some cases, disappeared. It has become the same with "saving" wetlands.

Wetlands are low spots (basins) that are moist or wet, most or all of the time. They are either isolated (no outlet), or flood at a certain level, or they vary with water levels in connected creeks, rivers, lakes, or salt water bodies. They flood and cover unimaginable acreages in wet periods (think Mississippi floods.) They disappear in dry periods (think the Midwest in the Dust Bowl 1930's.) They usually have certain plants that distinguish them, but many like cattail, for instance, grow on wet soft spots on sheer cliffs below seeping springs on the cliff face. While their benefits are indisputable (bird and fish production, ground water recharge, welcome relief in developed landscapes) they are like

"endangered" species, misrepresented as on the verge of extinction, and justification for new government powers and spending.

The federal government has had jurisdiction over "navigable waters" for some time. This is the authority used to dredge interstate waterways and dam western rivers for power, irrigation, and recreation. Extending current federal jurisdiction to wetlands is a scam, just like endangered species. There are hundreds of millions of acres of wetlands already in the federal landholdings. When private wetlands are tiled, ditched or filled, the water that formerly accumulated there is often simply diverted to other basins or associated waterways. Today, when

housing areas or business sites are built, water-settling basins (a new feature that slows runoff after storms) are common and used by nesting birds. Drained agricultural fields' temporary

wetlands often divert the water to government wetlands, such as state wildlife areas. Wetlands change as they get less water or more water from nearby watersheds that may see a road constructed, homes built, or a periodic climate change. To say that wetland X ought to always have the same acreage or the same plants, is just like saying wolves ought to be in all the places they were 100 or 200 years ago. Both are silly assertions. But, if the Endangered Species Act is any fair indication of what is being perpetrated by calling for increased federal authority over another amorphous (wetlands) portion of the environment of the United States, we should all be skeptical and resist all but those most highly justified.

Use of government acquisition as only a last resort – with the consent of the state affected. Other authorities should remain with state governments, and local authorities.

Biologically, you cannot freeze the environment, anymore than a transplanted Californian can freeze the view from



his new mountain retreat in Idaho or New Mexico. Stop the logging, and eventually it all burns. Stop the hunting, and gradually big mammals decrease in numbers, and predators become more common and dangerous to men and their animals. Stop the roads and trails, trapping, horseback riding, and all kinds of recreation, and eventually, public land management withers, because no one supports higher taxes for it. Taxes from logging, grazing, hunting, fishing, trapping, etc. disappear. Stop the grazing, and ranches and rural communities wither as well – to the detriment of all.

The government owns enough wetlands. Government wetlands, more often than not, are either closed to or restricted for the very human activities they claim to “save” them for. Government wetlands bought with millions of dollars in hunters’ Duck Stamp dollars, for waterfowl production, were threatened with being changed into “Pre-Columbian, Native Ecosystems” under the last administration. That meant slowly stopping the water management for marshes on refuges and in parks, instead, using that money for playing with endangered species humbug, or other such “priorities,” and allowing the government-purchased wetlands to revert to dry or semi-dry uplands covered with whatever happened to grow there. That is how government conservation policies today, can be changed into tomorrow’s nightmare.

Government is no more reliable as a savior of wetlands than they are as a designator and caretaker for endangered species. The hidden agenda behind federal wetland authority is the same as the one behind endangered species authority. It is being pushed by the same environmental and animal rights sects that incorporate the same silent conservation partners in Washington, the same politicians, bureaucrats, and professors.

The ultimate goal remains an all-powerful federal government, eliminating all the rights and freedoms that are the focus of environmental and animal rights radicals. Endangered species, wetlands, proposed invasive species authority, and continuing massive government land acquisition, are all intended to implement everything from Wildlands to Buffalo Commons, to

a United States free of hunting, fishing, trapping, ranching, logging, farming, and on, and on.

