UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETYet al,

Plaintiffs,

٧.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States, al.

Defendants.

GRAND STAIRCASE ESCALANTE PARTNERS,et al,

Plaintiffs,

٧.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States, al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:17cv-02587 (TSC)

Civil Action No. 1:17cv-02591 (TSC)

CONSOLIDATED CASES

AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF LAW PROFESSORS IN SUPPORT OF 3/\$,17,))6¶ 23326,7,21 72 027,21 72 ',60,66

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	
STATEMENT OF INTEREST	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
ARGUMENT	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page	e(s)
Cases	
Dames & Moore v. Regan 453 U.S. 654 (1981)	.11
Food and Drug Admiistration v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp 529 U.S. 120	.11
Kleppe v. New Mexiço 426 U.S. 529 (1976)	9
Little v. Barremę 6 U.S. (2 Cranch) 170 (1804)	.1.1
Summers v. Earth Islan d stitute, 555 U.S. 488 (2009) ²	1 -5
United States v. San Francisco 310 U.S. 16 (1940)	9
U.S. v. Students Challenging Regulatory Agency Procedures (SCRAP) 412 U.S. 669 (1973)	5
Union Oil Cnf0/CID 22>> BDC q ET mithn BT /F1 12 Tf 1 0 0 1 108.02 380.	23 Tm 0g 0G

[(4

General Mining Law of 1872, Ch. 152, 17 Stat. 91 (1872) (codified U.S.C. §21)	passim
Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009, Pub. L. No. 11411, § 2002(a), 123 Stat. 992009)	18
Utah Schools and Lands Exchange Act of 1998, Pub. L. No. 105335, 112 Stat. 3139 (1998)	passim
Utah Statehood Enabling Act, Ch. 138,§ 6,28 Stat. 107(1894)	13
Zion National Park Act, Pub. L. No. 6683, 41 Stat. 356 (9119) (codified at 6 U.S.C. § 344)	1.4
Presidential Documents	
Proclamation No. 6920Establishment of the Grand Staircasecalante National Monument 61 Fed. Reg50223 (Sept. 18, 1996)	7., 8, 15
Proclamation No. 9682 Modifying the Grand Staircas Escalante National Monument 80 Fed. Reg. 235 (Dec. 4, 2017)	2, 4, 7
Federal Regulations	
36 C.F.R. § 228.4 (2017)	6
43 C.F.R. § 3809 (2017.)	6-7
43 C.F.R. § 8341.1(a)	7
Congressional Documents	
Hardrock Mining and Reclamation Act of 2007, H.R. 2262, 110th Congress, 1st Sess. (2007.)	7
Related Filings	
\$PLFXV & XULDH % ULHI RI /DZ 3URIHVVRtb V Motion to DismissHopi Tribe v. TrumpNo.1:17cv-02590TSC, (D.D.C. Nov. 16, 2018)FCF No. 75	6XSSRUWLQJ 3

William J. Clinton, Remarks Announcing the Establishment of the Grand	
StaircaseEscalante National Monument at Grancanyon National Park,	
Arizona(Sept. 18, 1996), transcript by Gerhard Peters and John T.	
Woolley, The American Presiden Project University of California Santa	
Barbara https://www.presidencucsb.edu/node/221204	15

STATEMENT OF INTEREST

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

President Clinton establishedrand Staircasen 1996 in accordance with the Antiquities Act, pur

Staircase Proclamationand ratified by Congress Plaintiffs have alleged that the Trump Proclamation creates a risk of imminent harministorical and scientific resources in the lands that would be removed from the Moment. For instance, the Trump Proclamation subjects the lands removed from protection to the General Mining Law of 18702, the permits a wide range of explorative activities to the lands of the lands of the lands removed from protection to the General Mining Law of 18702, the permits a wide range of explorative activities to the lands of the lands of

As argued by amici law professors in a separatteerbefore this Court regarding the Bears Ears National Monument, which President Trump similarsyought to reduce by presidential proclamation, authority that Congress elegated to the President under the Antiquities Act does not include the authority to modify or revoke national monument designations made by prior presidents. For this reasen, rulmp Proclamation is ultra vires and must not be allowed to standurther, Congress has enacted its ation ratifying Grand Staircase affirming its conservation purpose and expanding its boundaries. Accordingly, the Trump Proclamation is in contration of the exercise of Congress authority with respect to the Monument and, if permitted to stand, would be an action contrary to the will of Congress as expressed by standucthese reasons, the Court should GHQ\\) HGHUDO 'HIHQG SQWV¶ PRWLRQ WR GLVPL

