Sovereign Energy
Statement of Position and Recommendations:
Opposing the Bipartisan American Affordability and Jobs Act (BAAJA)

I. Background

At Sovereign Energy, we believe Indigenous voices and leadership are essential to building a just, equitable, and clean energy future. The enduring impacts of energy extraction, exploitation, and systemic barriers to Tribal energy sovereignty continue to harm Indigenous communities and hinder Tribal Nation-building. We work alongside Tribal governments and Indigenous communities across the Southwest to advance Tribal energy self-determination, promote climate solutions, and advocate for reparative actions that address the injustices of harmful energy development.

Founded in 2021 as a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization, Sovereign Energy supports the individual and collective efforts of Southwest Tribes and Pueblos to lead the transition toward a just, interdependent, and sustainable energy future. Our work is grounded in Indigenous stewardship, traditional knowledge, and deep respect for the lands, waters, and sacred places that have sustained our communities for generations. We collaborate with Tribal Nations, Tribal entities, Indigenous-led organizations, policymakers, and environmental partners to ensure that Indigenous leadership guides energy policy and development.

Since its inception, Sovereign Energy has engaged in discussions surrounding federal permitting reform, recognizing the need for more efficient and predictable processes to support clean energy development and infrastructure. We support transformative permitting that upholds environmental protections, public participation, and the federal government's obligations to Tribal Nations.

Sovereign Energy supports meaningful permitting reform; however, we oppose the Bipartisan American Affordability and Jobs Act (BAAJA), S. 5653. Although proponents argue that the legislation would accelerate clean energy and infrastructure development, its provisions extend far beyond clean energy projects. We stand aligned with and in support of Tribal Nations across Indian Country voicing concerns that the bill would expedite a broad range of energy and industrial development, including fossil fuel extraction and mining, while weakening environmental safeguards, restricting meaningful public participation, and undermining Tribal consultation and historic preservation processes.

BAAJA would impose devastating consequences to Indian Country: substantially altering federal permitting and regulatory processes, diminishing opportunities for Tribal Nations to influence decisions affecting their ancestral homelands, sidelining public input and participation, and increasing the risk of irreversible harm to sacred places, cultural resources, water, and communities. These concerns are embedded throughout the entirety of the bill and cannot be adequately addressed through amendments or by removing individual provisions.

This statement outlines Sovereign Energy's concerns about the legislation and explains why BAAJA should be opposed in its entirety. We urge Tribes, Tribal entities, Native organizations, partner organizations, environmental and conservation allies, and concerned individuals to take the following actions:

1. Oppose BAAJA in its entirety.
2. Urge Senator Martin Heinrich to withdraw his support and co-sponsorship of BAAJA and collaborate with the bill's other sponsors, Senators Capito, Lee, and Whitehouse, to withdraw it from consideration.
3. Encourage every member of Congress to vote NO on the bill, including on any motion to proceed and on cloture.
4. Call on Congress to reset the permitting reform debate and meaningfully consult Tribal Nations in developing any legislative proposals or amendments that could affect Tribal sovereignty, cultural resources, or Tribal lands and waters.

II. BAAJA Undermines Tribal Sovereignty and Self-Determination

BAAJA would significantly affect the laws and processes Tribal Nations rely on to protect sacred places, water resources, cultural practices, and ancestral homelands, including areas outside present reservation boundaries. The legislation's provisions work together to diminish Tribal authority and participation: fewer activities could be subject to federal review; consultation processes could conclude before Tribal concerns are adequately addressed; Tribal historic preservation programs could face additional oversight and penalties; and courts could be restricted from halting projects even when agencies violate the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The federal government's responsibilities to Tribal Nations are not discretionary matters to be set aside for administrative convenience or compromised in the name of permitting efficiency. These responsibilities stem from Tribal sovereignty, federal law, treaties, and other binding agreements, as well as the enduring government-to-government relationships between the United States and Tribal Nations.

1. Weakening NHPA Protections and Threatening Sacred Landscapes

Under current law, properties of traditional and cultural importance to a Tribe may be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Federal agencies must consult with Tribes when proposed federal undertakings may affect properties of significance to them. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) provides an important mechanism for Tribal Nations to identify cultural resources, communicate their concerns, and participate in decisions that affect their ancestral homelands.