So the next time a news story murmurs about the need for more federal wetlands authority, or your politician says he supports more such authority, or they run an article in a magazine showing some pretty upper Midwest marsh in summer flowers surrounded by a band of trees, as an example of why we need more federal authority over wetlands, write a letter to the editor, and tell everyone you know, how dangerous and unnecessary it is to grow the federal estate and federal authority like this. Up until




now, saying things like this has been akin to criticizing affirmative action or questioning why we cannot manage whales and elephants like all other wildlife. Don't let this topic of wetlands authority remain a sacred cow. Challenge it when it comes up, and try to make everyone think critically about what is going on, with both endangered species and wetlands. 🌍

# Take Their Word?

By Jim Beers

Refuge Manager, Special Agent, & Wildlife Biologist U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, retired.



"Geez Beers, I saw more sharptails and sage grouse than I ever have or probably ever will in the rest of my life." So said a friend who had just returned from an annual, lengthy trip to Canada and Montana to hunt ducks, geese, pheasants, sharptails, and sage grouse. He has been hunting the prairies for fifty years and, like me, he is an educated and experienced wildlife biologist. I am hopeful that I might be invited to a dinner featuring some of those grouse, this fall or winter. The sharptails he served last fall were about as good as it gets.

After I hung up, I thought about endangered species scams and the National Hunting and Fishing Survey scam. I have received several requests, in the past year, to comment on the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service push to list the sage grouse as threatened or endangered. The FWS, and their environmental and animal rights sleep-partners, have been touting doomsday for sage grouse for the last 3 or 4 years.

Low populations of sage grouse (like warm summers are to global warming) were the trigger for the usual suspects to murmur the nonsense to forward their hidden agenda. The tune went something like this, "sage grouse are approaching extinction because of overgrazing, roads, and human activities." "Sage grouse are true native indicator species that tell us about an environment in need of preservation." "Sage grouse will need enormous acreages to be set aside, and only through the Endangered Species Act can we do that."

I could go on, but you get the picture. Suffice it to say, that even under "pristine" or "native" or "Pre-Columbian" conditions, sage grouse populations and

distribution went up and down. Some years, Blackfoot and Sioux got belly aches from eating so many one year, and other years, never even tasted them.

Today, however, such natural changes are legal reasons for federal seizure of state jurisdiction over these birds and justification for federal bureaucrats to close public lands, buy more private land, stop public uses like camping, hiking, hunting, grazing, ranching, dog hunting, and, probably, a whole list of things that you and I can't even imagine today.


Remember, these guys and dolls making these somber pronouncements about the precarious status of sage grouse and what must be done to save them, are the same ones who told us "wild turkeys need virgin forests" (a lie) and "Canada geese would make nice additions to urban landscapes" (I leave that one to you.) They are also the same ones assuring us about the desirability, and environmental importance, of reintroducing wolves. Oh, they are also the ones assuring you that wolves are harmless, and don't decrease game populations. They sell Brooklyn Bridge shares in their spare time. Which brings us to the National Hunting and Fishing Survey.

For more than 15 years, millions of dollars are set aside each year, from the Pittman-Robertson (excise taxes on hunting equipment, guns, and ammunition) and Dingell-Johnson (excise taxes on fishing tackle) funds, to fund the National Hunting and Fishing Survey. A crew at the FWS pays contractors (some of whom, have in turn become millionaires,) and Bureau of the Census staff, to "analyze"

census data ostensibly regarding "fish and wildlife." There have never been any hunting or fishing advocates on the FWS staff, which has been economists and analysts, who occasionally admit to having hunted or fished, but hunting or fishing advocacy has never been allowed, or present. Advocacy of endangered species and what is termed "non-consumptive use of wildlife," has always been their purpose and guiding philosophy.