^{4 30} U.S.C. §§ 21et seq

ARGUMENT

I. THE PLAINTIFFS FACE RISK OF IMMINENT INJ URY DUE TO EXPLORATIVE USES PERMITTED UNDER THE GENERAL MINING LAW OF 1872, MAKING THIS CASE RI PE FOR JUDICIAL REVI EW

Plaintiffs correctly asserthat the Trump Proclamation creates a risk of imminent harm to their recreational, aesthetic, scientified other interests in the protectedources within Grand Staircase Plaintiffs in The Wilderness Society Trumpallege inter alia, that underthe General Mining Law of 1872, 30 U.S.C. §§ £21seq 30 LQLQJ /DZ′ public landsremoved from the protection of the Monument by the tump Proclamation will be immediately vulnerable to the risk that prospectors will engage in exploration activities 3FDVXDO XVH′ DQG 3Q £61Wplub librib lawd ben'd fibiring law law LHV ZKHUH WKH\ SUHYÉ FSXNVaOy, FFairct 5016 Grand Staircase Escalante

Partners v. Trumpallege inter alia, WKDW WKH 7UXPS 3URFODPDWLRQ 3XQ HVVHQWLDO WR SUHYHQWLQJ WKHG £61HIJW £6 GVD KWHLR £QQ £6M UVDHP €6 access that the Mining Law

standingest. The Mining Law authorizes citizens of the United States to enter unreserved and unappropriated public lands to explore for valuable mineral deposits, such as gold or copper, and to stake claims to any deposits they discover, which can create vested private property rights within such public lands.

argument that Plaintiff¶V DOOHJHG Lla@geMyXfrlodrb_Hflutkure; Volte&chelteP agency dHFLVLRQV ′)HG 'HI 07' DW HPSKDVLV DGGHG

LQLW LIDZW WRKORXW QRWLFH WR %/0 IRU DQ\DFWLYLWLHV LID 43 C.F.R. §3809 Casual useactivities encapsulate a broad array of actions that disturb the landscape, including WKH FROOHFWLRQ RIJHRFKHPLFDO URFN using hand tools; hand praing; or non PRWRUL] HG WWKOHX LXFVLHQ JRI' 3 V PDOO SRIV V X FWLRQ GUHGJHV-ʻoplandatiod de voctorial de visceso BWRWWHRUUL] HG Y HKLFOH 43 C.F.R. § 8341.1(a) The Trump Proclamation explicit regarding the ability of the public to engage in offoad vehicle use within enearly 900,000 acres of federal land stripped of protections it provides that the Secretary of the Interior mayo O RZ PRWRUL] HG and nonmechanized vehicle use on roads and trails existing immediately before the issuance of [the rand Staircase Probamation@ DQG PDLQWDLQ URDGV DQG WUProclamation No. 9682, 82 Fed. Reg. at 58094.

The lands protected within Staircas contain geological, archeological, ecological, and otherensitive resource that could be severely degraded even the least invasive of the causal use activities remitted under the Mining Law. To take just one example, the Grand Staircase Proclamation tentifies 3 > I @ UDJLOH FU Socker ELRWLF ecological feature of VLJQLILFDQW ELWRITO TRIBLIAN TO DUO THAT WHICH HAVE SOD \ a critical role throughout the monument, stabilizing the highly erodible desert soils and SURYLGLQJ QXWI SHIRRWUNG LACRU SWORD WWW 1 DWLRQDO 3 DUN 6 soils can take anywhere from a few years the SHUDO GHFDGHV RU ORQJHU W they are compacted. Mineral exploration activities, including effoad vehicle use and

³⁶HDQLWLDWLRQ´KDV ORQJ EK0PK0Py @`

imminent risk of harm to sensitivgeological, archeological, ecological, and other resources. * LYHQ 3 O socierotified, Lied or beation alaes the tic and other interests time ORQXPHQW¶V UHVRXUFHV WKH SRWEHRQWWKLDGQRLWPHPOEKQDIQOV KI 3 F D V X D O X V berm Date of Whole Y the Walinting Law is sufficient for the Court to find that Plaintil I Val¶egations are ripe for judicial review.

