112TH CONGRESS
1st Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
112–151

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 2012

JULY 19, 2011.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. SIMPSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2584]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012. The bill provides regular annual appropriations for the Department of the Interior (except the Bureau of Reclamation and the Central Utah Project), the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other related agencies, including the Forest Service, the Indian Health Service, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

CONTENTS

67–352

INTRODUCTION

The fiscal year 2012 bill has been developed following careful consideration of the facts and details available to the Committee. The Committee recommends $27,465,000,000 to fund the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the

U.S. Forest Service, the Indian Health Service, the Smithsonian Institution, and 18 other related agencies.

This amount reflects a $2,094,000,000 reduction in spending from the fiscal year 2011 Continuing Resolution and a $3,824,290,000 reduction from the budget request. Overall spending is reduced by seven percent from fiscal year 2011 and 12 percent below the budget request. As a result, overall funding in this bill is essentially on par with levels established in fiscal year 2009.

The amounts in the accompanying bill are reflected by title in the table below. In addition, a detailed table providing the recommended amounts for each agency/bureau, account, or program funded through this bill is included at the end of this report.

BUDGET AUTHORITY RECOMMENDED IN BILL BY TITLE

Activity	Budget estimates, fiscal year 2012	Committee bill, fiscal year 2012	Committee bill compared with budget estimates
Title I, Department of the Interior:			
New budget authority	$11,054,410,000	$9,854,748,000	−$1,199,662,000
Title II, Environmental Protection Agency:			
New budget authority	8,973,000,000	7,149,202,000	−1,823,798,000
Title III, Related Agencies:			
New budget authority	11,258,880,000	10,458,050,000	−800,830,000
Title IV, General Provisions:			
New budget authority	0	0	0
Grand total, New budget authority	31,343,710,000	27,519,420,000	−3,824,290,000

BILL SUMMARY

FOCUSING ON PROVEN, CORE PROGRAMS

The fiscal challenges facing our country today are evident in record Federal budget deficits and our staggering national debt. These and other challenges which threaten our national economy and the economic stability of all Americans are rooted in unprecedented levels of Federal spending that has occurred in recent years.

At a time when the Federal government borrows over 40 cents for each dollar that it spends, Congress must take immediate action to put our nation's fiscal house in order by reducing Federal spending, balancing the budget, and creating jobs to put our economy on a sustainable, healthy course for the future.

While reductions in discretionary spending will not completely erase the deficit or fully address our country's economic challenges, the Committee has an obligation to reverse this unsustainable pattern of spending growth and put our nation on a path toward fiscal health. The fiscal year 2012 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill is a step forward in that direction.

The subcommittee has made difficult choices in fashioning its budget recommendations. While the bill makes significant reductions in spending across the multiple agencies and programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction, it provides sufficient funding enabling each to focus on their core missions. Members of Congress had considerable input in the contents of this measure. In total, 235 Members submitted over 1,700 programmatic requests relating to funding levels for multiple agencies and programs.

The Committee believes that too often a commitment to an issue is measured by ***the amount of money spent*** rather than ***how*** the

money is spent. History has shown that bigger budgets don't necessarily produce better results. Each agency under the jurisdiction of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies bill is strongly encouraged to carefully evaluate how it conducts its work during these constrained fiscal times and focus on proven, cost-effective programs and on better management of resources.

OVERSIGHT

The Appropriations Committee's first and foremost priority is oversight. The subcommittee takes seriously its oversight responsibility and has conducted 22 budget hearings (including five hearings involving the public and American Indians) to carefully review the programs and budgets under its jurisdiction. Over the course of these hearings, subcommittee Members engaged in a rigorous process to determine the best use of funds to meet the substantial needs and priorities outlined in this report. The subcommittee held the following oversight hearings over a three-month period:

Major Management Challenges at the Department of the Interior—March 1, 2011

Major Management Challenges at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)—March 2, 2011

EPA FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 3, 2011

Department of the Interior FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 8, 2011

National Park Service FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 9, 2011

Bureau of Land Management FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 10, 2011

Office of Surface Mining FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 10, 2011

Major Management Challenges at the U.S. Forest Service—March 10, 2011

U.S. Forest Service FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 11, 2011

Fish and Wildlife Service FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 16, 2011

U.S. Geological Survey FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 17, 2011

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement (BOEMRE) and Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR) FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 17, 2011

Bureau of Indian Affairs FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 30, 2011

Indian Health Service FY12 budget oversight hearing—March 31, 2011

Public Witnesses—April 14, 2011

Public Witnesses—April 15, 2011

Native American Public Witnesses—May 3, 2011 (morning)

Native American Public Witnesses—May 3, 2011 (afternoon)

Native American Public Witnesses—May 4, 2011

National Endowment for the Arts FY12 budget oversight hearing—May 11, 2011

National Endowment for the Humanities FY12 budget oversight hearing—May 11, 2011

Smithsonian Institution FY12 budget oversight hearing—May 12, 2011

In total, 136 individuals representing the General Accountability Office (GAO), the Executive Branch, the U.S. Congress, state and local government, the public and American Indians testified before the Subcommittee. The perspectives shared on a wide-range of issues were essential to the Subcommittee as it conducted an extensive and thorough review of the budget request.

Testimony provided by the GAO and the Inspector General (IG) of three Federal government agencies in separate oversight hearings revealed major management weaknesses at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Department of the Interior (DoI), and the Forest Service. The Committee believes this oversight will lead to higher levels of accountability and improved management efficiencies that will ultimately benefit the taxpaying public. The Committee directs each of these agencies to report to the Committee no later than 60 days following enactment of this Act on steps taken to implement reforms outlined by the GAO and the IG.

In addition to those who testified personally, over 150 individuals and organizations have provided written testimony for the permanent hearing record. These hearings are contained in eight published volumes totaling nearly 10,000 pages which are publicly available online.

Inherent in the Committee's oversight function is the responsibility to determine not only appropriate funding levels for this year but also what levels of funding remain from past years. In furtherance of its oversight responsibility, the Committee requested that major agencies funded in the bill provide information on the status of balances of appropriations, including amounts that are: (1) unobligated and uncommitted; (2) committed to contracts, grants or other planned obligations; and (3) obligated but unexpended.

During the development of the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution, it became evident that many of the agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction were unable to provide this data relating to both discretionary and mandatory accounts on a timely basis. The Committee experienced delays in receiving this information and found that the agency reports did not provide a comprehensive picture of the status of balances. Of particular concern, the Committee found that the agencies could not report on the age of balances by year of appropriation. As a result, it is not possible to tell whether the balances derive from uncommitted or unobligated balances in the immediately prior fiscal year or from appropriations acts enacted two, three or more years earlier.

The source year of carryover is important. If balances have languished on the books for multiple fiscal years it is a symptom, at best, of administrative inefficiency. Of more concern, it may suggest that the Committee was asked to provide appropriations in excess of the amount required to accomplish program purposes. Given the obvious importance of the source year of balances to budget administration, the Committee is puzzled that agencies have not configured internal accounting systems to capture and routinely report this information.

The Committee was pleased to learn that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Forest Service plan to track the source year of no year carryover balances beginning in fiscal year

2012. To ensure that other major agencies follow this lead, the Committee has included bill language that will compel the Department of the Interior and the Indian Health Service to prospectively adopt source year accounting for the status of funds for both commitments and obligations. Bill language contained in Title IV requires that the Department of the Interior, EPA, Forest Service, and the Indian Health Service begin reporting to the Committee on a quarterly basis on the status of balances, including the source year of balances. It is the Committee's intention that the agency reports show the status of balances at the appropriation account level, as well as at budget activity or other lower levels where such levels are reflected in the Committee's report accompanying an appropriation act.

REGULATION IN THE ABSENCE OF LEGISLATION

Many policy-related issues associated with the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies bill arise each year that have far-reaching impacts on the management of our public lands and natural resources as well as on the health of our national economy. Administration policies directly influence budgetary priorities and therefore impact the Committee's ability to determine annual appropriations. The so-called "Wild Lands" initiative established through a Department of the Interior secretarial order and the EPA's efforts to regulate greenhouse gases are illustrative of the challenges facing the Committee each year. In both cases, the Department of the Interior and the EPA took action in the absence of legislation and without clear congressional direction.

Members of Congress, particularly those from western states, expressed a variety of legitimate concerns about the Wild Lands initiative, which many believed would establish de facto wilderness without the benefit of public comment or congressional oversight. Chief among those concerns was that the Department had overstepped its own authority, that the initiative would make it harder to make sound land management decisions, and that it would result in increased litigation. In light of these and other concerns, Congress included a funding prohibition in the fiscal year 2011 Continuing Resolution to prevent the implementation of the Wild Lands initiative.

The Committee commends the Secretary of the Interior for his decision to comply with this congressional direction and his announcement that the Department would be working with all stakeholders in the future to develop a set of recommendations to Congress on how to manage lands with wilderness characteristics.

Similarly, the EPA's unrestrained effort to regulate greenhouse gases, and the pursuit of an overly aggressive regulatory agenda, are demonstrative of an agency that has lost its bearing. The impact of this agenda on our national economy—from the tremendous burdens it places on small businesses and large industries, to the impacts felt in small towns and rural communities across America, to lost jobs and lost economic production—is staggering.

Particularly concerning is the lack of credible cost-benefit analyses suggesting tangible benefits derived from the extraordinary cost of implementing these regulations. The Committee intends to carefully examine agencies' methodologies for conducting cost-ben-

efit analyses to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being used as efficiently as possible.

The Committee believes these and other regulatory efforts are an impediment to long-term economic growth. Members of both parties have expressed grave concern that the overzealous regulatory actions of the EPA over the last two years have vastly exceeded the authority it has been provided. An expression of this frustration was evident earlier this year during consideration of H.R. 1 when, during floor consideration of that measure, 21 amendments were adopted either restricting EPA funding or reining in its out-of-control regulatory agenda.

Congress has given agencies specific authority in regulating activities of industry and individuals, and the responsibility to determine whether or not to expand that authority—whether it regards regulation of greenhouse gases, coal mining, pond water, farm dust, or other sectors of the economy—rests solely with Congress and not the EPA.

Our country has made great strides in cleaning up pollution in the air, water, and soil over the past four decades. However, the Committee is alarmed by the efforts of the EPA to drastically expand its regulatory authority beyond what Congress intended by implementing regulations that will result in marginal health or environmental benefit at great cost to our economy. The Committee is concerned about the economic uncertainty created by the proliferation of new regulations proposed by the agency, many of which are not finalized for a number of years.

In light of ongoing concerns expressed by a bipartisan cross section of Members, the Committee has included as General Provisions a number of EPA funding prohibitions including a one-year prohibition on the use of funds for the implementation of greenhouse gas regulations, as well as a prohibition on the use of funds to change the definition of waters of the United States, in Title IV of this bill.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY FUNDING

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) does have an important role to play in protecting public and environmental health. Under statutory authority, the EPA implements programs to monitor and regulate air and water quality, drinking water, hazardous waste, research, pesticides, radiation, toxic substances, enforcement and compliance assurance, pollution prevention, oil spills, Superfund, Brownfields, and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank program. In addition, EPA provides Federal assistance for wastewater treatment, sewer overflow control, drinking water facilities, and other water infrastructure projects to help States, Tribes, and communities meet Federal mandates.

While the Committee recognizes the importance of the Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, these accounts received $6 billion in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 and a 130 percent increase in funding in fiscal year 2010. Under the current allocation, these funds must inevitably shrink. The Committee believes that funding these accounts through regular appropriations is unsustainable, and the Committee encourages the appropriate authorizing committees to

examine funding mechanisms for the SRFs that are sustainable in the long-term.

The Committee notes that the EPA's overall budget has grown significantly in recent years. In calendar year 2009, the agency received over $25 billion in combined stimulus funding and regular appropriations, a staggering sum nearly equivalent to the subcommittee's entire allocation this year. Based on this recent history, it should come as no surprise that the agency faces significant spending cuts under the subcommittee's current funding allocation. Funding for the EPA was reduced by $1.6 billion, or 16 percent, from the fiscal year 2010 enacted level in the fiscal year 2011 Continuing Resolution. An additional reduction of $1.5 billion, or 18 percent, from the fiscal year 2011 enacted level is proposed in this bill putting overall funding for the EPA well below fiscal year 2006 enacted levels.

COSTS OF LITIGATION AND LACK OF TRANSPARENCY

The Committee is concerned that many of the legitimate goals of the Forest Service, the BLM, and other agencies under the Committee's jurisdiction are undermined by litigation filed in an effort to shift land management decisions from the agencies tasked by Congress with those responsibilities to the courts, regardless of merit. It is apparent that many activist groups are using the Federal court system to stop any activity of which they disapprove. The outcome of such lawsuits becomes less important, really, than tying up a specific issue in the courts as long as possible.

Not only does the rising cost of litigation seem to indicate that the very existence of some organizations is predicated on their ability to file lawsuits challenging public policy and existing primarily to prevent worthy projects from moving forward, but it also undermines the work of this Committee.

As litigation costs siphon funding away from critical priority programs, agencies are forced to divert budgets intended for effective land management away from carrying out activities associated with their congressionally-directed missions. The Committee is alarmed that some state and field offices currently spend more than half of their current budget on responding to litigation. The Committee is also deeply concerned that these costs, which are paralyzing many national forests and field offices, are not accounted for by the agencies. It becomes impossible for this Committee to write an accurate or responsible budget when the costs of litigation are neither accounted for nor available.

The Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA) authorizes a court, under certain circumstances, to award reasonable attorneys fees and expenses to a party who prevails against the United States in a civil action. A provision within EAJA (28 U.S.C.ss 2412(d)(4)) directs an agency to pay an EAJA award out of its annual budget with the obligation resting on the agency to make and account for these payments.

The Committee has learned that neither the Department of Justice nor the Department of the Interior, EPA, or the Forest Service comprehensively track EAJA fee payments, identify the funds used to pay EAJA fees, nor routinely make this information publicly available. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department of the Interior, the EPA, and the Forest Service to provide to the

House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and make publicly available, no later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, and with each agency's annual budget submission thereafter, the following information: detailed reports on the amount of program funds used; the names of the fee recipients; the names of the Federal judges; the disposition of the applications (including any appeals of action taken on the applications); and the hourly rates of attorneys and expert witnesses stated in the applications that was awarded, for all EAJA fee payments awarded as a result of litigation against any of the Department of Interior bureaus, the EPA, or the Forest Service, or their respective employees. The report shall also include the information listed above for litigation relating to the Endangered Species Act and the amounts, outside of EAJA awards, paid in settlement for all litigation, regardless of the statute litigated.

The Committee is also deeply concerned that Federal courts are exceeding their constitutional authority and sequestering agency resources contrary to Congressional direction. In recent years, members of the judicial branch have compelled the Fish and Wildlife Service to list, or consider listing, as endangered or threatened species particular species even though focusing on these particular species is contrary to the priorities established by the agency and affirmed by Congress via appropriations. Finite appropriated funds have been redirected and reallocated to satisfy these judicial edicts. This judicial redirection of monies provided to the Service by Congress is contrary to the established separation of powers principle and in derogation of the constitutional power of the purse vested in Congress. The Committee urges the Service, and the Department, to be diligent in objecting to judicial overreach and orders regarding the Endangered Species Act that effectively sequester agency resources.

EXPIRED AUTHORIZATIONS

No less than 56 agencies and/or programs under the purview of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee remain unauthorized or have an expired congressional authorization of appropriations (see "Appropriations Not Authorized by Law" at the back of the report). Together these unauthorized agencies and programs comprise $7,248,023,000, or 26 percent, of this fiscal year 2012 appropriation bill. Continual appropriation for unauthorized programs circumvents the rigorous process of legislative review and revision.

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) is a prime example of an authorization long since expired that is overdue for additional Congressional review. No less than 2,018 species have been added to the threatened and endangered lists over the lifetime of the Act, of which only 21 have been recovered. Any other program with such a poor success rate would have long since been terminated. Originally enacted in a successful effort to save the nation's iconic bald eagle from extinction, the Act has become so highly contentious, political, and litigious that it has become a policy failure.

