EXHIBIT 17
DATE 3-11-11
SB 11

This message was sent to Executive Directors of the State Associations of the states listed. Below is the response received from each state. (As of 3/15)	
A bill is making its way through the Montana Legislature that would require county and special district governing bodies to demand that federal agencies coordinate with local policies. If the federal government fails to coordinate, the governing body can hold public hearings to discuss the plan or policy and determine whether or not to litigate to enforce the local government's coordination rights. The bill as originally introduced has been amended to remove schools and municipalities. I would like to request that you send me any related codes, bills or other information that may be available from your state.	
Alaska	No, we don't. [In] The State Legislature, so far, has not come along.
California	We have nothing like this in California. It is an issue to some of our rural counties with a lot of forest land, but does not rise to the level of state legislation.
Colorado	While we have had a number of counties/commissioners interested in cooperating agency status and what that means (and attending various seminars to learn about it), so far we have not seen any legislation to mandate that local governments or counties demand it.
Idaho	Nothing like this has happened yet in Idaho. (1st response) We haven't seen anything dealing with coordination. (2nd response)
Nebraska	We in Nebraska, have not seen any legislation introduced in our legislature during this session that relates to such "coordination".
Nevada	No such bill in Nevada at this time, but we are only in the third week of our 120 day session. I'll let you know if anything develops.
New Mexico	There was a conceptual bill along these lines that was talked about early in the session, but nothing has been introduced.
North Dakota	So far nothing introduced like that in North Dakota.
Oregon	Nothing like this has appeared in our legislature. In November we renewed a memorandum of cooperation with regional USFS and BLM and our association is engaged in several cooperative collaborations with federal agencies.
Texas	Nothing like this in Texas
Washington	We don't have anything like this. (1st response) This is what I had found earlier (2nd response)
Wyoming	None in Wyoming at this point.

Arizona	Arizona saw a bill virtually identical to Montana's pass through the legislative process last year. It passed on party-line votes out of both chambers. A copy of the bill is attached. According to conversations we've had with county supervisors, this legislation has had little or no impact on the willingness or unwillingness of federal agencies to work with counties. Many of our counties have already worked very closely with federal agencies on programs that directly impact their constituents. The legislation adopted last year did not compel anyone to work together who had not been doing so already. The biggest impact of the legislation, unfortunately, has been the impression it created among rural county residents that their supervisors could now demand coordination and thereby influence or even prevent the implementation of federal programs with which they disagree. For example, many residents of Greenlee County are now under the impression that the County could, if its supervisors decided, force an end to the Mexican Wolf Recovery Program, a hugely unpopular U.S. Fish and Wildlife activity in that county. As a result of the legislation, several county supervisors who have diligently worked for years with Fish and Wildlife to mitigate the impact of the program now find themselves accused of not "coordinating" and ending the program. The supervisors are now, in some cases, being blamed for the program's ongoing existence. Likewise, supervisors in Navajo County have been accused of failing to use the coordination tool to halt Forest Service implementation of travel management plans that restrict public access to the forest, in spite of having spent the last three years working closely with the Forest Service in a successful effort to maximize public access under the new plans. The feeling among all of these supervisors is that the law was unnecessary; that they were already coordinating with the federal counterparts and will continue to coordinate. When these supervisors report this to their constituents, they are often told that they are not coordinating "the right way" since they have not ended the program or forced the county's position on the federal agency. To summarize, the legislation has not improved federal agencies' cooperation with Arizona counties , but has unfairly raised public expectations that county supervisors can impose their will on federal agencies and thus influence or end unpopular federal programs. These expectations are a significant and frustrating challenge for county supervisors who, in fact, have successfully coordinated on behalf of their constituents for many years.