BAAJA would substantially weaken these protections by narrowing the projects, properties, and effects subject to Section 106 review, imposing abbreviated response periods, and allowing agencies to move

forward without meaningful Tribal participation. Section 2301 of S. 5653 would significantly amend the NHPA, including its treatment of properties of traditional religious and cultural importance. The bill's proposed language further constrains recognition of these properties by emphasizing categories such as districts, sites, buildings, structures, objects, artifacts, and material remains.

These changes risk erasing the living cultural landscapes and enduring relationships that define Tribal connections to ancestral homelands. They could also impose federal documentation and identification standards that conflict with Tribal knowledge systems, cultural protocols, and traditional understandings of sacred places. The legislation would restrict the federal undertakings and effects subject to Section 106 review, potentially excluding portions of development projects and limiting consideration of visual, atmospheric, audible, and cumulative impacts on cultural landscapes.

Sacred places are not confined to individual structures, archaeological sites, or isolated artifacts. They include mountains, springs, ancestral roads, gathering areas, and expansive ceremonial landscapes that hold cultural, spiritual, and historical significance across generations and jurisdictional boundaries. BAAJA's approach fails to recognize that harm to a sacred landscape can extend far beyond a proposed project's physical boundaries.

Equally concerning, Sections 2301–2302 could allow projects to proceed even when a court determines that an agency has violated the NHPA. This creates the risk that judicial findings of unlawful agency action will come too late to prevent irreversible harm. Once construction destroys or permanently alters a sacred place, no subsequent correction to an agency's process or paperwork can restore what has been lost.

Section 106 is an important mechanism through which the federal government recognizes Tribal sovereignty, self-determination, and the government-to-government relationship between Tribal Nations and federal agencies. It gives Tribes a critical opportunity to identify places of significance, share their knowledge, raise concerns, and participate in decisions affecting their ancestral homelands. Permitting reform should not come at the expense of Tribal sovereignty, the integrity of the NHPA, or the protection of sacred landscapes.

The federal government must not unilaterally define the significance of Tribal sacred places or diminish Tribal Nations' authority to identify, protect, and maintain their relationships with their ancestral homelands. These concerns are especially urgent in places such as Greater Chaco, Mount Taylor, Bears Ears, Caja del Rio, and other sacred landscapes where Tribal Nations continue to defend their cultural resources and ancestral connections against energy development, resource extraction, infrastructure expansion, and other threats.

Meaningful permitting reform must respect Tribal sovereignty and strengthen, rather than dismantle, the processes that ensure Tribal Nations have a meaningful voice in decisions affecting the places, histories, and cultural practices they have stewarded since time immemorial.

2. **Undermining Government-to-Government Consultation and Tribal Historic Preservation Programs**

BAAJA would impose restrictive consultation deadlines that fail to account for Tribal governmental processes, traditional leadership structures, cultural protocols, and the time necessary to assess potential impacts to sacred places. Under the proposed changes in Section 2301, federal agencies could advance historic preservation determinations when Tribes or Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) are unable to respond within specified 30-day periods. Agencies could also conclude consultation without meaningfully addressing or resolving Tribal concerns.

Meaningful consultation is not simply an administrative deadline or procedural formality. It is a fundamental component of the federal government's government-to-government relationship with sovereign Tribal Nations. It must allow sufficient time for participation, internal deliberation, and informed decision-making.

The proposed timelines fail to account for cultural protocols, seasonal access, translation needs, internal governmental deliberation, or consultation with traditional leaders and knowledge holders. These are essential components of Tribal decision-making, not administrative obstacles to be overcome. Restrictive deadlines could force Tribal governments to choose between rushing sensitive cultural reviews and losing an effective opportunity to influence federal decisions.

The legislation would further subject Tribal historic preservation programs to additional performance evaluations, audits, potential funding suspensions, and federal reassumption of certain THPO responsibilities. These provisions threaten Tribal self-determination and could divert already limited preservation resources from identifying, documenting, and protecting cultural resources.

Tribal Nations must retain authority over their preservation priorities, cultural information, and governmental decision-making processes. Failure to meet a federal deadline must never be interpreted as Tribal consent or agreement. Yet BAAJA would allow agencies to advance projects when Tribes cannot respond within prescribed timelines, effectively bypassing meaningful consultation and leaving Tribal concerns unresolved. This approach undermines the government-to-government relationship and places federal development schedules above Tribal sovereignty and the protection of sacred places.