Wolves are a case in point. Wolf populations in the Northern Rocky Mountains (NRM) and the Western Great Lakes (WGL) are recovered and should be delisted, in part because States have sound management plans in place, according to the scientific agen-

cy tasked by Congress with making those determinations. Nevertheless, third parties that should have been partnering with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the States to conserve wolves instead sued the Service over its decision to delist wolves in the NRM, which put the decision into the hands of the courts until an Act of Congress (P.L. 112–10) settled the matter permanently. Now that the Service has proposed to delist wolves in the WGL region, the matter would likely be headed to court but for a provision in this Bill exempting any future WGL wolf delisting determination from judicial review. Similar language has been included with regard to the State of Wyoming so that, should the Service propose to delist wolves after approving a State management plan, the provision included in P.L. 112–10 would be extended to the entire NRM population. If in the future the Service determines that wolves elsewhere in the nation should be delisted, such as in the desert southwest or elsewhere in the west where wolves have naturally expanded beyond the Northern Rocky Mountain Distinct Population Segment boundary, this Committee will consider similar bill language until such time as Congress has conducted a thorough review and reauthorization of the ESA.

Given an over-reliance by some agencies under the Committee's jurisdiction to extend authorizations on an annual basis, the Committee reserves the option to limit future funding for unauthorized programs or to discontinue funding altogether. In this fiscal year 2012 appropriation bill, the Committee has exercised that option by decreasing funding for Endangered Species Act implementation; reducing funding for the State and tribal wildlife grants program; and terminating the neotropical migratory bird conservation fund program, the EPA Alaska Native Villages grant program, EPA's U.S.-Mexico border grant program, and EPA's environmental education program. The Committee urges all entities with an interest in these and other unauthorized agencies and/or programs to take any and all necessary steps to work with the appropriate authorizing committees in a timely fashion to secure essential congressional authorization.

CONGRESSIONALLY CHARTERED ORGANIZATIONS

The Committee notes the presence of no less than eight congressionally chartered organizations funded by appropriations and private funds in the fiscal year 2012 bill. Congressionally chartered entities serve many diverse purposes and benefit from broad bipartisan support. An underlying question is whether these entities are areas that should be left to the private sector or whether they are examples of public private partnerships that enable the government to cost-share with the private sector. Beneath this question is the fundamental issue, "What ought government do?" The same question also applies to prospective museums and presidential memorials authorized by Congress to be built on or near the National Mall. The costs associated with constructing these museums and memorials place enormous additional pressure on already tight budgets to operate, maintain, and renovate existing assets and facilities.

The Presidio Trust is an illustration of a congressionally chartered organization that has, as a result of direction provided by Congress, successfully moved toward self-sustainability. Funding

contained in this year's bill fulfills the commitment made by Congress to support the transition of the Presidio Army Base to a mixed-use, financially independent facility. Successful collaboration between the private and public sectors has saved taxpayers over $1 billion in capital costs and over $45 million in annual operating costs associated with the Presidio while also significantly reducing the Federal government's role in managing this national historic landmark.

The Committee also observes that presidential memorials located at Mount Vernon and Monticello are operated through private, non-profit organizations and receive no ongoing Federal, state, or local funding. As the Committee seeks to identify future efficiencies throughout government, it is worth examining whether the Presidio Trust or these presidential memorials provide models for future self-sustainability for any of the congressionally charted organizations contained in this bill. Accordingly, the Committee directs the General Accountability Office (GAO) to initiate, not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, a study of present and prospective funding models to determine the feasibility of congressionally chartered organizations achieving self-sustainability.

ECONOMIES OF SCALE

After several years of rapid and unsustainable increases, spending for non-defense discretionary programs is being reduced to address soaring deficits and staggering levels of debt. The Committee maintains that these spending reductions present a real opportunity for agencies to plan for and execute restructuring and downsizing to achieve economies of scale. Agencies that fail to adapt to this new budgetary environment may see their programs terminated in the future.

To this end, the Committee has taken several actions in this bill to encourage, assist, and in some cases direct agency and program change. For example, the Committee has directed the Fish and Wildlife Service to take steps to consolidate its new and overlapping landscape conservation initiative with its ongoing and successful joint ventures program. Also, the Committee has directed the Department of the Interior to improve coordination and consolidate redundant functions within staffing of the Department's Office of Wildland Fire Coordination. Such efforts will achieve efficiencies, eliminate a duplication of effort, and provide more funding on the ground where it is needed most. Moving forward, the Committee will look favorably upon agencies and programs that initiate similar efforts.

The Committee maintains that agencies need to step up their efforts to consolidate regional offices across agencies. For example, three or more agencies in this bill have regional offices located in Albuquerque, Anchorage, Atlanta, Billings, Denver, Phoenix, Portland, and Sacramento. Agencies located in these cities should be co-located, and other agencies located in cities nearby should consider relocating to these and other more centralized locations. Similarly, field offices with two or fewer staff should be closed or co-located with field offices of other agencies—particularly when their functions are similar. The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for the Department of the Interior's effort to identify operating efficiencies

and achieve savings across bureaus through consolidation of services, facilities, and infrastructure.

The Committee believes that the Service First authority, first provided in fiscal year 2000, has resulted in creative ways for Federal agencies to work collaboratively, achieve more effective and efficient operations, and improve customer service. The Committee has reviewed testimony from Federal agencies and others about the potential for Service First to be expanded to generate even greater benefits. The Committee requests a joint report from the Department and the Forest Service on the Service First initiative, including recommendations to improve its effectiveness, estimated performance metrics and cost savings to date, and examples of successful use within 180 days of enactment of this Act.

Further, the Committee directs Interior bureaus, along with the EPA, Forest Service, and Indian Health Service, to provide with their annual budget submissions a list of field offices and their estimated FTE and budgets for the prior, current, and upcoming fiscal years. In an effort to achieve greater efficiencies and maintain funding for core programs, the Committee also directs the Department of the Interior, the EPA, Forest Service and Indian Health Service to submit not later than 120 days after enactment of this Act, a joint proposal to consolidate field offices or close offices with minimal staffing.

AMERICAN INDIAN PROGRAMS

There is no more complicated and less well-understood relationship than that between American Indians and the United States government. After nearly two centuries of conflicting policies toward American Indians, in 1970 President Nixon called for self-determination of American Indians without the threat of termination of the trust relationship over Indian lands. Since that date, self-determination has been the basis of Federal Indian policy as more operational aspects of Federal programs are transferred to tribal management.

Under numerous treaties between Tribes and the Federal government, the United States has responsibilities to American Indians including a wide range of services delivered in concert with the enhancement of Indian self-determination. There are over 20 Federal departments and agencies that collectively provide a full range of Federal programs to American Indians similar to those provided to the general public, including healthcare, social services, transportation and other infrastructure, education, public safety and justice, and natural resources management. Two departments and six agencies are represented in this bill, comprising about 45 percent of the total government-wide funding for American Indian and Alaska Native programs.

The Department of the Interior's Indian Affairs bureaus and the Department of Health and Human Services' Indian Health Service are the two primary sources of funding in this bill for Indian Country. Together these agencies deliver services to approximately 1.9 million American Indians and Alaska Natives who are members or descendents of 565 Federally recognized Tribes in the 48 contiguous United States and Alaska.

Notwithstanding the services provided in this bill and Federal government-wide, communities in Indian Country continue to face

a number of serious challenges, including health care, housing, crime, and education. Many American Indians today live in abject poverty; violence on Indian reservations is higher than the national average; and incidents of alcoholism, diabetes, infant mortality, substance abuse, and suicide in Indian Country are far in excess of the rest of America.

This year as in the previous year, the Committee held budget oversight hearings on the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service, in addition to three public witness hearings solely devoted to American Indian issues. No less than 110 tribal leaders and American Indian advocates testified in 2010 and 2011 combined. Among the recurring themes this Committee heard were: (1) the lack of coordination among the various agencies for infrastructure development; (2) the gaps in health care services and providers in Indian Country; (3) the shortfalls in law enforcement personnel; (4) the education challenges for underfunded and/or remote schools; and (5) the need to fully fund contract support costs.

In light of these challenges, the Committee has prioritized funding for programs that enable the Federal government to further meet its trust responsibilities to American Indians. At a time of record budget deficits, the Committee recognizes that increasing funding to fully meet all obligations is not feasible, but this bill makes calculated and significant steps toward meeting trust responsibilities by: increasing the budgets of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian Health Service by a combined $328,000,000; increasing funding for contract support costs by a combined $184,508,000; fully funding inflationary costs; increasing tribal law enforcement funding; increasing education funding; partially restoring by $50,000,000 the proposed elimination of replacement school construction; increasing healthcare facilities construction by $46,568,000; and fully funding the staffing costs of newly constructed health facilities.

While the Committee's recommendation and the President's budget include funds for these services, responsibility and oversight for many of the projects and programs are dispersed over several agencies. Some are contained within this Act, while others are not. For example, no less than three agencies may be involved in constructing a home on a reservation: the Indian Health Service, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Tribes may also seek funds from the Department of Transportation and the Environmental Protection Agency for infrastructure support of those homes. The result is a fragmented and confusing approach to addressing basic infrastructure and the health and education needs of American Indian communities.

On November 5, 2009, the President signed a memorandum directing all Federal agencies to provide a plan on how each agency is implementing Executive Order 13175, which requires Federal agencies to engage in regular and meaningful consultation with Tribes. The Committee supports this effort, but views it only as an initial step. Beyond consultation, there must be more effective implementation of the Federal laws and programs created to honor this Nation's trust responsibility to American Indians—including meeting government-wide mandates under the Indian Self Determination and Education Assistance Act (ISDEA, P.L. 93–638, as amended).

The Committee directs the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Attorney General, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Chief of the Forest Service to provide this Committee within 120 days of enactment of this Act a joint report on: (1) how these agencies can use the consultation process to streamline and coordinate grant programs and funding opportunities for American Indian programs under their jurisdiction; and (2) opportunities for each agency and bureau to enter into new compacts with Tribes, as per ISDEA.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAMS

The Committee recommends $65,833,000 for Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) programs, $234,701,000 below fiscal year 2011 enacted levels and $834,167,000 below the 2012 budget request. No funding is provided for new acquisitions other than for small Federal inholdings. The four Federal land acquisition programs and the three primary State grant programs are funded at minimal levels to continue to oversee projects that were funded in previous years.

The Committee recognizes the value that these programs have had over the life of the LWCF, and the cuts proposed in this bill are less about the merits of these programs and more about the larger issue of deficit spending and addressing more pressing priorities in this bill.

Still, the Committee had several concerns with the President's fiscal year 2012 request. First, such a rapid funding increase for LWCF is unrealistic and potentially wasteful in any budget climate. The Committee has seen enough evidence to suggest that the Administration put forth a request for more projects than it could responsibly manage in one fiscal year.

Second, the Committee is skeptical of the Administration's argument that more Federal land acquisition will result in reduced land management costs as inholdings are consolidated. That the four land acquisition agencies have different definitions of inholdings, and that projects requested for fiscal year 2012 include edgeholdings and tracts that aren't bordered at all by other Federal lands, is particularly disconcerting.

Moreover, the Committee notes that maintenance backlogs at the four major land management agencies are going up, not down, despite relatively flat annual maintenance funding, fiscal year 2009 stimulus funding, and continued land acquisitions. Compounding the issue is the fact that the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and in particular the Fish and Wildlife Service have all seen multi-million dollar budget increases in recent years for inventory and monitoring of an ever increasing land base.

Finally, the Administration's LWCF programs aren't as well coordinated with each other and with other programs as they should be. The Subcommittee held its first ever bipartisan, bicameral staff-level briefing with all four land acquisition agencies in order to determine what a coordinated and strategic fully-funded LWCF initiative looks like. The Committee applauds the Administration for its preparation and participation, however, more needs to be done. This Committee is looking for a clear and cohesive argument by the Administration as to: what absolutely has to be acquired in

a given fiscal year; why Federal acquisition is a more appropriate strategy than working in partnership with other governments, land alliances, and private citizen-stewards to conserve the land, using other existing Federal programs; and how the selection of acquisition projects are based at least in part upon existing landscape level conservation strategies.

CLIMATE CHANGE

This Committee remains skeptical of the Administration's efforts to re-package existing programs and to fund new ones in the name of climate change. That the climate is changing is not in dispute. However, recent rapid increases in funding and the number of new and seemingly duplicative programs are potentially wasteful. From 2008 to 2011, bill-wide climate change funding grew from $192 million to $371 million—a staggering 93 percent increase. In spite of concerns expressed repeatedly by the Committee, there is still no clear indication of how these funds are coordinated.

There must be a significant improvement in the level of coordination and communication of climate change activities, budgets, and accomplishments across the Federal agencies funded in this bill and across the entire Federal government if there is to be further investment by this Committee. To that end, this bill continues a general provision from last year requiring a report to Congress on Federal climate change expenditures, with a modification requiring clearer linkages of expenditures to specific strategic plan actions.

This Administration has annually submitted to this Committee a cross-cut table of programs labeled as climate change and funded in this bill. The table contains both ongoing programs and new program initiatives. The Committee recommends $287,554,000 for these so-called climate change programs, $83,426,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $142,064,000 below the budget request. This includes $64,920,000 for land management and wildlife adaptation efforts at the Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, and Bureau of Indian Affairs. The bill also provides $153,739,000 for science, technology and climate change programs at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and $68,895,000 for global change science and development at the U.S. Geological Survey, Forest Service, and Smithsonian Institution.

This Committee has long operated on the premise that proven programs ought to be rewarded instead of cut to make room for new and often duplicative initiatives. To that end, new initiatives are cut more deeply than ongoing, proven programs in this bill. More detailed agency-specific discussions are contained in their relative sections of this report.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The following are the procedures governing reprogramming actions for programs and activities funded in the Department of the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Definitions.—"Reprogramming," as defined in these procedures, includes the reallocation of funds from one budget activity, budget line-item or program area, to another within any appropriation funded in this Act. In cases where either the House or Senate Committee report displays an allocation of an appropriation below those

levels, that more detailed level shall be the basis for reprogramming.

For construction, land acquisition, and forest legacy accounts, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds, including unobligated balances, from one construction, land acquisition, or forest legacy project to another such project.

A reprogramming shall also consist of any significant departure from the program described in the agency's budget justifications. This includes proposed reorganizations, especially those of significant national or regional importance, even without a change in funding. Any change to the organization table presented in the budget justification shall be subject to this requirement.

General Guidelines for Reprogramming.—

(a) A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises, and then only if postponement of the project or the activity until the next appropriation year would result in actual loss or damage.

(b) Any project or activity, which may be deferred through reprogramming, shall not later be accomplished by means of further reprogramming, but instead, funds should again be sought for the deferred project or activity through the regular appropriations process.

(c) Except under the most urgent situations, reprogramming should not be employed to initiate new programs or increase allocations specifically denied or limited by Congress, or to decrease allocations specifically increased by the Congress.

(d) Reprogramming proposals submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for approval shall be considered approved 30 calendar days after receipt if the Committees have posed no objection. However, agencies will be expected to extend the approval deadline if specifically requested by either Committee.

Criteria and Exceptions.—A reprogramming must be submitted to the Committees in writing prior to implementation if it exceeds $1,000,000 annually or results in an increase or decrease of more than 10 percent annually in affected programs, with the following exceptions:

(a) With regard to the tribal priority allocations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, there is no restriction on reprogrammings among these programs. However, the Bureau shall report on all reprogrammings made during a given fiscal year no later than 60 days after the end of the fiscal year.

(b) With regard to the Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants account, the Committee does not require reprogramming requests associated with States and Tribes Partnership Grants.

Assessments.—"Assessment" as defined in these procedures shall refer to any charges, reserves, or holdbacks applied to a budget activity or budget line item for costs associated with general agency administrative costs, overhead costs, working capital expenses, or contingencies.

(a) No assessment shall be levied against any program, budget activity, sub-activity, budget line item, or project funded by the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act unless such assessment and the basis therefore are presented to the Committees on Appropriations in the budget justifications and are

subsequently approved by the Committees. The explanation for any assessment in the budget justification shall show the amount of the assessment, the activities assessed, and the purpose of the funds.

(b) Proposed changes to estimated assessments, as such estimates were presented in annual budget justifications, shall be submitted through the reprogramming process and shall be subject to the same dollar and reporting criteria as any other reprogramming.

(c) The Committees direct that each agency or bureau which utilizes assessments shall submit an annual report to the Committees which provides details on the use of all funds assessed from any other budget activity, line item, sub-activity, or project.

(d) In no case shall contingency funds or assessments be used to finance projects and activities disapproved or limited by Congress, or to finance programs or activities that could be foreseen and included in the normal budget review process.

