

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

## DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Op-Eds from ENSC230 Energy and the  
Environment: Economics and Policies

Undergraduate Research in Agricultural  
Economics

---

2021

### 30 by 30

LaRon Core

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ageconugensc>



Part of the [Environmental Indicators and Impact Assessment Commons](#), [Natural Resources and Conservation Commons](#), [Oil, Gas, and Energy Commons](#), and the [Other Environmental Sciences Commons](#)

---

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Research in Agricultural Economics at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Op-Eds from ENSC230 Energy and the Environment: Economics and Policies by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

OP-ED Final Draft

LaRon Core

30 by 30

Biden's 30 by 30 plan, a regulatory approach to conservation, an imminent response to environmental action, a promise of inclusivity to all stakeholders. Or a broken promise in the making, an environmental policy inadequate to deliver sufficient results to its stakeholders? I am set to believe Biden's 30 by 30 plan could very well be DOA.

Our private Nebraska landowners deserve better, their businesses and property rights deserve protection from Biden's 30 by 30's misleading intentions.

The distrust of the federal government stems from repeated failure of protection for Tribal lands, working lands, and private lands. After all who can we trust to protect Nebraska better than Nebraskans.

We can accomplish conservation efforts with market-based approaches, putting the power into the hands of state, and local governments while working alongside constituents that make up those communities.

First, 30 by 30 addresses the disappearance of nature. While there is indeed an extinction crisis due to the shrinkage of biodiversity. The DOI, in collaboration with the department of Agriculture and Commerce believe the problem is due to "development" (DOI 2021). Most likely the development and outward expansion of cities.

Critics believe there is no room for working lands in the 30 by 30 plan, as they believe working lands are the culprit to the lack of biodiversity. While this may hold some truth, ranch

and farmlands are shrinking at an alarming rate, some 17,000 square miles in just the last two decades (DOI 2021).

Ranch and farms lands, feed our country, there's also ways to incorporate sustainable farming and ranching techniques, techniques that promote biodiversity. Counting them out would do more harm than good, forcing productive lands out of commission.

Second, the 30 by 30 plan wants to mitigate the impacts created by climate change through conservation. Nebraska can mitigate climate change through conservation without the complete intervention of the federal government. It seems like Nebraska has already been doing its job at conserving land, as private landowners are essentially conservationists, and 97% of Nebraska land is privately owned (Spike 2021).

The 30 by 30 plan isn't necessary. It is unclear how 30% of land will be conserved and how effective this arbitrary number will help combat climate change. It's also unclear how the DOI plans to grab 30% more of US land, or if they even have the authority to do so.

Farmers already have been more than willing to participate in preexisting conservation programs, offered by the USDA, LWCF, Nebraska Environment Trust, and local and state conservation programs that offer incentives for voluntary participation (outdoornebraska 2021).

Many local governments use property taxes as a prime source of generating revenue. Federal lands are exempt from such taxation. Forcing a higher tax burden on private landowners, which would further hurt them, especially larger scale private farming and ranching operations (Spike 2021).

Supporters of the 30 by 30 plan, argue that conserving 30% more land will help fight climate change. People in opposition of the 30 by 30 claim that that the government will either use conservation easements or federal purchase of private landowners to accomplish this land

grab, otherwise known as eminent domain. Supporters however claim that this isn't a land grab at all but rather a plan to create more conservation opportunities.

Supporters also claim that the government needs control over these lands, because individuals cannot be trusted to properly manage their land efficiently. Individuals who have had ownership over several generations.

This executive order is DOA because it has already received pushback from several critical states the 30 by 30 plan would need to accomplish its' goal. One state pushing back is from our very own Governor Pete Ricketts who is currently making efforts to stop the 30 by 30.

This plan also needs to be completed by 2030, but the next president could very well reverse Biden's executive order. Does the DOI, and Department of Agriculture & Commerce even have the funds to successfully implement? What are the specifics of these voluntary conservation programs exactly look like? We can't trust a plan that lacks transparency, there needs to be more clarity, on exactly how the 30 by 30 will accomplish its goal.

Ultimately if the 30 by 30 plan truly wants to help states and local communities, its need to be clear and concise and what implementation will look like, that is how you incorporate, value, and support a community. Through providing trustworthy legislation, working alongside, and allowing private landowners to keep control of their land.

## Works Cited

*Report: Conserving and Restoring America the Beautiful 2021.*

<https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/report-conserving-and-restoring-america-the-beautiful-2021.pdf>.

Wufei Yu Analysis June 23, 2021 Like Tweet Email Print Subscribe Donate Now. “A Reality Check on Biden's '30 by 30' Conservation Plan.” *High Country News – Know the West*, 23 June 2021, <https://www.hcn.org/articles/south-politics-a-reality-check-on-bidens-30-by-30-conservation-plan>.

Tubb, Katie. “Devil's in Details in Biden's ‘30×30’ Conservation Plan.” *The Heritage Foundation*, <https://www.heritage.org/environment/commentary/devils-details-bidens-3030-conservation-plan>.

Philip Gruber, News Editor. “Biden 30 by 30 Conservation Plan Draws Controversy.” *Lancaster Farming*, 11 Aug. 2021, [https://www.lancasterfarming.com/news/main\\_edition/biden-30-by-30-conservation-plan-draws-controversy/article\\_45f20df6-4067-511e-8eab-2897f3ded5a4.html](https://www.lancasterfarming.com/news/main_edition/biden-30-by-30-conservation-plan-draws-controversy/article_45f20df6-4067-511e-8eab-2897f3ded5a4.html).

Post, Spike Jordan for The Fence. “‘30 x 30’ - Progressives Pushing for Massive Federal Land Grab.” *TheFencePost.com*, 5 Mar. 2021, <https://www.thefencepost.com/news/30-x-30/>.

*Vilsack: Biden's 30x30 Goal Is 'Not a Land Grab' | Agweb.*

<https://www.agweb.com/news/policy/politics/vilsack-bidens-30x30-goal-not-land-grab>.

DeMars, Grant. “Secretary of Agriculture: 30 by 30 Plan Not a 'Land Grab;' Questions, Concerns Linger.” *Https://Www.kwch.com*, <https://www.kwch.com/2021/04/28/secretary-of-agriculture-30-by-30-plan-not-a-land-grab-questions-concerns-linger/>.

“Landowner Programs.” *Nebraska Game and Parks*, 2 Aug. 2021, <http://outdoornebraska.gov/landownerprograms/>.