Congress should address longstanding capacity challenges facing Tribal historic preservation programs through sustained, dedicated funding and technical assistance, rather than penalizing Tribal governments for being unable to meet accelerated federal development schedules. Meaningful consultation requires adequate time, resources, and respect for Tribal governmental authority. Permitting reform must strengthen Tribal capacity to participate in federal decision-making, not create additional barriers that diminish Tribal Nations' ability to protect their cultural heritage and ancestral homelands.

3. **Prioritizing Developer Interests Over Tribal Sovereignty**

S.5653 aims to expand protections and legal options for project developers, but it simultaneously restricts the ability of Tribal Nations and other affected communities to engage in federal permitting decisions and seek effective remedies.

To provide developers with greater certainty, BAAJA proposes to freeze federal analysis at a specific point in time, effectively solidifying permits and limiting opportunities for future reviews. Section 1401 includes provisions intended to insulate permitting decisions from reconsideration or modification by future administrations, even if new information becomes available. This section also prohibits future administrations from interfering with the construction or full-capacity operation of a project that has already received approval. These permit certainty provisions in Section 1401 raise significant concerns about the long-term impacts on Tribal Nations, cultural resources, and environmental protections.

Section 1402 allows developers to challenge delays and denials of projects by showing a "pattern of disparate treatment" compared to permitting decisions made over the previous five years. If successful, developers could recover up to 100 percent of construction costs, plus other related damages, for permits they argue were improperly denied or unreasonably delayed. Additionally, Section 1403 gives permit applicants the right to sue agencies that fail to meet the one-year deadline for deciding permit applications after they are deemed complete. These provisions grant developers significant new financial remedies against federal agencies, while Tribal Nations face further restrictions on their ability to challenge detrimental decisions and obtain effective legal remedies.

The legislation also creates substantial financial protections for project developers while reducing accountability for federal permitting decisions. If an agency unsuccessfully tries to revoke or modify an authorization, the project sponsor can recover delay costs and an additional 25 to 50 percent of the project costs from the Judgment Fund.

The concerns are heightened by the bill's limitations on judicial remedies under NEPA and NHPA. Because violations of these laws may result only in a court-ordered remand, Section 1401 would further constrain what agencies can do to correct their reviews. Even if a revised environmental analysis identifies greater environmental or cultural harm or highlights less damaging alternatives, agencies would generally be restricted from changing previously issued authorizations based on that new analysis. In effect, the legislation could require agencies to address flawed reviews without allowing them to meaningfully reconsider the underlying project approval. Instead of streamlining permitting, these provisions could lead to years of litigation as courts interpret their scope and implications.

Ultimately, BAAJA would enhance developers' ability to challenge and influence federal permitting decisions while simultaneously limiting opportunities for Tribal Nations to participate, express their concerns, and seek meaningful legal remedies. The legislation establishes additional protections and recourse avenues for developers while potentially restricting Tribal Nations' ability to address new information, contest inadequate federal reviews, and prevent harm to sacred sites and cultural resources. The consequences for Tribal Nations could be particularly severe, as sacred places, waters, and cultural resources may suffer irreversible damage even when significant flaws in federal reviews or permitting decisions are identified.

Tribal Nations may be adversely affected by projects that cross jurisdictional boundaries or impact ancestral homelands, cultural landscapes, and treaty-protected interests far beyond individual project sites.

The certainty provided to developers should not take precedence over Tribal sovereignty or the federal government's obligation to protect the rights and interests of Tribal Nations.

These provisions show how BAAJA would undermine Tribal sovereignty through the gradual erosion of the processes and protections that enable Tribal Nations to exercise their authority and safeguard their ancestral lands. These concerns extend beyond historic preservation and consultation, as other provisions within the legislation would weaken foundational environmental laws, limit access to judicial remedies, and restrict the ability of federal agencies to prevent environmental and cultural harm.

III. BAAJA Weakens Environmental Protections and Limits Accountability

Beyond its proposed amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act, BAAJA raises significant concerns about the integrity of other foundational environmental laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Clean Air Act (CAA), and the Endangered Species Act (ESA). These laws provide essential safeguards for public health, environmental protection, and the long-term well-being of communities and ecosystems.