(e) New programs requested in the budget should not be initiated before enactment of the bill without notification to, and the approval of, the Committees on Appropriations. This restriction applies to all such actions regardless of whether a formal reprogramming of funds is required to begin the program.

Quarterly Reports.—All reprogrammings between budget activities, budget line-items, program areas, or the more detailed activity levels shown in the Statement of the Managers, including those below the monetary thresholds established above, shall be reported to the Committees within 60 days of the end of each quarter and shall include cumulative totals for each budget activity, budget line item, or construction, land acquisition, or forest legacy project.

Land Acquisitions, Easements, and Forest Legacy.—Lands shall not be acquired for more than the approved appraised value (as addressed in section 301(3) of Public Law 91–646), unless such acquisitions are submitted to the Committees on Appropriations for approval in compliance with these procedures.

Land Exchanges.—Land exchanges, wherein the estimated value of the Federal lands to be exchanged is greater than $1,000,000, shall not be consummated until the Committees have had a 30-day period in which to examine the proposed exchange. In addition, the Committee shall be provided advance notification of exchanges valued between $500,000 and $1,000,000.

Budget Structure.—The budget activity or line item structure for any agency appropriation account shall not be altered without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Report Language.—Any limitation or directive contained in either the House or Senate report which is not contradicted by the other report nor specifically denied in the conference report shall be considered as having been approved by both Houses of Congress.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Bureau of Land Management (Bureau) is responsible for the multiple use management, protection, and development of a full range of natural resources, including minerals, timber, rangeland, fish and wildlife habitat, and wilderness on about 245 million acres of the Nation's public lands and for management of 700 million ad-

ditional acres of Federally-owned subsurface mineral rights. In addition, the Bureau has trust responsibilities on 56 million acres of Indian trust lands for mineral operations and cadastral surveys. Surface lands under direct Bureau management make up about 13 percent of the total land surface of the United States and more than 40 percent of all land managed by the Federal government, making the Bureau the nation's largest single land manager. The Bureau is the second largest provider of public outdoor recreation in the Western United States.

The amounts recommended by the Committee for each Bureau of Land Management appropriation account, compared with the budget estimates by activity, are shown in the table at the end of this report.

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$961,779,000
Budget estimate, 2012	933,779,000
Recommended, 2012	918,227,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−43,552,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−15,552,000

The Committee recommends $918,227,000 for management of lands and resources, $43,552,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $15,552,000 below the budget request.

As mentioned in the introduction to this report, the Committee lauds the Department of the Interior for its significant changes to the Wild Lands policy and notes that the Bureau of Land Management has, to date, been in compliance with the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution prohibiting funds for the use of Secretarial Order 3310. While the Department is now rightly requesting the input of Members of Congress, Senators and the public, the Committee is concerned about the internal direction given to the Bureau of Land Management regarding the inventory of lands managed by the Bureau. As the Department has stated, inventories of Bureau lands are required under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) and the Committee agrees with this reading of the Act. The Committee points out that inventories should, however, cover all land uses and multiple uses, not just lands with wilderness character. The values to be assessed include wildlife and fish habitat, non-motorized and motorized recreation, hunting, fishing, grazing, conventional and renewable energy development, mining, wilderness character, forest management and aesthetics. All of these values are important and one value does not supersede another. The Committee also directs the Bureau to use the definition of wilderness as defined in the 1964 Wilderness Act and as directed by Section 603 of FLPMA. The Committee will continue to conduct oversight on this issue and the inventory of Bureau lands.

Land Resources.—The Committee recommends $246,615,000 for land resources, $18,608,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $4,695,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends soil, water and air management at the requested level of $46,303,000.

The Committee recommends $87,532,000 for the range management program, $10,617,000 above fiscal year 2011 enacted levels and $15,929,000 above the budget request. The program has been

significantly underfunded in the past while its costs, mostly due to litigation, continue to rise. The Committee has increased funding to address numerous challenges including completion of grazing permit renewals, hiring of seasonal employees to ensure timely turn-out of livestock, annual and trend monitoring of grazing allotments, and improving the quality of Bureau work on environmental and other documents related to livestock grazing. The Committee includes bill language in Title I General Provisions requiring litigants of the Bureau to first exhaust administrative review before filing in Federal court unless there's an untimely response from the Bureau. Title I General Provisions also include language that exempts trailing of livestock across public lands from the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The Committee also includes bill language addressing a number of grazing issues in the Title IV General Provisions including: (1) The Rescissions Act (Sec. 415 Extension of Grazing Permits) affecting both the Forest Service and Bureau is reauthorized for 5 years and modified to allow for the transfer of permits as requested by the Department. Permits must be managed based on existing mandatory terms. (2) Language maintaining current management of bighorn sheep related to domestic sheep for both the Forest Service and the Bureau until associated research can be completed. The Committee intends for these provisions to be temporary until the authorizing committees of the applicable statutes can address these problems.

The Committee recommends $63,986,000 for wild horse and burro management, $11,767,000 below fiscal year 2011 enacted levels and $11,022,000 below the budget request. The recommendation is equal to fiscal year 2010 enacted levels. The Committee is deeply troubled by the Bureau's announcement that it will reduce gathers needed to remove 2,400 excess wild horses and burros from rangelands that are overpopulated. The Committee appropriated the fiscal year 2011 level of $75,753,000 only because the Bureau requested an increase for the urgent removal of excess wild horses from the range. Because the Bureau has announced it will reduce gathers, the Committee has reduced funding for this program. The Committee is very concerned that the Bureau continues to change its course on this matter and especially that the Bureau is now abandoning the goal of bringing wild horse and burro populations down to the Appropriate Management Levels (AML) as required by the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burro Act of 1971. The Committee believes it's critical to balance the use of public rangelands for all wildlife and other multiple uses. The Committee is also deeply concerned about the rising costs associated with the wild horse and burro program and, despite the claims of the Bureau, does not believe that the latest course change will reduce costs. The Committee retains language prohibiting any funds from being used for the slaughter of wild horses and burros in Administrative Provisions and allows the Bureau to enter into long-term contracts for holding wild horses in the Title I General Provisions.

Wildlife and Fisheries.—The Committee recommends $50,784,000 for wildlife and fisheries, $245,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $457,000 above the budget request. The Committee's recommendation includes the $2,000,000 increase for sage grouse habitat monitoring in the request. The Committee encourages the Bureau to use this and additional funding under the Man-

agement of Land and Resources activity to update and amend resource management plans as necessary to prevent the listing of the sage grouse. The Committee also directs the Bureau to work with the Fish and Wildlife Service on these plans.

Threatened and Endangered Species.—The Committee recommends $21,668,000 for threatened and endangered species as requested, $491,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. The Committee encourages the Bureau to continue its efforts toward recovery of listed plant and animal species and to take conservation action on Bureau-managed lands and waters for at-risk species and ecosystems so the need for listing is prevented.

The Committee commends the Bureau's actions to date to conserve and increase populations of sage grouse. Numerous states have also taken action to conserve the sage grouse. The Committee notes that of the resource management plans with sage grouse habitat, 89 of 93 have measures to protect the specie. To prevent listing, the Committee urges the Bureau to continue working with the Fish and Wildlife Service on plan amendments that provide regulatory measures to conserve the sage grouse. The Committee believes any plan amendments made to mitigate impacts on sage grouse must be science-based, allow for adaptive management and flexibility based on site specific information. Mitigation measures should be realistic and supported by science.

Recreation Management.—The Committee recommends $67,574,000 for recreation management, $1,243,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $9,183,000 below the budget request. The Committee recognizes the importance of recreation on Bureau lands and maintains fiscal year 2011 enacted levels for recreation resource management as funding from this sub-activity contributes to the greatest amount of visitors on Bureau lands. The Committee is not opposed to the Secretary's America's Great Outdoors Initiative, but the current budget situation does not provide for the requested increases.

Energy and Minerals.—The Committee recommends $111,786,000 for energy and minerals and rejects the budget request proposal to impose new inspection fees on onshore oil and gas producers.

The Committee is concerned by rising energy prices and believes domestic energy production must increase while also being mindful of the environment and other competing land uses. To aid in this effort, the Committee has recommended a $4,452,000 increase to oil and gas management and has funded renewable energy at $19,735,000 as requested.

The Bureau manages 700 million acres of mineral estate, a large portion of the potential production in the United States, and will contribute $4.3 billion to the Treasury in onshore oil and gas royalties for fiscal year 2012. Currently, however, only four percent of the Bureau's mineral estate is leased for energy development. The Committee is concerned that the production of oil and gas on Federal lands has been hurt by the perception of tremendous regulatory uncertainty in operating on Federal lands. The Committee would remind the Bureau that when investment capital moves to non-federal lands that the result is a reduction in revenue over time to Federal and state treasuries. The Committee urges the Bureau to consider these factors in advance of future policy changes.

The Committee is concerned about current and past collection and tracking of oil and gas production. According to the Government Accountability Office, Federal mineral management agencies rely on antiquated and faulty methods to track oil and gas production. The Committee encourages the Department to consider integrating systems that would allow for remote monitoring and third party verification of Bureau production reporting mechanisms. The Committee believes this approach is necessary to determine if better measurement technology can potentially reduce the size and scope of under-reported royalty payments to the Federal government.

Mining Law Administration.—The Committee recommends $39,696,000 for mining law administration as requested, $3,000,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. There is growing awareness in Congress about the need for a coherent minerals policy to ensure availability of minerals essential to the manufacturing supply chain. Currently, less than half of the mineral needs of U.S. manufacturing are met from domestically mined resources. To ensure access to the minerals that are vital to our national and economic security, we must address the role that delays in permitting of mining activities, including the Department's overly cumbersome Federal Register clearance process, plays in hindering the ability to develop domestic sources. The fiscal year 2012 request takes an important first step to address permitting delays by providing an additional $1,250,000 to supplement agency resources for the processing of mining plans of operations and notices. Additional resources are justified by the fact that the number of mining claims filed over the past decade has increased by nearly 250 percent while the number of full time equivalent employees assigned to the program fell from 397 to 296.

The Committee includes language in Title IV General Provisions on association placer claims that changes claim maintenance fees for placer claims including two or more people, to the same fees required for individual placer claims. The Committee also includes bill language in the Title IV General Provisions prohibiting the withdrawal of certain lands in Arizona from entry under the General Mining Law.

Challenge Cost Share.—The Committee recommends terminating the challenge cost share program due to poor management and the lack of necessity for the program.

National Landscape Conservation System.—The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for the National Landscape Conservation System base program, $11,870,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $19,345,000 below the budget request. The Committee notes that additional funding for the NLCS is provided in other activities, such as wilderness, transportation, and the Oregon and California Grant Lands account. The Committee retains language prohibiting mineral leasing within national monuments in the Title IV General Provisions.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$4,617,000
Budget estimate, 2012	3,576,000
Recommended, 2012	3,576,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−1,041,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $3,576,000 for construction as requested, $1,041,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

LAND ACQUISITION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$21,956,000
Budget estimate, 2012	50,000,000
Recommended, 2012	4,880,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−17,076,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−45,120,000

The Committee recommends $4,880,000 for land acquisition, $17,076,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $45,120,000 below the budget request. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

The Committee has included language in the front of the report regarding Land and Water Conservation Fund programs.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$111,334,000
Budget estimate, 2012	112,043,000
Recommended, 2012	112,043,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+709,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $112,043,000 for the Oregon and California grant lands as requested, $709,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. The Committee is supportive of the Secretary's Western Oregon strategy pilot projects, but is concerned that these projects may not result in realistic long-term solutions to the management of O&C Lands. The Committee believes a comprehensive review and change of current policies, including Survey and Manage, is necessary to meet the goals of the O&C Lands Act of 1937. The Committee notes that the law directs that these lands be managed "for permanent forest production . . . with the principal of sustained yield for the purpose of providing a permanent source of timber supply, protecting watersheds, regulating stream flow, and contributing to the economic stability of local communities and industries, and providing recreational facilities" (43 USC Sec. 1181a).

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2012	10,000,000
Recommended, 2012	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	0
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends an indefinite appropriation of not less than $10,000,000 to be derived from public lands receipts and

Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act lands grazing receipts. Receipts are used for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements, such as seeding, fence construction, weed control, water development, fish and wildlife habitat improvement, and planning and design of these projects.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

The Committee recommends an indefinite appropriation estimated to be $32,125,000 for service charges, deposits, and forfeitures as requested. The service charges, deposits, and forfeitures appropriation is offset with fees collected under specified sections of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and other Acts to pay for reasonable administrative and other costs in connection with rights-of-way applications from the private sector, miscellaneous cost-recoverable realty cases, timber contract expenses, repair of damaged lands, the adopt-a-horse program, and the provision of copies of official public land documents.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

The Committee recommends an indefinite appropriation estimated to be $19,700,000 as requested and $4,500,000 above fiscal year 2011 enacted levels, for miscellaneous trust funds. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 provides for the receipt and expenditure of moneys received as donations or gifts (section 307). Funds in this trust fund are derived from the administrative and survey costs paid by applicants for conveyance of omitted lands (lands fraudulently or erroneously omitted from original cadastral surveys), from advances for other types of surveys requested by individuals, and from contributions made by users of Federal rangelands. Amounts received from the sale of Alaska town lots are also available for expenses of sale and maintenance of town sites. Revenue from unsurveyed lands, and surveys of omitted lands, administrative costs of conveyance, and gifts and donations must be appropriated before it can be used.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation includes the administrative provisions as requested and retains the provision prohibiting the use of appropriated funds for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses in the care of the Bureau or its contractors.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The mission of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is to conserve, protect and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats for the continuing benefit of people. The Service has responsibility for migratory birds, threatened and endangered species, certain marine mammals, and land under Service control.

Currently, the Service accomplishes its mission by managing more than 150 million acres of land and ocean, 553 units in the National Wildlife Refuge System, 81 Ecological Services Field Stations, 71 National Fish Hatcheries, 1 historical National Fish Hatchery, and numerous waterfowl production areas in 206 counties.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$1,244,861,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,271,867,000
Recommended, 2012	1,099,055,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−145,806,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−172,812,000

The Committee recommends $1,099,055,000 for resource management, $145,806,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $172,812,000 below the request. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

Ecological Services.—The Committee recommends $228,974,000 for ecological services, $72,312,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $85,943,000 below the budget request.

The Committee recommends that the Service take into account economic impacts while conducting all Section 7 consultations pursuant to the Santa Ana Sucker Critical Habitat designation. These economic impacts to be considered by the Service should include the costs of local water supply development and imported water costs, infrastructure needs, water conservation efforts, and efforts to increase employment in the region affected by the Santa Ana Sucker Critical Habitat designation.

The Committee supports the requested funding for aplomado falcon and California condor recovery. The Service is encouraged to continue to support these ongoing, successful recovery efforts.

The Committee directs the Service to continue to address white nose syndrome in bats, and to continue the wolf monitoring and depredation programs.

The Committee supports the Service's ongoing efforts towards sage grouse conservation and in particular the joint efforts by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to work with private landowners.

The Partners for Fish and Wildlife program's climate change initiative is funded at $4,000,000 which is $2,000,000 below the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

National Wildlife Refuge System.—The Committee recommends $455,297,000 for the National Wildlife Refuge System, $36,762,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $47,578,000 below the budget request.

The proposal to transfer land protection planning to the land acquisition account is not accepted.

The climate change inventory and monitoring program is funded at $12,000,000 which is equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee encourages the Service to consider transferring nationwide management of the Partners for Fish and Wildlife program from ecological services to refuges, which has been shown to be particularly effective in the Great Lakes/Midwest and mountain-prairie regions.

The Committee is concerned about recent operational considerations by the Service that may limit recreational opportunities on public waterways, such as a proposed Comprehensive Conservation Plan for Deer Flat National Wildlife Refuge which would significantly curtail recreational activities, and particular restrictions on overnight houseboat accommodations at concessionaire-operated

marinas. In keeping with Executive Order 12866, the Committee directs the Service to carefully consider the impact to concessionaires of such operational changes.

The Committee understands that any transfer of lands currently withdrawn by the Bureau of Reclamation surrounding the Seedskadee National Wildlife Refuge must first undergo an open public process; and further, the Committee believes that the highest priority in transferring acres should be given to the Bureau of Land Management in recognition of its current management responsibilities on these acres.