II. THE TRUMP PROCLAMATION EXCEEDS THE AUTHORITY DELEGATED TO THE PRESIDENT BY CONGRESS UNDER THE **ANTIQUITIES ACT**

The Constitution vests plenary authority over the public lands in Congless.

37KH &RQJUHVV VKDOO KDYH 3RZHU WR FΟ Const. art, IV, † 5XOHV DQG 5HJXODWLRQV UHVSHFWLQJ WKH 6XSUHPH &RXUW KDV FKDUDFWHUL]HG &RQJUHVV¶V DXW (citing United States v. San Francisco U.S. 16, 29 (1940) Accordingly, presidential authority over public lands is limited to that which specifically been degated by Congress.

In the case of the Antiquities Act, the Preside Intasthe authRULW\WR3UHVHUYH \(^{3}\) lands. 54 U.S.C. § 320301(a)However, Congress

3URSHL

Abolish or Diminish National Monument\$03 Va. L. Rev. Online 55 (2017). The brief submitted by amici law professors in consolidated claetesre this Court concerning Bears Ears National Monument (Case Nos. 1:467-02590 (TSC), 1:1-7cv-02605 (TSC), and 1:17cv-02606 (TSC)) WKH ³ (ADHDVU \$\mathbb{S} PLFX \text{fully setts Librit little legal and historical bases for these arguments, which app for tood Staircasies as they doto the Bears Ears National Monumel 1. As discussed in detail in that brief WKH 3UHVLGHQW \$\mathbb{S} UHVLGHQW \$\m

III. CONGRESSIONAL RATIFICATION O) 7+(02180(17¶6 BOUNDARIES PRECLUDES MODIFICATION BY PRESIDENTIAL DECLARATION

As referenced above and discusse Playintiffs and other amici, the Presidelaticks authority under the Antiquities Act to reduct the top of a national monument. The case of the Monument, the Presidelational lacksthis authority by virtue of the fact that Congress has, by legislation, exerted its authority and expressed clear intent as to the ORQXPHQW¶V ERXQGDULHV DQG FRQVHUYDWLRQ SXUSRVH to reduce the scope of the Monument.

¹⁶ \$PLFXV &XULDH %ULHI RI /DZRO @ ð 0 D Fþ ^gŽ¿`1 õ € Ài8.59 Tmg 0 044>9<0

Α. The President may not exercise authority delegated by Congresis a manner that is contrary to Congressional intent

It is axiomatic that, when exercising delegated authority the idents prohibited from acting in a manner that is contrary to the will of Congress expressed tute. Little v. Barreme 6 U.S. (2 Cranch) 170, 1778 (1804) (rejecting presidential order to seize ships sailing from French ports when statute authorized seizure only of ships stailing French ports) Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Saw 48 US. 579, 586 (1952) (finding SUHVLGHQWLDO DFWLRQ XQODZIXO ZKHQ LQFRPSDWLEOH Taft-Hartley Act); Food and Drug Administration v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. 529 U.S. 120, 155 (rejecting asserted authority of FrDAequiate tobacco products where & RQJUHVVLRQDO DFWLRQV 3>W @ DNHQ W RSJflehrWoutsleh U GHVFULEHG E\ -XVWLFH -DFNVRQ 3>Z@KHQ WKH 3UHVLGH expressed or implied will of Congressis power is at its lowest ebb, for then he can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any constitutional powers of Congress over WKH P DY Wu Mystown 343 U.S. ta637 (Jackson, J., concurring) e Dames & Moore v. Regan453 U.S. 654, 6861981) (employing the framework set forth by Justice Jackson in Youngstow)n

SU

Under this principle, even ssuming arguend othat the President was delegated authority under the Antiquities Act to reduce the boundaries of a national monu(hent was not) that authority could not be exercised in contravention of legislation by Congress establishing or ratifying the scope of such a monumentere, because Congress has ratified and modifiedhe boundaries of the Monument through legislation of President may not now, by proclamation or otherwise, shrink those and open those public lands to uses in direct contravention of Congressional intent.