Many have called for removing Title III and its NHPA provisions from the bill. However, removing the historic preservation title alone would not address the broader concerns BAAJA raises. Other provisions throughout the legislation would impose restrictions on water quality certification, establish broader litigation deadlines, create exemptions for certain projects, and limit federal agencies' ability to revisit or reconsider previously issued approvals. These provisions raise independent concerns that extend well beyond historic preservation.

Taken together, the proposed changes could significantly weaken federal agencies' ability to identify, evaluate, and prevent projects that threaten public health, environmental quality, and vital water resources. They would also diminish opportunities for meaningful Tribal participation in regulatory and permitting decisions, further limiting Tribal Nations' ability to protect their communities, natural resources, and cultural landscapes.

The implications extend beyond Tribal Nations and Indigenous communities. By weakening foundational environmental laws and reducing essential permitting safeguards, BAAJA could accelerate fossil fuel development and other projects without considering their long-term environmental and public health consequences. The resulting impacts could affect all of society, particularly communities already experiencing disproportionate exposure to pollution, water scarcity, and environmental degradation.

There is a legitimate need to improve the efficiency and predictability of federal permitting processes. However, expediting approvals should not come at the expense of the purpose and integrity of the environmental laws Congress established to address decades of environmental degradation and protect public health. Speed alone does not measure effective permitting reform. Congress must prioritize

responsible federal oversight over weakening safeguards and relying on reactive measures after environmental harm occurs.

1. **Threatening Tribal Water Resources and Environmental Protections**

Section 1202 would significantly limit the authority of Tribal Nations with treatment-as-a-state status to protect water quality under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The bill would require Tribes and other certifying authorities to meet a high evidentiary standard, providing clear and convincing evidence to justify every condition or denial. Additionally, the bill would narrow the types of water quality requirements that Tribes can enforce, excluding broader protections available under existing Tribal and state laws. These changes would make it more difficult for Tribes to impose conditions on federally permitted projects to protect water quality and the designated uses of affected waterways, weakening authority recognized by the Supreme Court in PUD No. 1 of Jefferson County v. Washington Department of Ecology, 511 U.S. 700 (1994).

For Tribal Nations, water is inseparable from cultural practices, agricultural traditions, community health, spiritual responsibilities, and obligations to future generations. Rivers and their tributaries, springs, groundwater, and entire watersheds sustain Tribal communities and maintain cultural relationships that extend across generations and jurisdictional boundaries. Weakening water quality protections in favor of expedited project approvals threatens not only environmental health, but also Tribes' ability to protect resources essential to their continued cultural and community well-being.

Other provisions of BAAJA would further limit environmental safeguards and Tribal participation in decisions affecting natural resources. Section 1304 would allow states to assume Endangered Species Act consultation responsibilities without giving Tribal Nations a role. Section 2232 would restrict conditions imposed under the Federal Power Act to protect Tribal reservations to those reasonably related to the effects of the project, potentially giving project licensees additional grounds to challenge protections for Tribal lands and resources.

These changes would further marginalize Tribal governments within federal regulatory processes, limiting their ability to address the broader impacts of development on interconnected ecosystems. The efforts of Tribal Nations to protect watersheds, maintain water quality, and safeguard culturally significant ecosystems from the effects of uranium and other mining, as well as oil and gas development, energy infrastructure, and other industrial activities, would be undermined. The repercussions would extend beyond individual project sites, jeopardizing interconnected waterways, traditional food systems, cultural practices, and the health of Tribal communities.

Federal permitting reform must recognize that protecting water resources is inseparable from protecting Tribal sovereignty, cultural continuity, and the health of present and future generations. Tribal Nations must retain meaningful authority and opportunities to protect the waters and ecosystems their communities and ways of life depend on.

2. **Restricting Judicial Review and Remedies for Irreversible Harm**

BAAJA would significantly restrict Tribal Nations' ability to seek meaningful judicial remedies when federal agencies violate environmental and historic preservation laws. While the legislation expands developers' ability to challenge federal permitting decisions and seek financial damages, it also establishes new barriers for Tribes and other affected parties seeking to hold federal agencies accountable.

Sections 1110 (NEPA), 1205 (Clean Water Act Section 404), 1305 (Endangered Species Act), and 2301 (NHPA) would shorten the time to challenge federal decisions from as long as six years under 28 U.S.C. § 2401(a) to 150 days. Section 2201 would impose the same restriction on energy and mining authorizations under any federal law. The legislation would also limit the ability to challenge NEPA and NHPA claims or Section 404 permits unless parties submitted sufficiently detailed comments during the public comment period that address the specific issues later raised in subsequent litigation (§§ 1110, 1205, 2301(c)). Although the bill includes a limited exception for Tribes that raise issues in writing during consultation, this protection does little for Tribal Nations that are never meaningfully consulted in the first place.