Migratory Birds, Law Enforcement, and International Conservation.—The Committee recommends $122,048,000 for migratory birds, law enforcement, and international conservation, $6,176,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $8,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee has included language below directing the Service to combine landscape conservation cooperatives, bird joint ventures, and national fish habitat partnerships.

Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Conservation.—The Committee recommends $128,343,000 for fisheries and aquatic resource conservation, $10,596,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $7,669,000 below the budget request.

The Committee has restored the proposed $3,388,000 shortfall in the budget for mitigation hatchery operations and critical supplies, with the understanding that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will reimburse the Service an amount of $3,800,000 during fiscal year 2012, subject to appropriations. The Committee directs the Service to continue to seek reimbursement from the remaining agencies for mitigation hatchery operations, and to redirect any additional reimbursed funding to deferred maintenance.

The increase proposed for the fish passage program is funded at $500,000 instead of $1,000,000. The National Fish Habitat Action Plan program's climate change initiative is funded at $2,000,000, which is equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee has included language below directing the Service to combine landscape conservation cooperatives, bird joint ventures, and national fish habitat partnerships.

The Committee is concerned about the continued rapid spread of invasive zebra and quagga mussels in the West. The Committee understands that prevention measures are lacking at many Federally-managed water bodies, despite Federal coordination and planning efforts through the aquatic nuisance species task force. The Committee has added to the President's fiscal year 2012 budget $1,000,000 to implement the highest priority prevention measures called for in the February 2010 Quagga-Zebra Mussel Action Plan for Western U.S. Waters, specifically the implementation of mandatory inspection, decontamination, and law enforcement programs at all high-risk Federally-managed water bodies.

Cooperative Landscape Conservation and Adaptive Science.—The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for the cooperative landscape conservation and adaptive science initiative, $10,970,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $17,483,000 below the budget request.

The Committee recognizes a limited Federal role in science-based, landscape-level conservation of our nation's natural resources, including fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats. The con-

cept is not new; in fact it has been underway for some time in other agencies such as the Forest Service and the National Park Service, and in other Fish and Wildlife Service programs such as bird joint ventures and the National Fish Habitat Action Plan. How these and other efforts fit together is of grave concern to the Committee.

The Fish and Wildlife Service continues to struggle in developing this initiative. Fundamental, unanswered questions pertaining mostly to roles and responsibilities of partners and existing programs have been asked by too many for too long. Furthermore, Service partners are overwhelmed by the increasing volume of Service partnership efforts at a time when State, local, tribal, and non-profit organization budgets are flat or decreasing.

Despite the Committee's concerns about how the Service has been implementing this initiative, the Service has made a strong case to this Committee as to why the initiative is necessary. The Service's current business model, containing an abundance of authorizations and programs, is not working as well as it could. Programs are stove piped. Habitats are being lost. The health of most species for which the Service has a trust responsibility is either unknown or poor.

In this budget climate more than ever, new initiatives such as this must either be achieving economies of scale, or must be offset, or both. By proposing to cut the budget for climate change planning and adaptive science capacity, this Committee is directing the Service to: (1) more fully develop the initiative in a limited number of areas; and (2) combine the initiative with bird joint ventures and national fish habitat partnerships. The Committee urges the Service to take into account these directives as it develops and submits its fiscal year 2013 budget request.

Bill Language.—The Committee has included bill language prohibiting the use of funds for certain Endangered Species Act activities. The bill also provides limited no-year funding for certain law enforcement and environmental contaminants activities.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$20,804,000
Budget estimate, 2012	23,088,000
Recommended, 2012	11,804,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−9,000,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−11,284,000

The Committee recommends $11,804,000 for construction, $9,000,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $11,284,000 below the request. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

The Committee expects the Service to allocate funding to projects in the order of priority presented in the fiscal year 2012 budget request.

LAND ACQUISITION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$54,890,000
Budget estimate, 2012	140,000,000
Recommended, 2012	15,047,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−39,843,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−124,953,000

The Committee recommends $15,047,000 for land acquisition, $39,843,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $124,953,000 below the budget request. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

The Committee has included language in the front of the report regarding Land and Water Conservation Fund programs.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

The Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund provides grants to States and territories for endangered species recovery actions on non-Federal lands and provides funds for non-Federal land acquisition to facilitate habitat protection. Individual States and territories provide 25 percent of grant project costs. Cost sharing is reduced to 10 percent when two or more States or territories are involved in a project.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$59,880,000
Budget estimate, 2012	100,000,000
Recommended, 2012	2,854,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−57,026,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−97,146,000

The Committee recommends $2,854,000 for the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund, $57,026,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $97,146,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommendation continues funding for administration of ongoing projects funded in prior years. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

The Committee has included language in the front of the report regarding Land and Water Conservation Fund programs.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

This program makes payments in lieu of taxes based on their fair market value to counties in which Service lands are located. Payments to counties are estimated to be $16,869,000 in fiscal year 2012, with $13,980,000 derived from this appropriation and $2,889,000 from the net refuge receipts estimated to be collected in fiscal year 2011.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$14,471,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0
Recommended, 2012	13,980,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−491,000
Budget estimate, 2012	+13,980,000

The Committee recommends $13,980,000 for the National Wildlife Refuge Fund, $491,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $13,980,000 above the request.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, through the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund, leverages partner contributions for wetlands conservation. Projects to date have been in 50 States, 13 Canadian provinces, 25 Mexican states, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. In addition to this appropriation, the Service receives funding from fines for violations of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; interest earned on tax receipts in the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration account from taxes on firearms, ammunition, archery equipment, pistols, and revolvers, and from the Sport Fish Restoration account from taxes on fishing tackle and equipment, electric trolling motors and fish finders, and certain marine gasoline taxes. By law, sport fish restoration receipts are used for coastal wetlands in States bordering the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, States bordering the Great Lakes and Gulf of Mexico, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the freely associated States in the Pacific, and American Samoa.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$37,425,000
Budget estimate, 2012	50,000,000
Recommended, 2012	20,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−17,425,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−30,000,000

The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund, $17,425,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $30,000,000 below the request.

NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION

The Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 2000 authorized, through fiscal year 2010, grants for the conservation of neotropical migratory birds in the United States, Latin America and the Caribbean, with 75 percent of the amounts available to be expended on projects outside the U.S. There is a three to one matching requirement under this program.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$3,992,000
Budget estimate, 2012	5,000,000
Recommended, 2012	0
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−3,992,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−5,000,000

The Committee recommends $0 for the neotropical migratory bird conservation program, $3,992,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $5,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends that this program not be funded in fiscal year 2012 because its authorization of appropriations has expired.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

The Multinational Species Conservation Fund provides technical support and cost-sharing grant assistance to countries to strengthen anti-poaching activities, build community support for conservation near the species' habitats, conduct surveys, monitoring, applied research, and provide infrastructure and field equipment necessary to conserve habitats. These funds help to leverage work with

partners and other collaborators to conserve and protect African and Asian elephants, rhinoceroses, tigers, great apes and marine turtles and their habitats.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$9,980,000
Budget estimate, 2012	9,750,000
Recommended, 2012	7,875,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−2,105,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−1,875,000

The Committee recommends $7,875,000 for the Multinational Species Conservation Fund, $2,105,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,875,000 below the budget request.

STATE AND TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS

The state and tribal wildlife grants program provides funds for States to implement their comprehensive wildlife conservation plans for species of greatest conservation need. States are required to provide a 50 percent cost share for grants that implement State Wildlife Action Plans.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$61,876,000
Budget estimate, 2012	95,000,000
Recommended, 2012	22,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−39,876,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−73,000,000

The Committee recommends $22,000,000 for state and tribal wildlife grants, $39,876,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $73,000,000 below the request. Within the amount provided, $2,000,000 is for competitively awarded grants to Indian Tribes.

The Committee encourages the Service and the program partners to complete the Wildlife TRACS database so that the program can better demonstrate its ability to prevent at-risk species from having to be listed under the Endangered Species Act.

Bill Language.—The Committee has included bill language that requires a 50 percent match of all grant funding. Not included is language carried in prior years which allowed unobligated funding to be re-apportioned.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The mission of the National Park Service is to preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. Established in 1916, the National Park Service has stewardship responsibilities for the protection and preservation of the heritage resources of the national park system. The system, consisting of 394 separate and distinct units, is recognized globally as a leader in park management and resource preservation. The national park system represents much of the finest the Nation has to offer in terms of scenery, historical and archeological relics, and cultural heritage. Through its varied sites, the National Park Service attempts to explain America's history, interpret its culture, preserve examples of its natural ecosystems, and provide recreational and educational opportunities for U.S. citizens and visitors from all over the world. In addition, the National Park

Service provides support to tribal, local, and State governments to preserve culturally significant, ecologically important, and public recreational lands.

The National Park Service will be 100 years old in 2016, and the Service has embarked on an historic ten-year effort to enhance the national parks leading up to this historic celebration. The Committee continues to support this effort and the $2,479,430,000 recommended will help the Service prepare for a second century of conservation, environmental stewardship and recreation benefiting millions of visitors from throughout the world. In spite of extraordinary fiscal challenges, the Committee has provided funding sufficient to manage NPS units nationwide without disruptions to operations or staffing.

Table of Allocations by Activity.—The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$2,250,050,000
Budget estimate, 2012	2,296,877,000
Recommended, 2012	2,240,152,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−9,898,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−56,725,000

The Committee recommends $2,240,152,000 for Operation of the National Park Service (NPS), $9,898,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $56,725,000 below the budget request. This account funds the day-to-day operations of individual park units as well as regional and headquarters support operations of the NPS. The Committee recommends the following changes to the request:

Resource Stewardship.—The Committee recommends $336,742,000 for Resource Stewardship, $6,898,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $19,534,000 below the budget request. Reductions below the fiscal year 2011 level are to climate change-related activities. The Committee has noted throughout this report the critical need for a significant improvement in the level of coordination and communication of climate change activities, budgets, and accomplishments across the bureaus within the Department of the Interior.

Visitor Services.—The Committee recommends $240,817,000 for Visitor Services, $1,000,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $10,482,000 below the budget request.

Park Protection.—The Committee recommends $362,143,000 for Park Protection, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,752,000 below the budget request.

Facility Operations and Maintenance.—The Committee recommends $691,020,000 for Facility Operations and Maintenance, $4,000,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $15,518,000 below the budget request.

Park Support.—The Committee recommends $442,967,000 for Park Support, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $5,712,000 below the budget request.

External Administrative Costs.—The Committee recommends $166,463,000 for External Administrative Costs, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,727,000 below the budget request.

Additional Guidance.—The following additional direction and guidance is provided with respect to funding provided within this account:

Civil War Sesquicentennial.—The Civil War Battlefields, sites and Monuments provide vital historic and educational opportunities for the millions of Americans that visit each year. The calendar years 2011 through 2015 mark the sesquicentennial of the Civil War beginning with the election of Abraham Lincoln and concluding with the end of the Civil War. The 150th anniversary presents a significant opportunity for Americans to recall and reflect upon the Civil War and its legacy in a spirit of reconciliation and reflection, through exploration, interpretation, and discussion. To ensure a suitable national observance of the Sesquicentennial that is comprehensive, the Committee directs the Director to encourage discussion of the historic, social, legal, racial, cultural and political forces that caused the American Civil War and influenced its course and outcomes at events organized and supported by the Park Service. Realizing the importance of the 150th Anniversary of the Civil War, the Committee has provided an increase for Visitors Services in the National Park Service to be used at the discretion of the Director for Sesquicentennial related programs and events.

Technical Assistance.—The Committee understands and supports the need for the technical expertise of the National Park Service in park management, resource preservation, public recreation, tourism, and education in other countries, especially but not limited to developing nations where the concept of national parks is still being established. The Committee is also aware that many highly experienced Park Service retirees are organizing to volunteer technical assistance to national parks in other countries. The Committee encourages the Park Service to support this effort from available funds.

Historic Leases.—The Committee believes that historic leases provide an opportunity to attract private capital and expertise to the challenges of preserving park resources. Under the terms of a historic lease, the lessee agrees to invest in the rehabilitation and maintenance of the leased structure in exchange for the right to use the structure. A historic lease shifts the burden of maintenance to the lessee for the duration of the lease term. Historic leases not only generate revenue, they play a role in rehabilitating, restoring, and maintaining park resources with private funds, saving taxpayer dollars. The Committee encourages the Park Service to pursue the use of cost-effective, innovative solutions like historic leases when practical and when the arrangement comports with a park unit's enabling legislation. These solutions can help mitigate a growing backlog of historic structures in need of preservation. Further, the Committee directs the Park Service to provide an inventory of current historic leases, the benefits derived from such leases, and any challenges posed by existing partnerships.

Flight 93 Memorial.—Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, over 1.2 million people have visited the temporary Flight 93 National Memorial in Shanksville, Pennsylvania. The memorial honors the 40 men and women who died saving the White House or U.S. Capitol from a potentially catastrophic terrorist attack. Phase 1A and 1C of the permanent memorial is scheduled for com-

pletion by September 2011. The Committee remains firmly committed to the timely completion of this project.

In addition, since 2005, the National Park Service has recorded over 1,500 hours of audio interviews involving over 600 individuals including family members of the passengers and crew, eyewitnesses, first responders, and others. The Committee strongly encourages the Park Service to devote the resources necessary to properly archive, maintain, and preserve these invaluable collections.

U.S. Capitol Concerts.—The Committee continues to support funding for the National Capitol Area Performing Arts Program and directs the Park Service to maintain funding for the summer concert series staged on the U.S. Capitol grounds at the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

National Mall Restoration Public-Private Partnership.—The National Mall is the most visited national park in the nation with 25 million annual visitors. The Committee strongly supports the public-private partnership involved in efforts to restore the National Mall. Former First Lady Laura Bush is serving as the honorary chair of the national campaign to raise $350 million in non-Federal funding working closely with private, philanthropic, and non-profit partners. These non-Federal funding sources will complement the $60 million in Federal dollars provided thus far for restoration projects including the reconstruction of the Jefferson Memorial seawall, the revitalization of the Lincoln Memorial landscape and reflecting pool, and other improvements.

Cuyahoga Valley National Park.—The Committee is aware that staff at the Cuyahoga Valley National Park are working with the surrounding communities to support a well-maintained local road system. The Committee encourages the Park Service to continue this collaborative effort to support local road systems and establish maintenance priorities.

Sequoia National Park.—The Committee is troubled that the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior have not heeded clear direction provided in the conference report for the fiscal year 2010 Interior and Environment Appropriations Act relating to the negotiation of renewal terms for a special use permit for an electrical generation station with features that lie within the boundaries of Sequoia National Park. Based on this earlier guidance, the Committee directs the Department to promptly resume negotiations utilizing a third-party, independent mediator, giving full consideration to utilizing Federal formulas valuing the use of Federal land applied to hydroelectric generation stations, such as those utilized by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and others, and report to the Committee on progress within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

Everglades Restoration.—The Committee notes the substantial progress toward restoration of the Everglades ecosystem over the last two years and continues to fully support this important national program. Funding is provided at the request level for the multi-year effort to preserve one of the great ecological treasures of the United States.

Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and Middle Delaware National Scenic and Recreational River, Appalachian National Scenic Trail.—The committee is concerned about delays in

completing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) announced by the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior regarding improvement of electric transmission lines partially lying within the boundaries of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. The timely completion of the EIS is of great importance to the reliability of the regional grid and is critical to the supply of electricity to 58 million consumers in 13 states and Washington, D.C. The Committee directs the National Park Service and the Department to adhere to its previously announced schedule and publish a final Record of Decision (ROD) in October of 2012 and report to the Committee on progress relating to the EIS within 90 days of the enactment of this Act.

Bill Language.—The Committee has included bill language in Title I General Provisions authorizing modifications to the Tamiami Trail as described in, and in accordance with, the preferred alternative identified in the final environmental impact statement noticed in the Federal Register on December 14, 2010, (75 Fed. Reg. 77896), relating to restoration efforts of the Everglades ecosystem.

The Committee has included bill language in Title I General Provisions addressing jurisdictional questions involving the National Park Service and the Coast Guard relating to boater safety checks on the Yukon River within the Yukon-Charley National Preserve.