While the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and one of their Committees "oversee" the Survey, that oversight has always been perfunctory, and laced with hidden agendas. Convinced as they (state and federal bureaucrats) are that the days of trapping, hunting, and fishing are numbered; the Survey has always been something they point to, when accused of only being only a "hook and bullet" gang. It is something they will point to when we – hunters, fishermen, and trappers – have been banned, like English foxhunters.

While many lower-level state employees will tell you what a load of BS the Survey is, the mid-level and top guys protect it like a puppy. No matter that the questions and analysis have always been slanted to overstate the "eco-tourism, wildlife photography" stuff. The short shrift it has always given hunters, fishermen, and trappers is legendary. One example should suffice. While the funding comes from both P-R and D-J, only P-R funds can be used for non-hunting purposes. D-J funds, by law, can only be used for sport fish activities, but



There have never been any hunting or fishing advocates on the FWS staff... Advocacy of endangered species, and what is termed “non-consumptive use of wildlife,” has always been their purpose and guiding philosophy.

that has never proved an impediment for crafty bureaucrats.

Attending one of the Survey Committee Meetings or a Survey briefing has always been like attending a Women and Minority Government Contractor Convention. While someone like George Orwell would immediately recognize how words are used to mean the exact opposite of what they really mean, most people would never pick up on how they talk about a Hunting and Fishing Survey, but they are really discussing a “tissue of lies” about how hunting is dying, and photographers (who pay no excise taxes) will soon rule the world.

The conservation groups, from sport fishing to guns, and all the old line “conservation” groups have known about this, and colluded with them, for years. The FWS Survey crew plays them like a fiddle, giving them chestnuts for their members and making them feel like they are benefiting, too. The whole thing belongs in an old time carnival at a table with a guy in a straw hat, with three walnut shells and a pea.

Hunters are decreasing and birdseed sales are soaring, so what? Hunting is decreasing, in part, because of the expense, entry requirements, and age limits that have been increased beyond all sense, to smooch up to the anti-hunters

and anti-gun folks. State agencies have hired way too many people to do environmental and animal rights mischief in the game and fish departments. Just like the sage grouse “came back” without a bunch of bonus money appropriated for some bureaucrat, our hunting, fishing, and trapping would probably benefit significantly from fewer employees, concentrating on the species that generate funds, and intense interest from citizens, instead of every little nook and cranny of the “ecosystem.”

When hunters decrease, those of us who persist, enjoy more opportunity and less competition. This alone attracts hunters, and future hunters, into the sport. Because we are a “smaller” percentage of the population, we need to worry. Well, you better tell that to the guys who go to boxing matches, or the people who go to symphonies, or people who gather walnuts, or those who collect knives – “if you don’t constitute a majority, you will be erased, by those who object to what you do.” Trendlines, like economic forecasts and population predictions, go up and down, and most often, for reasons unbeknownst to experts.

It is time to quit listening to these self-serving bureaucracies as if they have our best interests at heart. They don’t! In these two cases, the states should demand

that FWS stop meddling in anything to do with sage grouse, and then they (the states who should be spending that P-R and D-J money on hunting and fishing) should stop approving any funding for the Survey, and apportion that funding to the states, where their whining for the past couple of years about not having money has been continuous and irritating. Anyone hear the states standing up? Nope. What about the “conservation” groups? Nope, they just attend the meetings at glitzy locations and get their meals paid for. Anyone hear the FWS say anything? **Nope, not only is the Survey a way for them to get more employees: it is a way to skim “overhead,” and a source of propaganda when they need to justify some acquisition, endangered species thrust, or some particularly egregious harm to the citizenry, or rural area.**

After all, “78.62% of the people support it, according to the National Survey,” and “the sage grouse populations are at all-time lows, and only if that land is bought and those practices are stopped, can they have any hope for recovery.” Baloney.

The last twenty years couldn’t be described by Mr. Barnum as a period when there was “a sucker born every minute,” rather, there were thousands born every minute. ☹

It is time to quit listening  
to these self-serving bureaucracies  
as if they have our best interests at heart.  
They don’t!