In the cases of NEPA and NHPA, parties may need to go beyond current standing requirements by alleging "direct harm," which the bill does not clearly define (§ 1110, proposed NEPA § 111(b)(3); § 2301(c), proposed 54 U.S.C. § 306108(c)(9)(D)(i)(II)). Collectively, these restrictions would make it significantly harder for Tribal Nations and other impacted communities to access the courts, especially when they lack the resources to identify and monitor new project proposals, participate in compressed public comment periods, and secure legal representation within shortened deadlines. Tribal Nations would be especially burdened by these requirements given the extensive number of proposed projects that may affect their ancestral homelands, cultural resources, and treaty-protected interests.

BAAJA also expands exclusions and introduces opportunities to substitute alternative review processes for NEPA documents. It outlines that a lead agency's decision that no environmental document is required would be binding to other agencies. Section 1107 extends the statutory reliance period for programmatic documents from five to ten years, depending on the underlying statute's conditions. These provisions could reduce opportunities for fresh environmental analysis, meaningful public participation, and overlook Tribal concerns. They could also limit agencies' ability to consider new information, changing environmental conditions, and less damaging project alternatives when evaluating proposed development.

Perhaps most concerning is that, when violations occur under the covered NEPA or NHPA provisions, courts would generally be limited to directing agencies to correct review deficiencies without halting project approvals or development. This creates a significant risk that construction, excavation, and other destructive activities could continue even after a court determines that an agency violated federal law.

In practical terms, a Tribal Nation could prove that an agency failed to meet its legal obligations, yet still be unable to prevent the destruction of the very resources it sought to protect. Once a sacred place is destroyed, it cannot be restored through a revised environmental assessment, additional consultation, or corrected agency paperwork. Access to judicial review must include meaningful remedies that can prevent irreversible harm to Tribal sacred sites, waters, cultural resources, and communities.

By shortening filing deadlines, restricting access to the courts, and limiting remedies when agencies violate the law, BAAJA risks making legal protections increasingly difficult to enforce and, in some cases, ineffective at preventing the very harms those protections were intended to address.

IV. BAAJA Perpetuates Environmental Injustice and Fossil Fuel Generation

1. Implications for Data Center Development and Supporting Infrastructure

The rapid expansion of data centers raises significant concerns regarding water consumption, electricity demand, air emissions, noise, and infrastructure costs. These issues extend beyond individual facilities to encompass the power generation, transmission lines, pipelines, and other infrastructure developed to support them.

When federal approvals are involved, changes to environmental review and permitting under the BAAJA could weaken scrutiny of data centers and their supporting infrastructure. While state and local approvals will still be relevant, they cannot replace federal responsibilities for evaluating environmental impacts, protecting cultural resources, and ensuring meaningful opportunities for public and Tribal participation. The bill includes provisions aimed at protecting other electricity customers from the transmission costs associated with data centers. However, these measures do not address broader concerns about water availability, pollution, cultural resources, or community participation.

Before these projects move forward, communities deserve transparent information about water sources and consumption, energy requirements, infrastructure costs, and enforceable developer obligations. Congress should ensure that developers are responsible for the costs they create and maintain rigorous reviews of environmental and cultural impacts.

These considerations are particularly crucial in New Mexico and throughout the Southwest, where water scarcity, competing demands on natural resources, and the protection of culturally significant landscapes are ongoing concerns. Promises of economic development must be evaluated against the long-term demands placed on Tribal Nations, ecosystems, water resources, land, and communities.

Meaningful permitting reform must ensure that emerging industries and their supporting infrastructure undergo appropriate environmental reviews, transparent decision-making processes, and active community participation. Accelerating development should not diminish the ability of Tribal Nations and surrounding communities to understand, influence, and protect themselves from the consequences of projects that may fundamentally alter their lands and resources.

2. BAAJA Does not Ensure Progress Toward Decarbonization

Proponents of BAAJA argue that the legislation is necessary to advance decarbonization goals and accelerate the much-needed development of clean energy infrastructure. However, the bill does not limit

its permitting reforms to clean energy projects or initiatives that advance climate goals. Instead, its provisions could also accelerate critical mineral mining, fossil fuel development, and other energy projects with potentially significant environmental and community impacts.