The Committee has also included bill language in Title IV General Provisions amending current law to authorize the use of competitive grant funds for interpretive displays and exhibits at the Education Center at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The Education Center is being built with non-Federal funds.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

The National Recreation and Preservation account provides for outdoor recreation planning, preservation of cultural and national heritage resources, technical assistance to Federal, State and local agencies, and administration of Historic Preservation Fund grants.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$57,870,000
Budget estimate, 2012	51,567,000
Recommended, 2012	49,363,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−8,507,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−2,204,000

The Committee recommends $49,363,000 for National Recreation and Preservation, $8,507,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,204,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends the following changes to the request.

Natural Programs.—The Committee recommends $11,172,000 for Natural Programs, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,204,000 below the budget request.

Heritage Partnership Program.—The Committee recommends $8,993,000 for the Heritage Partnership Program (HPP) as requested, $8,408,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. These funds support grants to local non-profit groups in support of historical and cultural recognition, preservation and tourism activities.

Congress has in recent years expanded from 27 to 49 the number of authorized heritage partnerships, creating additional pressure on available grant funding. The Committee notes that State and

local managers of National Heritage Areas continue to rely heavily on Federal funding. The Committee has in the recent past provided direction for the development of self-sufficiency plans for heritage areas which have yet to be realized.

Funding for the Heritage Partnership Program was sustained in fiscal year 2011 at the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, in part to provide participating heritage areas additional time to develop plans for long-term sustainability. The Committee fully expects HPP funding to be under even greater pressure in future years. Accordingly, the Committee directs that participating heritage areas move expeditiously to develop plans for long-term self-sustainability.

Native American Graves Protection Grants.—The Committee provides funding for the Native American Graves Protection Grant program at the budget request level of $1,750,000.

Japanese American Confinement Site Grants.—The Committee maintains its support for the Japanese American Confinement Site Grants program at the budget request level of $3,000,000. This program leverages proportional funding through partnerships with local preservation groups to preserve Japanese American World War II confinement sites.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

The Historic Preservation Fund supports the State historic preservation offices to perform a variety of functions. These include State management and administration of existing grant obligations; review and advice on Federal projects and actions; determinations and nominations to the National Register; Tax Act certifications; and technical preservation services. The States also review properties to develop data for planning use. Funding in this account also supports direct grants to qualifying organizations for individual preservation projects and for activities in support of heritage tourism and local historic preservation.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$54,391,000
Budget estimate, 2012	61,000,000
Recommended, 2012	49,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−4,891,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−11,500,000

The Committee recommends $49,500,000 for historic preservation programs, $4,891,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and 11,500,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends the following changes to the request:

State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices.—The Committee supports the longstanding efforts of State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices to identify and protect irreplaceable historic and archaeological resources. Notwithstanding its strong support of this work, the Committee notes that the budget for State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices has grown by more than 16 percent since 2008. The request, if enacted, would represent a 25 percent increase in funding since 2008. While the demand for funding to address the needs of this program is great, this pattern of growth simply cannot be sustained.

The Committee recommends $42,500,000 for State Historic Preservation Offices, $3,907,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $7,500,000 below the budget request. The Committee rec-

ommends $7,000,000 for Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, $984,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $4,000,000 below the budget request. This level for State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices is equal to funding provided in fiscal year 2009.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$184,646,000
Budget estimate, 2012	152,121,000
Recommended, 2012	152,121,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−32,525,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $152,121,000 for construction, $32,525,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and equal to the budget request. These amounts fund major repairs and construction of National Park Service assets.

The following additional direction and guidance is provided with respect to funding provided under this account:

Special Resource Studies.—Special Resource Studies are directed by Congress to gather information about candidate areas to determine if they meet established criteria for significance, suitability, and feasibility as potential additions to the national park system.

The Committee notes that the NPS completed 12 studies in calendar year 2010 and is scheduled to complete between 12 and 16 studies this calendar year. The Committee directs the NPS to complete previously authorized studies before initiating any new studies. The Committee also directs the Park Service to provide, not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, a timeline for the completion of previously authorized studies.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

RESCISSION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	−$30,000,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−30,000,000
Recommended, 2012	−30,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	0
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends the rescission of $30,000,000 in the annual contract authority provided by 16 U.S.C. 460l–10a. This authority has not been used in years, and there are no plans to use it in fiscal year 2012. The Committee does not agree with the Administration's proposal to permanently cancel the authority.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$94,810,000
Budget estimate, 2012	360,000,000
Recommended, 2012	18,294,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−76,516,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−341,706,000

The Committee recommends $18,294,000 for land acquisition and state assistance, $76,516,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $341,706,000 below the budget request. The amounts rec-

ommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

The Committee has included language in the front of the report regarding Land and Water Conservation Fund programs.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The United States Geological Survey (USGS) was established by an Act of Congress on March 3, 1879, to provide a permanent Federal agency to conduct up-to-date systematic and scientific "classification of the public lands, and examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and products of the National domain." The USGS is the Federal government's largest earth-science research agency and the primary source of data on the Nation's surface and ground water resources. Its activities include conducting detailed assessments of the energy and mineral potential of the Nation's land and State offshore areas; investigating and issuing warnings of earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, landslides, and other geologic and hydrologic hazards; research on the geologic structure of the Nation; studies of the geologic features, structure, processes, and history of other planets of our solar system; topographic surveys of the Nation and preparation of topographic and thematic maps and related cartographic products; development and production of digital cartographic data bases and products; collection on a routine basis of data on the quantity, quality, and use of surface and ground water; research in hydraulics and hydrology; the coordination of all Federal water data acquisition; the scientific understanding and technologies needed to support the sound management and conservation of our Nation's biological resources; and the application of remotely sensed data to the development of new cartographic, geologic, and hydrologic research techniques for natural resources planning and management, surveys, investigations, and research.

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$1,083,672,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,018,037,000
Recommended, 2012	1,053,552,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−30,120,000
Budget estimate, 2012	+35,515,000

The Committee recommends $1,053,552,000 for surveys, investigations, and research, $30,120,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $35,515,000 above the budget request. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report. Prior year appropriations have been recalculated to reflect the Committee-approved budget realignment for fiscal year 2012.

Ecosystems.—The Committee recommends $150,120,000 for ecosystems programs, $10,717,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $16,303,000 below the budget request.

The Committee supports the President's budget proposal to conduct an in-depth analysis of the extent and sources of endocrine-disrupting chemicals impacting fish and wildlife in the Chesapeake basin.

Climate Variability.—The Committee recommends $40,628,000 for climate variability, $23,706,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $32,291,000 below the budget request. Changes from the request include the following: a decrease of $9,086,000 from research and development; a decrease (elimination) of $14,345,000 from carbon sequestration; and a decrease (elimination) of $8,860,000 from science support for Department of the Interior bureaus. The Committee expects the Survey to utilize funding throughout its entire budget to provide science support to other Interior bureaus.

Land Use Change.—The Committee recommends $85,303,000 for land use change, an increase of $11,496,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and an increase of $51,817,000 above the budget request.

The increase above the budget request is for land remote sensing, which is not funded in a separate account as was proposed by the Administration. The Committee supports the continuation of the LandSat program beyond LandSat 8 and urges the Administration to submit a fiscal year 2013 budget proposal that does not offset increases for LandSat with decreases elsewhere in the Survey's budget.

Energy, Minerals, and Environmental Health.—The Committee recommends $99,912,000 for energy, minerals, and environmental health, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and an increase of $11,394,000 above the budget request. The recommended level restores proposed cuts to mineral resources, energy resources, contaminant biology, and toxic substances hydrology.

Natural Hazards.—The Committee recommends $135,965,000 for natural hazards, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,096,000 above the budget request. The recommended level restores proposed cuts to earthquake, volcano, and landslide hazards.

Water Resources.—The Committee recommends $217,503,000 for water resources, $5,080,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $17,903,000 above the budget request.

The recommended level restores proposed cuts to nationally important water programs. The national streamflow information program and the cooperative water program are increased above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level by $2,900,000 and $2,090,000, respectively.

The Committee encourages the Survey to include with its fiscal year 2013 budget request a proposal to establish a national groundwater monitoring network as authorized by the Secure Water Act.

Bill Language.—The bill provides two-year funding authority. The cooperative water program is funded in the bill at $65,561,000. Provisos include a funding limitation on surveys on private property and a cost-share requirement on topographic mapping and water resources activities carried on in cooperation with States and municipalities.

NATIONAL LAND IMAGING

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$0
Budget estimate, 2012	99,817,000
Recommended, 2012	0
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	0
Budget estimate, 2012	−99,817,000

The Committee recommendation rejects the Administration's proposal to establish a new National Land Imaging account for LandSat and related activities. Instead these activities continued to be funded under Surveys, Investigations, and Research.

BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT, REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT

The Minerals Management Service (MMS) was created in 1982 and was renamed the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement (BOEMRE) by Secretarial Order 3302, issued June 18, 2010.

The BOEMRE is responsible for managing development of the nation's offshore energy resources in an environmentally and economically responsible way. The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) develops and implements plans for leasing conventional and renewable energy resources on the outer continental shelf (OCS) and is responsible for overseeing offshore energy operations and ensuring compliance with environmental and safety laws and regulations.

The BOEMRE is still in the process of reorganizing into three functions of the former Minerals Management Service: development of offshore mineral resources, environmental safety and enforcement, and receipt collections. The first phase of the reorganization moved the royalty collection activities to the new Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR) within the Office of the Secretary. Recommendations for ONRR are located under the Office of the Secretary in this report. The remaining functions will be divided into two independent organizations, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) in fiscal year 2012.

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT (FORMERLY ROYALTY AND OFFSHORE MINERALS MANAGEMENT)

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$238,999,000
Budget estimate, 2012	121,265,000
Recommended, 2012	138,605,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−100,394,000
Budget estimate, 2012	+17,340,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $138,605,000 for ocean energy management, $100,394,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $17,340,000 above the request. The large change in funding from fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2012 is due to the shift of $109,364,000 for royalty management to the Office of the Secretary under the newly created Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR). The Committee also rejects the budget proposal request to increase offshore inspection fees by $55,000,000. The recommendation also continues language in Title I General Provisions from the fiscal year 2011 enacted bill allowing the reorganization of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, and successor bureaus only in conformance with Committee reprogramming guidelines.

The Committee continues to strongly encourage the Bureau to issue offshore permits in a manner that is both consistent with the need to ensure safety and environmental protections and provides certainty and consistency for industry. A productive domestic oil and gas industry remains an important part of efforts to ensure our nation's energy independence, but without certainty that permits will be issued in a timely and consistent manner, domestic producers will continue to leave the Gulf for foreign waters, reducing our ability to achieve long-term energy independence. The Committee remains concerned that delays in issuing permits and lack of clarity on what is required for a permit have resulted in large losses for the businesses that contract and service rigs and unnecessary job losses for Americans in a difficult economy.

In light of these concerns, the Committee significantly increased funding in the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolutions to hire additional inspectors, enhance safety, and move forward with permitting after the moratorium was lifted. The Committee understands that it takes time and resources to properly address the problems that led to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill and that it was necessary for the Bureau to review and revise its safety and environmental standards in the reorganization process.

Noting that the Administration committed to moving forward with issuing new permits once reforms and needed funding were in place, the Committee is carefully monitoring the Bureau's efforts to provide the certainty needed to support efficient and environmentally responsible domestic energy production. During budget hearings on the Bureau, the Committee made clear that it believed additional funds were necessary, but that the Committee would not authorize a blank check. The Committee will strongly consider whether the additional funding provided to the Bureau has been used to issue permits in a timely fashion and provide industry with needed certainty when appropriating funding next year.

The Committee is concerned about the lack of transparency and public comprehension regarding the Bureau's oil and gas permitting data, particularly on its public website. The Committee directs the agency to work with the Committee on a system that allows the public and the Committee to better understand the performance metrics associated with offshore oil and gas permitting and to more fully justify the funds provided by this Act.

The Committee is concerned with the Bureau's stated intentions for the expansion of regulatory authority over non-lease holders under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA). The authority and need for this action has not been explained or justified to the Committee, nor how this diversion of limited resources would impact the Bureau's current mission and objectives identified in the fiscal year 2012 request. The agency is directed to use all the resources provided toward the regulatory efforts presented in the fiscal year 2012 request and that no funds be expended for other purposes until the agency has fully explained its authority, intentions and objectives to the Committee and the public.

The Committee notes that the *Report to the President by the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling* (the report) included among its recommendations to work with our Gulf neighbors toward agreeing on "a common, rigorous set of standards, a system for regulatory oversight, and the

same operator adherence to the effective safety culture called for in th[e] report, along with protocols to cooperate on containment and response strategies and preparedness in case of a spill." The Committee directs the Secretary of the Interior to report to the Committee on actions that are planned or have been taken to implement this recommendation.

Finally, the Committee will remain involved with the Administration, other Committees of Congress, the GAO, Inspector General, and other interested groups and industry in the oversight of BOEMRE and its response to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

The Committee has included bill language in Title IV General Provisions that clarifies existing law related to Clean Air Act permits for the outer continental shelf and sets a timeline for the approval of exploration drilling permits.

OIL SPILL RESEARCH

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$11,744,000
Budget estimate, 2012	14,923,000
Recommended, 2012	14,923,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+3,179,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $14,923,000 for oil spill research as requested, $3,179,000 above fiscal year 2011 enacted levels. This funding is derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to conduct oil spill research and financial responsibility and inspection activities associated with the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, Public Law 101–380. The Committee believes the requested increase in this program is warranted given the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in 2010.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), through its regulation and technology account, regulates surface coal mining operations to ensure that the environment is reclaimed once mining is completed. The OSM accomplishes this mission by providing grants to those States that maintain their own regulatory and reclamation programs and by conducting oversight of State programs. Further, the OSM administers the regulatory programs in the States that do not have their own programs and on Federal and tribal lands. Through its Abandoned Mine Land (AML) reclamation program, the OSM provides funding for environmental restoration at abandoned coal mines based on fees collected from current coal production operations. In their un-reclaimed condition these abandoned sites endanger public health and safety, and prevent the beneficial use of land and water resources. The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act amendments of 2006 dramatically changed the manner in which AML funds are distributed.

The amounts recommended by the Committee for each Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement appropriation account, compared with the budget estimates by activity, are shown in the table at the end of this report.

REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$127,026,000
Budget estimate, 2012	118,469,000
Recommended, 2012	123,050,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−3,976,000
Budget estimate, 2012	+4,581,000

The Committee recommends $123,050,000 for regulation and technology, $3,976,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $4,581,000 above the budget request. The Committee funds regulatory grants at $68,700,000, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $8,377,000 above the President's request. The Committee strongly urges OSM to discontinue efforts to push States to raise fees on industry as the bill provides the funds necessary for States to run their regulatory programs. Further, providing Federal regulatory grants to primacy States results in the highest benefit and the lowest cost to taxpayers. If a State were to relinquish primacy, OSM would have to hire and train sufficient numbers and types of Federal employees, and the cost to implement the program would be significantly higher.

The Committee also rejects the proposal to increase inspections and enhanced Federal oversight of State regulatory programs. Delegation of the authority to the States is the cornerstone of the surface mining regulatory program. The Committee believes the President's proposal to increase Federal inspections would not only be a redundant activity, but also duplicative and wasteful spending. The State regulatory programs do not need enhanced Federal oversight to ensure continued implementation of a protective regulatory framework. Accordingly, the Committee has not provided the $3,932,000 and 25 FTE increase requested for those activities within the Regulation and Technology account, and funding for State and Program Evaluation is maintained at the fiscal year 2010 enacted level of $8,630,000.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$35,517,000
Budget estimate, 2012	27,443,000
Recommended, 2012	27,443,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−8,074,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $27,443,000 for the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund as requested, $8,074,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION

The Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education (Bureau) was founded in 1824 to establish a government-to-government relationship and trust responsibility that results from treaties with Native groups. The Bureau delivers services to over 1.7 million American Indians and Alaska Natives. In addition, the Bureau provides education programs to American Indians through the operation of 169 schools and 14 dormitories. The Bureau administers more than 56 million acres of land held in trust status. Over

10 million of these acres belong to individuals and 46 million acres are held in trust for Tribes.

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$2,329,846,000
Budget estimate, 2012	2,359,692,000
Recommended, 2012	2,333,690,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+3,844,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−26,002,000

The Committee recommends $2,333,690,000 for the Operation of Indian Programs, $3,844,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $26,002,000 below the request. The recommended total funding level for the Bureaus of Indian Affairs and Indian Education is $28,998,000 above the budget request. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

Tribal Government.—The Committee recommends $518,660,000 for Tribal Government, $9,071,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $21,567,000 above the budget request.