Law and Policy 129-145 (3d ed. 2016). The school land grant policy as premised on an expectation that the state parcels, like the federal land that surrounded them, would eventually pass into private hands or be leased for development, with the proceeds benefiting UtD K ¶ V V F K R R Od. FHIS WEQEG Laid HTQ2 the American 6 R X W K Z H V W ¶ V defining feature limited the potential uses over large tracts of public land, and as a result,

owned tracts that were beyond the jurisdiction of the federal land managers, even though many of them contained ignificant cultural, geological and biological resources the kind identified in the Grand Staircase Proclamatio BeeLands Exchange Act § 202

At the WLPH RI*UDQG 6WDLUFDVH¶V GH bidgottatoon LRQ DV D
were underway between the State of Utah and the federal government to exchange state
lands within several other federally protected areas in Utah for unprotected federal lands
outside those areas. President Clinton¶V DQQRXQR Helpe Polition of WStarcase
Proclamational luded to the negotiations, and suggested that the designation of the
Monument would 3DFFHOHHDPWKHDQWINHPS SCIPE of Helpe WY President Clinton
directed the Secretary of the Inth ULRU WR ZRU by verification with the Secretary of the Inth ULRU WR ZRU by verification with the administration
ZRXOG 3UHVROMHGUHBWRQDBBV LQ YDOXDWLR OHELQ IDYRU
specifically linked the exchange with the RQXPHQW¶V, starting that QDD WW IN QDD WW

In 1998, Utah and the federal governmente ached an agreeme in twhich Utah would convey lands to the deral government further federal conservation interests, including state landwithin Grand Staircase exchange for federal lands of equal value to be develop 60.63 Tm 223.13 7 377J E3 /P <</MCID 7>> BDC q TJ ET q TJ ET q 0.6t TJ E

3 \$ JUHHP \$ POCHWCALLY, Utah transferred WLWOH WR WKH 8 QLWHG 6 WDWH the exterior boundaries of the Monument, comprising approximately 176,698.62 acres of ODQG DQG WKH PLQHUDO LQWHUHVW LQldDas \$ 2 (E) 1 PDWHO\

The Agreement DRYLGHG WKDW 3 ODQGV DQG LQWHUHVWV LQ O within the exterior boundaries of the Monument . . . shall become a part of the Grand Staircas Escalante National Monument, and shall be subject to all the laws and regulations applicDEOH WR WKHd. (2 F) (X) PH (2 M/r), 'the federal government greed to convey to Utah federal lands outside the Monument and other conservation areas that were suitable for mineral or other economic development and the s 5 Month of Id. at

FRPPLWPHQWV′RIWKH SDUWLHMod.at³\$D34(b)Dnn FRsDhimNodiMogsth, URI)HGH

UHVHUYDWLRQV DQG RWKHU SURYLVLRQV'RI WKH \$JUH

Congress affirmed and specifically enumerated the conservation benefits eved by including the state tracts within the Monument ingthat

[c]ertain State school trust lands within the Monument, like the Federal lands comprising the Monument, have substitude noneconomic scientific, historic, cultural, scenic, recreational, and natural resources, including ancient Native American archeological sites and rare plant and aniomahounities.

Lands

C. 6 X E V H T X H Q W O H J L V O D W L R Q F R Q I L U P V & R Q J U H V V protect resources within Grand Staircase, precluding Presidential

CONCLUSION

3 U H V L G H Q W & O L Q WGRa@d¶ Stain@asted prob@dD &WwidRe QrarRetty of important scientific and historic resources YnR X W K H U Q 8 W D K Z D V U D W L I L H G enactment of the Lands Exchange Act in 1998. The Trump Proclamation purporting to reduce the area of the Monument and open formerly protected public lands to exploration and exploitation creates a risk of imminement by virtue of the operation of the Mining

/ D Z P D N L Q J 3 O D L Q W L I I V ¶ F R P S O D L Q W V U L S H I R U U H Y L H Z ultra vires, as the President lacks the authority under the Antiquities Act to shrink a national monument, and directlyochtracts the intention of Congress as expressed by legislation ratifying the Monument and affirming its conservation purpose. Heavet reasons, Federal Defendants ¶ motion to dismiss must be denied.

Respectfully Submitted: November 19, 2018

/s/ Douglas W. Baruch
Douglas W. Baruch (D.C. Bar No. 414354)

Appendix A

ON BEHALF OF THE FOLLOWING LAW PROFESSOR SIGNATORIES:

В

CHRISTINE A. KLEIN Chesterfield Smith Professor of Law University of Florida Levin College of Law

SARAH KRAKOFF Moses Lasky Professor of Law University of Colorado Law School

MONTE MILLS
Associate Professor of Law and
Co-Director, Margery Hunter Browlindian Law Clinic
Alexander Blewett III School of Law
The University of Montana