Expediting permitting does not necessarily translate into reduced greenhouse gas emissions or meaningful progress toward decarbonization. The legislation could facilitate projects that increase carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions while increasing localized pollution and environmental impacts. Its permit certainty provisions further limit opportunities for federal agencies to reconsider approvals in light of new information, including newly identified environmental impacts and cumulative emissions. This could make it more difficult to address the long-term climate consequences of projects once permits have been issued.

The impacts of climate change are increasingly evident in communities across the country, including through more frequent and severe extreme weather events, threats to water resources, and disruptions to ecosystems and traditional ways of life. These impacts are especially consequential for Indigenous communities whose cultural practices, food systems, livelihoods, and relationships with ancestral homelands are deeply connected to the health of the natural environment. By streamlining approvals across a broad range of energy and industrial projects without adequately distinguishing their environmental consequences, BAAJA risks perpetuating existing environmental injustices, particularly for Tribal Nations, Indigenous communities, and other communities already disproportionately affected by pollution and resource extraction.

Permitting reform should prioritize projects that demonstrably advance a transition to cleaner energy and provide meaningful benefits to communities, rather than simply accelerating energy development regardless of its environmental or climate impacts. Any changes to federal permitting processes and foundational environmental laws must carefully consider potential environmental harm, cumulative impacts, and the full lifecycle carbon and greenhouse gas emissions associated with proposed projects. Decarbonization requires more than faster project approvals. It requires a deliberate approach to energy development that accounts for long-term environmental consequences, protects vulnerable communities, and supports a transition away from activities that contribute to climate change.

V. Conclusion and Recommendations

BAAJA represents a fundamental shift in federal permitting policy that prioritizes expedited development and developer certainty over Tribal sovereignty, environmental protection, and meaningful public participation. Its provisions would weaken the legal and regulatory safeguards that Tribal Nations rely on to protect their ancestral homelands, sacred places, water resources, and cultural lifeways. These changes would also limit the ability of federal agencies and courts to prevent or remedy irreversible harm.

Sovereign Energy recognizes the need for more efficient and predictable permitting processes to support critical infrastructure and a clean energy transition. However, meaningful permitting reform must

strengthen the federal government's ability to make informed decisions, uphold its government-to-government relationships with Tribal Nations, and protect the resources and communities affected by development. Efficiency should not be measured solely by how quickly projects receive approval, but by whether permitting processes produce responsible, equitable, and sustainable outcomes.

Tribal Nations and Indigenous communities play a crucial role in climate protection and environmental stewardship, benefiting everyone. Indigenous peoples possess traditional knowledge that promotes sustainable practices and fosters a system of reciprocity that supports the mutual flourishing of humans and the environment. Tribal lands also maintain the highest levels of biodiversity, which is essential for the overall ecosystem. For generations, tribes and Indigenous communities have led on climate, and any permitting reforms should not diminish their leadership role or the vital role they play in global success in navigating climate change.

Congress must pursue a different approach, one that meaningfully engages Tribal Nations in the development of permitting legislation, respects Tribal sovereignty and self-determination, preserves environmental and historic preservation safeguards, and ensures access to effective judicial remedies. Tribal Nations must be recognized as sovereign governments with inherent authority and enduring relationships with their ancestral homelands, not simply stakeholders whose participation can be streamlined or set aside.

Sovereign Energy therefore urges:

1. Tribes, Tribal entities, Native organizations, partner organizations, environmental and conservation organizational allies, and concerned individuals to oppose BAAJA in its entirety.
2. Senator Martin Heinrich to withdraw his support and co-sponsorship of BAAJA and work with the bill's other sponsors to withdraw it from consideration.
3. Every member of Congress to vote NO on BAAJA, including on any motion to proceed and on cloture.
4. Congress to reset the permitting reform debate through a transparent, inclusive process that meaningfully consults Tribal Nations and upholds Tribal sovereignty, environmental protections, and the federal government's obligations to Tribal Nations.

Permitting reform must support responsible development while protecting the rights, resources, and communities that sustain us. Tribal sovereignty, environmental protection, and a just energy transition are not obstacles to progress. They are essential to achieving it.

Mayane Barudin
Executive Director
Sovereign Energy