Contract support costs are fully funded at $228,000,000. Two recent court cases found that the Bureau was legally obligated to pay the full amount of all contract support costs that it had contractually agreed with Indian Tribes to pay, and limitations on the overall contract support cost appropriation does not overcome the Bureau's obligation to pay said costs. The Committee believes that the Bureau should pay all contract support costs for which it has contractually agreed and directs the Bureau to include the full cost of the contract support obligations in its fiscal year 2013 budget submission.

Trust—Natural Resources Management.—The Committee recommends $157,361,000 for natural resources management, $1,279,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $4,891,000 below the budget request. Cooperative landscape conservation is funded at $419,000.

The Committee encourages the Bureau, in consultation with Tribes, to evaluate the needs of its hatchery program to ensure that funding is fairly allocated nationwide.

Education.—The Committee recommends $769,485,000 for education, $16,787,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $26,069,000 below the request.

This Committee recognizes that tribal education departments and agencies are uniquely situated at the local level to implement innovative education programs to improve Native American education. The Committee provides $2,000,000 to build capacity of tribal education agencies (TEAs) and for a pilot project to increase the role of tribal education departments in Native American education. In the pilot, TEAs should directly administer some ESEA programs and enter into collaborative agreements with States to work closely with school districts located on Indian reservations or former Indian reservations. The Committee expects the BIA to collaborate with the Department of Education on this effort.

The Committee directs the Bureau, in coordination with the Department of Education, and in consultation with the Tribes, to up-

date its count of students eligible for the Johnson-O'Malley Program funding and to report the results to this Committee within 180 days of enactment of this Act. In addition, the Committee directs the Bureau to reestablish the full-time permanent Johnson-O'Malley coordinator position that was terminated in 2005.

Public Safety and Justice.—The Committee recommends $342,709,000 for public safety and justice, $8,619,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $12,000,000 below the request.

To address the needs of American Indian youth in custody at tribal detention centers operated or administered by the BIA, the Committee directs the BIA to consider educational and health-related services to juveniles in custody as allowable costs for detention/corrections program funding.

CONSTRUCTION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$209,580,000
Budget estimate, 2012	104,992,000
Recommended, 2012	154,992,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−54,588,000
Budget estimate, 2012	+50,000,000

The Committee recommends $154,992,000 for construction, $54,588,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $50,000,000 above the request. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

Education.—The Committee recommends $102,104,000 for education construction, $38,405,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $50,000,000 above the budget request. The increased funding is for replacement school construction, which should complete the remaining projects on the 2004 priority list. The Committee urges the Bureau to move with all deliberate speed to publish a new replacement school construction priority list, and to request funding to implement projects on the list in fiscal year 2013.

The Committee understands the Bureau has been working with the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe on the needs of the Bug O Nay Ge Shig School and encourages the BIA to continue these efforts to ensure all health and safety concerns are addressed. The Committee directs the Bureau to report quarterly on progress to address these concerns.

Public Safety and Justice.—The Committee recommends $11,329,000 for public safety and justice construction as requested, $6,535,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

The Committee supports recent efforts by the Bureau and Department of Justice to improve coordination related to the constructing, staffing, and maintenance of tribal detention centers. The Committee encourages the Bureau and the Department of Justice to work together and in consultation with the Tribes through the Bureau's Tribal Interior Budget Council to develop methodologies for constructing tribal detention centers, including regional detention centers, based on need and best use of resources. The Department of the Interior is strongly encouraged to update the Committee at least quarterly on achievements and actions taken.

The Committee commends the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation for their initiative in addressing their law enforcement needs by constructing a justice center to house their adult and juvenile detention and rehabilitation center, tribal courts, and police department. The Committee also commends the Bureau of Indian Affairs in its efforts to assist the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes in ensuring that the Center continues to operate effectively. Knowing that work must be done in consultation with Tribes, the Committee continues to encourage the Bureau to consider establishing regional detention centers at new or existing facilities, such as the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' Justice Center, as it works to combat the crime problem in Indian Country.

INDIAN LAND AND WATER CLAIM SETTLEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PAYMENTS TO INDIANS

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$46,387,000
Budget estimate, 2012	32,855,000
Recommended, 2012	32,855,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−13,532,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $32,855,000 for Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians as requested, $13,532,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

INDIAN GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$8,199,000
Budget estimate, 2012	3,114,000
Recommended, 2012	8,114,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−85,000
Budget estimate, 2012	+5,000,000

The Committee recommends $8,114,000 for the Indian guaranteed loan program account, $85,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $5,000,000 above the budget request. The increase is for the guaranteed and insured loan subsidy.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The Office of the Secretary supports a wide-range of Departmental business, policy, and oversight functions. In September 2010, Secretarial Order 3306 established the Office of Natural Resources Revenue as part of the reorganization of the former Minerals Management Service (MMS). This revenue collection and compliance function is now managed within the Office of the Secretary.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$118,598,000
Budget estimate, 2012	283,670,000
Recommended, 2012	250,151,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+131,553,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−33,519,000

The Committee recommends $250,151,000 for salaries and expenses for the Office of the Secretary, $131,553,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $33,519,000 below the budget request. The detailed allocation of funding by program is included in the table at the end of this report.

The Committee includes the proposed restructuring of Departmental Offices, reflecting the incorporation of the Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR) and alignment of the budget with the Department's organization. Although the overall budget for Departmental Offices reflects an increase over the fiscal year 2011 level, this is due to the move of the ONRR from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement.

The Committee includes the realignment of budget activities and subactivities and creation of two new budget activities—Leadership and Administration and Management Services. This will bring the funding allocations and reporting in line with the current organization of the Department, improve transparency and accountability, and clearly separate the policy and oversight functions from the operational functions. The Committee directs the Department to continue providing the Committee with the level of budget detail that has historically been provided (at the office level).

Leadership and Administration.—The Committee recommends $119,032,000 for Leadership and Administration, $10,386,000 below the budget request. The reduction below the request is to Central Services.

Management Services.—The Committee recommends $21,755,000 for Management Services, $12,888,000 below the request. The reduction below the request is to the Office of Valuation Services.

Office of Natural Resources Revenue.—The realignment of the Office of Natural Resources Revenue into the Office of the Secretary and separation from the mineral leasing functions ought to improve transparency in the collection and distribution of $9 billion annually in mineral production revenues. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) testified before this Committee in March about the importance of these activities in generating revenues that are shared between Federal, State and tribal governments. In February 2011, the GAO designated Interior's management of oil and gas resources as a government-wide high risk and discussed the challenges related to the collection of oil and gas revenue. The Committee is aware of efforts underway to address these challenges and advance a set of reforms including those recommended by the GAO.

With this in mind and the funding allocated to the function in fiscal year 2011, the Committee maintains funding for ONRR at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level of $109,364,000, which is $10,245,000 below the budget request. The Committee remains focused on working with the Department to ensure the success of this function and directs the Department to provide a report on the Office of Natural Resources Revenue within 120 days of enactment on the organization, funding, staffing and status of reforms.

The Committee supports the increased transparency provided with the alignment of functions consistent with the organization of Departmental Offices and lauds the Department's efforts in IT transformation, reducing travel spending, and other steps to reduce spending. These actions resulted in savings of $62 million in fiscal

year 2011 and are expected to generate additional cost savings and cost avoidance in future years. The Committee urges the Department to consider other restructuring to achieve improved effectiveness and efficiency in the delivery of programs and services. The Committee directs that the Department report back to the Committee on progress made on these efforts within 180 days of enactment.

Additional Guidance.—National Monument Designations.—The Department is directed to work collaboratively with interested parties, including the Congress, States, local communities, tribal governments and others prior to planning, implementing, or making national monument designations.

Geospatial Information Systems.—Commercial off-the-shelf software now provides the tools, capabilities, and capacity to implement Department-wide enterprise geospatial information systems (GIS) at low cost that do not require development or maintenance of expensive customized software and which benefit a broad base of internal and external users. The potential cost savings and improvements to efficiency and mission performance are significant. The Committee recommends that the Department of the Interior give priority to fully competitive implementation of COTS-based department-wide enterprise GIS in fiscal year 2012, using the full range of scientific and demographic data already available within the Department.

Direct Hire Authority.—The Committee commends the National Park Service for its ongoing efforts to improve its business practices through programs such as the Business Plan Initiative (BPI), a program that offers financial management internships to graduate students enrolled in top Business Schools, Policy Schools, and Environmental Management Schools. Programs such as BPI allow bureaus to recruit young professionals with private-sector financial management training into Federal service, where an aging workforce and a tightening budget climate make such skills increasingly critical. To encourage NPS and DOI use of programs such as BPI, the Committee has included a Title I General Provision that will enable the Secretary to hire these students into financial management positions across the Department upon completing their undergraduate or graduate studies.

Bill Language.—The Committee has continued to include bill language that deducts two percent of State royalties to help cover Federal administrative costs. As requested, the language has been moved from Administrative Provisions under the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement to the Office of the Secretary.

INSULAR AFFAIRS

ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

The Office of Insular Affairs (OIA) was established on August 4, 1995, through Secretarial Order No. 3191, which also abolished the former Office of Territorial and International Affairs. The OIA has important responsibilities to help the United States government fulfill its responsibilities to the four U.S. territories of Guam, American Samoa (AS), U.S. Virgin Islands (USVI) and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) and also the

three freely associated States: the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) and the Republic of Palau. The permanent and trust fund payments to the territories and the compact nations provide substantial financial resources to these governments. During fiscal year 2004 new financial arrangements for the Compacts of Free Association with the FSM and the RMI were implemented; these also included mandatory payments for certain activities previously provided in discretionary appropriations as well as Compact impact payments of $30,000,000 per year split among Guam, CNMI, AS, and Hawaii. During fiscal year 2012 permanent funding of $377,133,000 will be made available to these governments in addition to the discretionary funding discussed below.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$84,182,000
Budget estimate, 2012	84,117,000
Recommended, 2012	82,558,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−1,624,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−1,559,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee for the Office of Insular Affairs appropriations accounts compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report. The Committee recommends $82,558,000 for assistance to territories, $1,624,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,559,000 below the budget request.

Territorial Assistance.—The Committee recommends $32,086,000 for territorial assistance, $1,669,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,559,000 below the budget request. Within the amount provided, the Committee maintains the fiscal year 2011 funding level for the Office of Insular Affairs, the Brown tree snake, coral reef initiative, water and wastewater projects, and empowering insular communities. The Committee also supports the OIA's partnership with the Close Up Foundation which allows students and educators from Guam, American Samoa, the CNMI, the FSM, the RMI, the Republic of Palau, and the United States Virgin Islands to participate in civic education programs.

American Samoa.—The Committee recommends $22,752,000 for American Samoa operations as requested, which is $45,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

Northern Mariana Islands/Covenant Grants.—The Committee recommends $27,720,000 for CNMI covenant grants as requested, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$17,307,000
Budget estimate, 2012	3,054,000
Recommended, 2012	3,307,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−14,000,000
Budget estimate, 2012	+253,000

The Committee recommends $3,307,000 for the Compact of Free Association, $14,000,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level, and $253,000 above the request. The Committee expects the Compact will be renegotiated and therefore the discretionary stopgap funding provided in fiscal years 2010 and 2011 will not be necessary in 2012. Further, the Committee finds insufficient justifica-

tion to reduce funding for the Enewetak program and maintains funding at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INSULAR AFFAIRS

The Committee recommendation continues bill language, as requested, allowing the Interior Department to transfer certain funds designated for Guam to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, when requested by the Governor of Guam, as a subsidy for direct or guaranteed rural development loans to Guam for construction and repair projects. During the next ten years, the military will be moving major facilities and personnel to Guam which will result in tremendous impacts on the island's infrastructure. This language, which does not supplant any existing USDA authority, will help the government of Guam respond to this unprecedented change.

Bill language has not been included to provide the Secretary with authority to redistribute capital improvement funds in 2012. The Committee is similarly focused on the slow spending rates in the territories and urges all territories to increase expenditure of previously awarded funds. The Committee intends to revisit the issue in fiscal year 2013 if expenditure rates have not substantially increased.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$64,946,000
Budget estimate, 2012	68,476,000
Recommended, 2012	64,946,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	0
Budget estimate, 2012	−3,530,000

The Committee recommends $64,946,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $3,530,000 below the budget request. The detailed allocation of funding by program is included in the table at the end of this report.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$48,493,000
Budget estimate, 2012	49,471,000
Recommended, 2012	48,493,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	0
Budget estimate, 2012	−978,000

The Committee recommends $48,493,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $978,000 below the budget request. The detailed allocation of funding by program is included in the table at the end of this report.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians was established by the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–412). The Department of the Interior is responsible for managing 55 million surface acres and 57 million acres of subsurface minerals estates for almost 381,000 Individual Indian Money (IIM) accounts and about 2,800 tribal accounts (over 250 Tribes). On these lands, the Department of the Interior manages over 100,000 leases for individual Indians and Tribes. The Department received approximately $299,000,000 in fiscal year 2010 from leases, permits, sale revenues, and investment income for Individual Indian Money accounts, and approximately $532,000,000 for Tribal accounts.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$160,768,000
Budget estimate, 2012	152,319,000
Recommended, 2012	152,319,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−8,359,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $152,319,000 for Federal Trust programs as requested, $8,359,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

The Committee remains interested in the government's obligation to protect Indian Trust records. While efforts in recent years have led to improvements, such as the creation of the American Indian Records Repository, the Committee understands that valuable records still exist in unprotected locations on Indian reservations and government offices. The Committee urges the Department to continue its efforts to prevent deterioration and destruction of these valuable records and to provide adequate resources for this critical effort.

Bill Language.—As in previous fiscal years, the Committee has included bill language under the Office of the Special Trustee that limits the amount of funding available for historical accounting to $31,171,000.

DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

The Department's wildland fire management and FLAME wildfire suppression reserve accounts support fire activities for the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$718,057,000
Budget estimate, 2012	729,521,000
Recommended, 2012	574,072,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−143,985,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−155,449,000

The Committee recommends $574,072,000 in new discretionary funding for wildland fire management which, when combined with the directed use of $189,000,000 in carryover emergency fire suppression funds, provides $763,072,000 for wildland fire management at the Department of the Interior. In addition, the Committee recommends $92,000,000 as requested for the FLAME wildfire suppression reserve account. The Committee's recommendation fully funds the inflation-adjusted 10-year fire suppression average expenditures. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

Wildfire Preparedness.—The Committee recommends $276,964,000 for wildfire preparedness as requested, $13,488,000 below the fiscal year 2011 and 2010 enacted level. The Committee believes that the Department and the Forest Service must work together, along with States and other partners, to maintain sufficient readiness within the preparedness program. The Department should immediately notify the Committees on Appropriations if it appears that funding shortfalls may limit needed firefighting capacity.

Wildfire Suppression Operations.—The Committee recommends $270,611,000 as requested for fire suppression operations but directs the Department to utilize $189,000,000 in carryover emergency fire suppression funds. The Committee recommendation, including the FLAME wildfire suppression reserve fund, fully meets the 10-year average expenditure on all emergency and discretionary funded suppression actions which actually occurred, adjusted for inflation.

Other Wildland Fire Management Operations.—The Committee recommends $215,497,000 for other national fire plan wildland fire operations, $13,157,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted funding level and $33,551,000 above the budget request. The Committee recommends increasing the hazardous fuels reduction program by $26,551,000 over the request. The Committee recommends funding Rural Fire Assistance at the fiscal year 2010 enacted level of $7,000,000 and rejects the termination of this program in the request. The Rural Fire Assistance program is important to small, rural communities and helps ensure safe and effective firefighting. The program also improves the capacity and capability of rural firefighters to respond and fight wildland fires. Other subactivities are funded at the requested levels.

In testimony before this Committee in March, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) outlined the management challenges that the Department of the Interior faces, including protecting lives, property and resources from wildland fire. GAO testified that, in collaboration with the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, Interior has taken steps to manage this daunting challenge and has demonstrated improvements, although work remains in developing a cohesive strategy, establishing clear goals and a strategy to contain wildland fire costs, management of the fuel reduction program, and interagency budgeting and planning.

The Committee is appreciative of the leadership in the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior in producing the cohesive strategy, but questions the dissimilar approaches currently taken by the two agencies in the management of hazardous fuels,

budgets, and firefighting resources. As part of the continuing development of the cohesive strategy, the Committee looks forward to an evaluation of alternative approaches to effective management of the full set of wildland fire management programs that will ensure comprehensive, cost efficient and effective reduction of risks posed to firefighters, the public and communities and the natural resources that support them within and outside the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI).

The Committee is deeply concerned with the Interior Department's fiscal year 2012 budget proposal that arbitrarily restricts the use of hazardous fuels funds to projects in or immediately adjacent to the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). The Committee believes that the socio-economic health and vitality of rural areas are highly dependent on the health and vitality of the landscapes and ecosystems that surround them. There is also a significant risk to communities if neighboring public land managers are not able to conduct the necessary treatments that would prevent the build-up of fuel loads. The Committee also believes that continued emphasis on structural protection will eventually result in communities, and the natural resources they depend on, being more threatened by fires originating outside of the WUI than they are presently. While the Committee appreciates the Department's efforts to ensure scarce hazardous fuels reduction funds are directed to the highest priority projects in the highest priority areas, the Committee directs the Department to provide the Committee with a more rational process for establishing priorities that includes the full scope of community interests that are threatened by wildland fire within 120 days after enactment of this Act.

The Committee also shares GAO's concerns about containing costs in the fire program, particularly given the constrained fiscal environment. The Committee is appreciative of the agencies' efforts that are presently underway to eliminate duplication of fire-related information technology applications and consolidate governance and staffing in these IT systems and urges the two agencies to continue these efforts. However, more must be done.

The Committee is aware of the duplication that exists in the Department of the Interior's wildland fire programs, with multiple parallel organizations in four bureaus, each having nearly identical administrative organizations at the national, State and regional levels, and at the local level to manage fire planning and environmental compliance, prevention and preparedness, hazardous fuels reduction and biomass utilization, protection and suppression, smoke management and air quality, post-fire stabilization and burned area rehabilitation, facilities construction and maintenance, fire science, rural fire assistance, and fire management-related aviation management activities.

The Committee directs the Department to complete an assessment of these Wildland Fire programs in order to determine the most cost effective and efficient means of providing comprehensive fire management services in support of Departmental and bureau missions, and to better direct scarce resources from duplicative administrative management organizations to focus resources on the protection of lives, property and natural and cultural resources. The Committee asks for a set of options for restructuring and conducting the wildland fire programs, including streamlining the De-

partment and bureau roles and responsibilities for administration and management of preparedness, suppression operation, hazardous fuels reduction, burned area rehabilitation, fire facilities, fire science, community assistance, and budget and finance functions. Further, the Department should evaluate existing alternative models for service delivery, including the Alaska Fire Service, States, and other countries and identify resources that can be redirected to on-the-ground services through reorganization of its wildland fire management programs. Lastly, the Committee directs the Department to report back to the Committee no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act with a set of options including estimated cost savings and schedules for implementation.

FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$60,878,000
Budget estimate, 2012	92,000,000
Recommended, 2012	92,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+31,122,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $92,000,000 for the FLAME wildfire suppression reserve fund as requested. As discussed above under the wildland fire management account, the Committee fully funds the 10-year average expenditure for wildfire suppression.

CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$10,155,000
Budget estimate, 2012	10,149,000
Recommended, 2012	10,149,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−6,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $10,149,000 for the central hazardous materials fund as requested, $6,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT AND RESTORATION

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FUND

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$6,449,000
Budget estimate, 2012	6,263,000
Recommended, 2012	5,763,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−686,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−500,000

The Committee recommends $5,763,000 for the natural resource damage assessment fund, $686,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $500,000 below the budget request. The detailed allocation of funding by program is included in the table at the end of this report.

The Committee notes that the program's fiscal year 2012 budget request projects an unobligated balance of $493,442,000 in settlement funds carried forward at the end of fiscal year 2012, which is an increase from the amount carried forward in the previous two fiscal years. The Committee is concerned that the program is inef-

fective in its ability to obligate funding in a timely manner. Meanwhile, habitat programs at the cooperating Interior bureaus are being proposed for cuts by the Administration. The Committee believes there may be economies of scale to be gained here and directs the program, in consultation with the cooperating Interior bureaus, to evaluate alternative approaches to delivering restoration projects that better utilize the existing expertise throughout Interior bureaus in a way that not only implements restoration projects faster but provides a supplemental source of funding to other bureau habitat programs. The program is directed to report back to the Committee within 120 days of enactment of this Act.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$85,651,000
Budget estimate, 2012	73,119,000
Recommended, 2012	57,019,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−28,632,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−16,100,000

The Committee recommends $57,019,000 for the working capital fund, $28,632,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $16,100,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends $52,019,000 for the Financial and Business Management System (FBMS), $28,266,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $6,100,000 below the budget request. The Committee notes that this funding decrease corresponds to the funding increase over the budget request for FBMS contained in the Department's fiscal year 2011 Operating Plan. The Committee expects the Department to complete deployment expeditiously in order to maximize the benefits including shutting down costly, outdated legacy systems. The Committee expects the Department to mandate standardization and minimize additional future costs. Further, the Committee expects that the Department will produce standardized reporting beginning in fiscal year 2012 that will be used to monitor funds status, obligations and expenditures.

The Committee also recommends $2,500,000, which is $2,500,000 below the budget request, to support the Department's continuing IT transformation from an antiquated system of stovepipes in each bureau to consolidated enterprise architecture under the Office of the Chief Information Officer. The Committee expects this ongoing initiative to reduce long-term IT costs. Additionally, the Committee recommends $2,500,000, which is $2,500,000 below the budget request, for the Department's efforts to identify operating efficiencies and achieve savings across bureaus through consolidation of services, facilities, and infrastructure. The Committee has not provided $5,000,000 as requested for training, recruitment, retention, and hiring of the acquisition workforce.

Bill Language.—The Committee has included bill language from prior years continuing the Department of the Interior's prohibition on establishing reserves in the appropriated Working Capital Fund other than for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment without the prior approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

The Committee has also continued language from prior years relating to the Department's ability to recover its costs for leasing

space and providing for training, professional services and equipment to State, local and tribal government employees at the National Indian Program Training Center in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The National Indian Training Center's mission is to establish partnerships with State, local and tribal governments for providing educational opportunities in support of the Department's trust responsibilities to American Indians. Any funds recovered shall only be available to the National Indian Program Training Center.

The Committee has not provided requested bill language relating to training, recruitment, retention, and hiring of the acquisition workforce.

The Committee has provided the Administrative Provision carried in prior years, as requested, governing acquisition of certain aircraft.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Section 101 continues a provision providing for emergency transfer authority with the approval of the Secretary.

Section 102 modifies a provision providing for emergency transfer authority with the approval of the Secretary.

Section 103 continues a provision providing for the use of appropriations for certain services.

Section 104 continues a provision permitting the transfer of funds between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians.

Section 105 continues a provision permitting the redistribution of tribal priority allocation and tribal base funds to alleviate funding inequities.

Section 106 continues a provision permitting the conveyance of the Twin Cities Research Center of the former Bureau of Mines for the benefit of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Section 107 continues a provision allowing the Secretary to pay private attorney fees for employees and former employees in connection with Cobell v. Salazar.

Section 108 provides authority to the National Park Service to implement modifications to restoration efforts of the Everglades ecosystem.

Section 109 continues a provision authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands in support of transportation of visitors to Ellis, Governors, and Liberty Islands, NJ and NY.

Section 110 extends the authority of the Department to hire Indian probate judges to handle Indian probate cases.

Section 111 continues a provision allowing for the reorganization of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement only in conformance with Committee reprogramming guidelines.

Section 112 allows the Bureau of Indian Education to utilize funds recovered from grants or ISDA contracts to Tribes upon reassumption of school operations by the Bureau.

Section 113 extends a provision allowing the Bureau of Land Management to enter into long-term cooperative agreements for long-term care and maintenance of excess wild horses and burros on private land.

Section 114 provides the Secretary of the Interior statutory authority to enter into rental or lease agreements that benefit Bureau of Indian Affairs operated schools.

Section 115 continues a provision dealing with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's responsibilities for mass marking of salmonid stocks.

Section 116 addresses a matter of jurisdiction between the National Park Service and the Coast Guard relating to boater safety checks on the Yukon River within the Yukon-Charley National Preserve.

Section 117 provides the Secretary of the Interior the authority to hire, upon graduation, college and graduate students who have recently completed a rigorous internship program with a land management agency, such as the NPS Business Plan Initiative.

Section 118 requires the exhaustion of administrative review before litigants may file in Federal court.

Section 119 provides that certain rules published by the Secretary shall not be subject to judicial review if certain conditions are met.

Section 120 provides for the trailing of livestock across public lands through fiscal year 2014.

Section 121 requires the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement to report to the Committee quarterly on permitting.

Section 122 allows the Department of the Interior to lease certain land within Fort Pulaski National Monument.

Section 123 reinstates a demonstration program to allow certain tribes to maintain some autonomy from the Department of the Interior in the management of their trust funds and finances.

Section 124 continues a provision prohibiting funds to implement, administer or enforce Secretarial Order 3310 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.

The Committee did not include requested language for outer continental shelf inspection fees or onshore oil and gas inspection fees.

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was created by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, which consolidated nine programs from five different agencies and departments. Major EPA programs include air and water quality, drinking water, hazardous waste, research, pesticides, radiation, toxic substances, enforcement and compliance assurance, pollution prevention, oil spills, Superfund, Brownfields, and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank program. In addition, EPA provides Federal assistance for wastewater treatment, sewer overflow control, drinking water facilities, other water infrastructure projects, and diesel emission reduction projects. The Agency is responsible for conducting research and development, establishing environmental standards through the use of risk assessment and cost-benefit, monitoring pollution conditions, seeking compliance through enforcement actions, managing audits and investigations, and providing technical assistance and grant support to States and Tribes, which are delegated authority for much of the program implementation. Under existing statutory authority, the Agency contributes to specific homeland security efforts and may participate in international environmental activities.

Among the statutes for which the Environmental Protection Agency has sole or significant oversight responsibilities are:

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.
Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended.
Toxic Substances Control Act, as amended.
Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.
Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended.
Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended.
Oil Pollution Act of 1990.
Public Health Service Act (Title XIV), as amended.
Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended.
Clean Air Act, as amended.
Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended.
Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002.
Bioterrorism Act of 2002.
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended.
Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002 (amending CERCLA).
Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986.
Pollution Prevention Act of 1990.
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended.
Pollution Prosecution Act of 1990.
Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003.
Energy Policy Act of 2005.
Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

For fiscal year 2012, the Committee recommends $7,149,202,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency, $1,532,915,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,823,798,000 below the budget request. The amounts recommended by the Committee are changes to the request. Comparison to the budget request and 2011 enacted levels are shown by account, program area and selected activity in the table at the end of the report.

Reprogramming.—The Agency is held to the reprogramming limitation of $1,000,000. This limitation will be applied to each program area in every account at the levels provided in the detailed table at the end of this report. This will allow the Agency the flexibility to reprogram funds within a set program area. However, where the Committee has cited funding levels for certain program projects or activities within a program area, the reprogramming limitation continues to apply to those funding levels. Further, the Agency may not use any amount of deobligated funds to initiate a new program, office, or initiative, without the prior approval of the Committee. The other guidelines laid out in the "Reprogramming Guidelines" section of this report continue to be in effect.

Congressional Budget Justification.—The Committee directs the Agency to include in future Justifications the following items: (1) a comprehensive index of programs and activities within the program projects; (2) the requested bill language, with changes from the enacted language highlighted, at the beginning of each account section; (3) a justification for every program/project, including those proposed for elimination; (4) a comprehensive, detailed explanation of all changes within a program project; (5) a table showing consolidations, realignments or other transfers of resources and personnel

from one program project to another such that the outgoing and receiving program projects offset and clearly illustrate a transfer of resources; and, (6) a table listing the budgets and FTE by major office within each National Program Management area with pay/non-pay breakouts. The Committee notes that the Congressional Justification includes the bill language for each account. The Committee directs the Agency to highlight and explain any changes to the proposed bill language in the Congressional Justification.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Science and Technology (S&T) account funds all Environmental Protection Agency research (including Superfund research activities paid with funds moved into this account from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account). This account includes programs carried out through grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, States, universities, and private business, as well as in-house research. It also funds personnel compensation and benefits, travel, supplies and operating expenses, including rent, utilities and security, for all Agency research. Research addresses a wide range of environmental and health concerns across all environmental media and encompasses both long-term basic and near-term applied research to provide the scientific knowledge and technologies necessary for preventing, regulating, and abating pollution, and to anticipate emerging environmental issues.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$813,480,000
Budget estimate, 2012	825,596,000
Recommended, 2012	754,611,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−58,869,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−70,985,000

The Committee recommends $754,611,000 for science and technology, $58,869,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $70,985,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends that $23,016,000, as requested by the President, be paid to this account from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account for ongoing research activities consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended. The changes to the request, as recommended by the Committee, appear in the table at the end of this report. The Committee provides the following additional detail by program area.

Clean Air and Climate.—Funding has been reorganized in this program area, as requested, therefore comparisons to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level present little value. The Committee recommends $120,082,000 for the Clean Air and Climate Program which is $14,288,000 below the request. The Committee remains very interested in the demonstration projects for the hydraulic hybrid technology and funding has been provided as requested for the Clean Automotive Technology and Fuel Cell and Hydrogen programs. The Committee has not provided the requested increases in the Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification program project. The Committee understands the engine certifications and implementation of the light and heavy-duty vehicles standards are

priority activities for the Agency to fund within baseline levels, and expects the Agency to prioritize accordingly.

Enforcement.—Funding for forensics support has been maintained at the 2011 enacted level of $15,293,000, which is $33,000 below the budget request.

IT/Data Management.—Funding has been maintained at the 2011 enacted level of $3,657,000, which is $451,000 below the budget request.

Operations and Administration.—The Committee has provided $70,050,000 for Facilities Infrastructure and Operations, $390,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $6,471,000 below the budget request. The Committee has not provided the increases requested for 2012. The Committee's recommendation fully supports the requested amounts for rent, utilities, security, transit subsidy, and regional moves while eliminating funding for other facilities operations. The Committee continues to support plans to reduce energy utilization rates in order to mitigate rising utility costs.

Pesticide Licensing.—Funding has been maintained at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level of $6,578,000 which is $253,000 below the budget request. EPA is directed to absorb the laboratory fixed cost increases.

Research: Air, Climate and Energy.—The bill provides $93,000,000 for Air, Climate and Energy research, which is $15,000,000 below the budget request. From within this amount, $77,195,000 is for Research: Clean Air and $15,805,000 is for Research: Global Change. Funding has not been provided for other air, climate, and energy research activities. The recommended level does not provide the $3,000,000 increase for the NAAQS monitor development, applies a $5,000,000 programmatic reduction for climate research, and eliminates funding for other proposed research in this program area including research on biofuels and mercury.

Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability.—Funding has been reorganized in this program area as requested, therefore comparisons to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level present little value. The Committee recommends $125,514,000, which is $12,543,000 below the budget request. The Committee has not provided the requested increase for green chemistry and design. Within the amount provided, the Committee supports the increased research focus on Computational Toxicology and Endocrine Disruptors.

Research: National Priorities.—The bill provides $5,000,000 which shall be used for extramural research grants to fund high-priority water quality and availability research by not-for-profit organizations who often partner with the Agency. Funds shall be awarded competitively with priority given to partners proposing research of national scope and who provide a 25 percent match. The Agency is directed to allocate funds to grantees within 180 days of enactment of this Act.

Research: Safe and Sustainable Water Resources.—The Committee recommends $108,532,000, which is $8,765,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $10,244,000 below the budget request. The Committee has not provided the requested $5,996,000 increase for additional green infrastructure research beyond what is already provided in the base, or the requested $4,226,000 increase for additional drinking water case studies.

Research: Sustainable and Healthy Communities.—The Committee recommends $154,324,000, which is $16,702,000 below the budget request. Resources for Endocrine Disruptor research, Computational Toxicology research, and Human Health Risk assessment have been transferred to the Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability program area as a result of the proposed reorganization of ORD resources. The Committee has not provided funding for the Fellowships program in 2012, a $17,261,000 decrease below the budget request. The Committee has provided $2,559,000 for the laboratory study and footprint analysis, and encourages ORD to institute efficiency improvements that will result in long term savings using the amounts provided.

Additional Guidance.—The Committee has included the following additional guidance with respect to funding provided under this account.

Computational Toxicology.—Recognizing ToxCast has great promise to streamline and significantly increase the throughput of the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program (EDSP), the Committee directs EPA to accelerate the evaluation, validation and implementation of the endocrine-relevant ToxCast assays. The Agency shall (1) in future EDSP Test Orders, use a targeted approach and adjust individual Test Orders in response to scientifically credible requests by taking existing data into account, and using information from valid in vitro assays or computer models, including ToxCast, as appropriate; and (2) use a peer consultation process to revise the EDSP weight of the evidence guidance to assure a systematic and consistent approach for evaluating other scientifically relevant information and EDSP results. These two activities shall include public comment and publication of Agency responses.

Consolidation of laboratory and other research space.—From fiscal year 2007 through fiscal year 2010, EPA released approximately 250,000 square feet of space at headquarters and facilities nationwide resulting in a cumulative annual rent avoidance of over $1.1 million in this account. These achieved savings and potential savings partially offset EPA's escalating rent budget. The Committee continues to support the Agency's space strategy efforts, including those options that could lead to further efficiencies and potential reductions to the Agency's real property footprint.

Hydraulic Fracturing.—The Committee directs the Agency to submit the Final Draft of the Interim Study Results and any additional final study results of the Plan to Study the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources, for Interagency Review and public comment, consistent with the processes described in Sections 2.2 and 2.5 of the Draft Hydraulic Fracturing Study Plan released February 7, 2011.

Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS).—While the Committee is supportive of the goals of EPA's IRIS program, fundamental improvements to the policies and practices of this program are necessary to ensure that assessments reflect the highest standard of scientific inquiry. As such, assessments must be based on the best available evidence and evaluated in accordance with established protocols.

Therefore, EPA shall incorporate, as appropriate, based on chemical-specific datasets and biological effects, the recommendations of Chapter 7 of the National Research Council's Review of the Envi-

ronmental Protection Agency's Draft IRIS Assessment of Formaldehyde, into the IRIS process. The Agency shall issue a progress report to the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees of the Congress no later than December 1, 2011 describing its implementation of the National Research Council's recommendations for ongoing and new assessments.

Although the Committee does not wish to delay the IRIS process, it is imperative that EPA incorporate best practices to ensure timely and accurate risk assessments. In order to ensure that any action taken by EPA as a result of ongoing and new assessments is based firmly on the principles of modern scientific methods and commonly accepted practices, no funds shall be used to take any administrative action based on any draft or final assessment that does not incorporate the recommendations in Chapter 7 of the National Research Council's Review of the Environmental Protection Agency's Draft IRIS Assessment of Formaldehyde as part of the assessment process.

Additionally, no funds shall be used to take any administrative action based on any draft or final assessment which has not fully documented the implementation of the National Academy of Science's (NAS) recommendations.

The Committee directs EPA to contract with the NAS to conduct up to three reviews of IRIS assessments that EPA seeks to make final. These reviews will include an evaluation of whether the recommendations it made in previous reviews, including in Chapter 7 of the National Research Council's Review of the Environmental Protection Agency's Draft IRIS Assessment of Formaldehyde, have been implemented. Of the three studies, the Committee directs the Agency to contract with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of the cancer and non-cancer hazards from oral exposure to inorganic arsenic. Based on EPA's performance with the 2010 draft cancer assessment, the need to conduct a comprehensive, independent peer-review of the toxicology of inorganic arsenic, and the significant societal implications of changes in risk management approaches to arsenic, the Committee finds the need to require the NAS to conduct a study of the cancer and non-cancer hazards of inorganic arsenic, and to provide its recommendations regarding the estimated toxicity values for both endpoints based on its analysis. The NAS study should include, but not be limited to, the methodology from which the most recent cancer potency is derived, the 300 studies in the published scientific literature EPA failed to review for its 2010 draft assessment, and an analysis of the dose-response relationship between inorganic arsenic and cancer to determine whether a threshold can be established for safe exposure at low levels. The Committee directs that no further action be taken to post EPA's 2010 draft cancer assessment of inorganic arsenic as final or for the use of any risk values from this assessment in Federal regulatory or permitting decisions pending the completion of the NAS study. NAS shall choose the remaining two reviews from a representational sample of IRIS assessments and notify Congress directly of these choices.

Furthermore, no funds shall be used for action on any proposed rule, regulation, guidance, goal or permit, issued after May 21, 2009, that would result in the lowering or further lowering of any exposure level that would be within or below background con-

centration levels in ambient air, public drinking water sources, soil, or sediment.

Title 42 Hiring Authority.—The Committee directs EPA to more effectively use Title 42 authority to recruit external talent to the Agency. EPA's Title 42 authority is intended to ensure that the Agency has the benefit of our Nation's best scientific minds. While the Committee recognizes the world class talent that currently resides within the Agency, EPA should identify where critical talent gaps exist and actively recruit accredited scientists with the knowledge and expertise needed by the Agency. EPA should expand its recruitment to include advertising vacancy announcements in scientific publications to ensure the widest applicant pool possible. Consistent with the National Academies of Science recommendations, for all vacant Title 42 slots, EPA's search committees and selection committees should include members who are outside the agency.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

The Environmental Programs and Management account encompasses a broad range of abatement, prevention, enforcement, and compliance activities, and personnel compensation, benefits, travel, and expenses for all programs of the Agency except Science and Technology, Hazardous Substance Superfund, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund, Inland Oil Spill Programs, and the Office of Inspector General.

Abatement, prevention, and compliance activities include setting environmental standards, issuing permits, monitoring emissions and ambient conditions and providing technical and legal assistance toward enforcement, compliance, and oversight. In most cases, the States are directly responsible for actual operation of the various environmental programs, and the Agency's activities include oversight and assistance.

In addition to program costs, this account funds administrative costs associated with the operating programs of the Agency, including support for executive direction, policy oversight, resources management, general office and building services for program operations, and direct implementation of Agency environmental programs for headquarters, the ten EPA regional offices, and all non-research field operations.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$2,756,470,000
Budget estimate, 2012	2,876,634,000
Recommended, 2012	2,498,433,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−258,037,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−378,201,000

The Committee recommends $2,498,433,000 for environmental programs and management, $258,037,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $378,201,000 below the budget request. The changes to the request, as recommended by the Committee, appear in the table at the end of this report. The Committee provides the following additional detail by program area:

Clean Air and Climate.—Resources have been transferred to and from other program areas as part of the budget reorganization rendering little value to comparisons to the 2011 enacted level. The

Committee recommends $263,741,000, which is $51,545,000 below the budget request. Within the amount provided, the Committee directs the following changes to the request:

For the Climate Protection Program, $91,997,000 which is $19,637,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $19,997,000 below the budget request. From within this total, the Committee provides the following program amounts: (1) $48,206,000 to fund the Energy Star program at fiscal year 2008 levels; (2) $12,646,000 for the Greenhouse Gas Registry, a $5,000,000 programmatic reduction from the budget request; and (3) $25,529,000 for voluntary climate protection programs, $7,000,000 below the budget request. These voluntary programs seek to achieve pollution reductions across various sectors in conjunction with willing partners, rather than using overly burdensome regulations. At the same time these programs divert funds away from EPA's core mission responsibilities and often lack a statutory mandate.

The Committee understands that the Energy Star program has instituted reforms to cease self-certification via the website and include third party verification to address the 2010 GAO findings. However the Committee continues to question the Federal role of the program along with the need for additional resources if companies are required to submit their products to a third party for a review. In addition, the Committee believes EPA may not rely on broad user fee authority as the basis for charging Energy Star fees and therefore lacks such authority. If EPA wishes to collect user fees to offset the costs of the program, the Administration should send a legislative proposal to the committees of jurisdiction for consideration in the same manner as they have requested for the electronic manifest system and proposed increases for pesticide user fees.

For Federal Stationary Source Regulations, $20,590,000 which is $9,258,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $13,507,000 below the budget request. The Committee's recommendation represents a one-third reduction to the 2011 enacted level. This amount does not provide funding for the New Source Performance Standards as bill language has been included to relieve EPA of the need to promulgate such standards. EPA's justification identifies over 300 air toxics rules that need to be under development by fiscal year 2012. At the same time, no new legislation has passed since 1990 mandating that EPA engage in these rulemakings. This is the clearest example of EPA's regulatory agenda running out of control and it must be tempered. The Committee understands that a number of these required actions are the result of past regulatory attempts that failed to withstand judicial review; however, in the case of ozone, EPA has voluntarily chosen to review the 2008 standards well in advance of the next update. The Committee strongly urges EPA to wait until the next mandatory review cycle before promulgating a new ozone NAAQS standard. Further, the committee disagrees with the proposal to add 30 new Federal regulators for stationary sources.

For Federal Support for Air Quality Management, $115,270,000 which is $11,782,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $18,552,000 below the budget request. The amount includes a $24,446,000 incoming transfer of funds from the air toxics program

as a result of the budget reorganization. The Committee has not provided any of the requested programmatic increases, including the increases for greenhouse gas permitting of stationary sources. EPA is also asked to absorb additional workforce and IT costs within the funds provided. Further, the recommended level assumes a $4,700,000 programmatic reduction to fund EPA's stationary source permitting programs at the fiscal year 2006 enacted level, and overall Federal Support for Air Quality Management and Air toxics at the fiscal year 2008 levels following the reorganization. The Committee agrees that more FTE are required in this account, but only if those FTE improve the performance of EPA's permit review and approval process, which continues to be a point of frustration for applicants.

Funding for the Domestic Stratospheric Ozone Program has been maintained at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level of $5,547,000, which is $65,000 below the budget request.

Brownfields.—The Committee recommends $23,680,000, which is equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,717,000 below the budget request. The Committee has not provided funding for the Smart Growth program, a voluntary interagency partnership established in 2009 without a Congressional mandate. The Committee has also not provided requested funding or FTE increases above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level in order to address the grants management workload as grants in the STAG account have been reduced in 2012.

Compliance.—The Committee provides $106,874,000, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $12,774,000 below the budget request. The Committee's recommendation includes the transfer of resources from the Compliance Assistance Centers and Incentives program to the Compliance Monitoring and Civil Enforcement program, as requested. The Committee rejects the $9,631,000 proposed increase for the Regaining Ground in Compliance Initiative on the grounds that additional monitoring, inspections, and reporting are not the solutions to improving compliance. EPA working in concert with local stakeholders and providing technical assistance is the key for regaining compliance in those communities. The Committee has also not provided funding for the plethora of increased web training, ICIS database and IT enhancements requested in the budget. In maintaining the enacted level the Committee also assumes that the program will absorb the increased payroll costs.

Enforcement.—The Committee recommends $226,656,000, which is $29,194,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $41,562,000 below the budget request. The Committee's recommended level recognizes the transfer of funds from the Compliance line items to Civil Enforcement. EPA implemented this reorganization under the 2011 budget without the explicit approval of Congress.

For fiscal year 2012, EPA has proposed the largest budget ever for its Office of Enforcement and Compliance. This continues a string of regular increases for the enforcement budget despite reductions in the FTE levels. Since 2006, the enforcement line item has received anywhere between a 4 and 7 percent increase annually. Given increases in recent years, the Committee directs EPA to absorb the payroll costs within the $163,883,000 provided for civil enforcement. As noted in previous sections, the Committee

does not agree with the Regaining Ground on Compliance Initiative as proposed, and has not provided the requested increases. The Committee's recommended level also does not provide additional resources for the air toxic monitoring at schools or for the Deepwater Horizon litigation. The Committee recognizes these are high priority activities and expects they will be prioritized accordingly within the funds provided. The Committee recommendation has reduced funding by $15,000,000 to bring the amount for civil enforcement in line with 2007 funding levels.

The criminal enforcement program is funded at $41,365,000, equal to the fiscal year 2008 level and $10,000,000 below the budget request. Funding for the Environmental Justice program has been maintained at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level, recognizing that this is an Administration priority. The Committee recommends $14,572,000 for NEPA implementation, equivalent to the 2008 level and a $3,500,000 reduction from the request.

Environmental Protection: National Priorities.—The bill provides $15,000,000 for a competitive grant program to provide rural and urban communities with technical assistance to improve water quality and provide safe drinking water. Grants shall be awarded on a competitive basis, and priority for said grants shall be given to qualified not-for-profit organizations whose activities are national in scope, offer a 25 percent match, and are supported by a majority of small community water systems or currently provide assistance to private well owners. The Agency is directed to allocate funds to grantees within 180 days of enactment of this Act.

Geographic Programs.—The Committee recommends $346,280,000, which is $69,762,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $116,727,000 below the budget request. The Committee has provided funding for programs that support restoration and protection of our nation's most important water bodies, as protection of these resources continues to be a priority for the Committee. From within the amount provided, the Committee directs the following changes to the request:

Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.—The Committee recommends $250,000,000 for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI), $100,000,000 below the budget request. While this amount is $49,400,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level, the GLRI continues to be the largest single recipient of funds within Geographic Programs, and restoration of the Great Lakes continues to be a key priority for the Committee. Funding for the Agency's Great Lakes National Program Office and its work to implement the Great Lakes Legacy Act is included in this amount. Within the amount provided, funds shall be allocated to the five focus areas as follows:

$101,364,000 for Toxic Substances and Areas of Concern, of which $50,000,000 is for the Great Lakes Legacy Act;

$43,303,000 for Invasive Species;

$39,402,000 for Nearshore Health and Nonpoint Source Pollution;

$40,377,000 for Habitat and Wildlife Protection and Restoration; and $25,554,000 for Accountability, Education, Monitoring, Evaluation, Communication and Partnerships.

Funding amounts for these focus areas are subject to a reprogramming threshold of $5,000,000. The Agency is directed to report quarterly to the Committees on Appropriations on changes

below the threshold. As the Agency implements the Initiative in 2011 and 2012, EPA is directed to accelerate the obligations and outlays given lessons learned and protocols established in 2010. Given the late appropriation for fiscal year 2011, the Committee remains concerned about the slow pace at which the funds were utilized in fiscal year 2010, and expects that 2011, 2012, and future resources will be transferred to Federal partners in a more expeditious manner. More than half of the GLRI funds provided to EPA were transferred to the fifteen other participating Federal entities to administer programs that those entities have the authority, experience, or expertise in performing. The Committee understands that appropriate controls needed to be established to ensure proper accountability and oversight before those funds were transferred. In turn, the Committee expects those Federal entities will similarly be in a position to accelerate the obligation of funds to projects given lessons learned in 2010. The Committee continues to direct the EPA to work with other Federal agencies to ensure that funds transferred through interagency agreements are used to increase each Agency's level of effort by supplementing and expanding existing programs and not supplanting an Agency's existing resources as the Agency moves forward in the third year of the Initiative.

The Committee is pleased with the progress the Agency is making together with local, State, non-governmental and other Federal agency partners with the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. The Committee understands that plan implementation, particularly as deadlines and targets approach, will require difficult decisions given the proposed funding levels. The Committee expects the partners to meet action plan objectives even if doing so will result in significant shifts over time in the size and scope of projects funded and the distribution of funds across focus areas.

The Committee directs the Agency and the other Federal agencies to exercise maximum flexibility to minimize non-Federal match requirements in recognition of the exceptional economic circumstances of the region and the significant ongoing investments made by non-Federal partners. The Committee understands that States have struggled to provide the State match for the funds provided for Great Lakes Legacy Act work. If the Agency again determines that States are unable to provide the required match, EPA should conduct a thorough review to identify the best use of funds across all 16 Federal partners and across all five focus areas. The Committee directs EPA to consult with both Federal and non-Federal partners when setting funding priorities for 2012, and when proposing to reallocate funds.

Lastly, the Committee directs EPA and the other Federal partners to prioritize action oriented projects in lieu of additional studies, monitoring and evaluations. Sound science should continue to serve as the backbone for all decisions in the Great Lakes; however, the Committee expects to see measurable results from the large increases provided over the last few fiscal years. The Committee has reinforced this directive by maintaining the fiscal year 2011 funding levels for work on the Areas of Concern and Invasive Species.

Chesapeake Bay.—The Committee recommends $50,000,000 for the Chesapeake Bay Program, $4,391,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $17,350,000 below the budget request.

While funding has been maintained at the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, the Committee is concerned that States and local stakeholders have not bought into the goals and approach contained in the latest Chesapeake Bay action plan. The Committee appreciates the enhanced Federal coordination and commitment as an outgrowth of the May 2009 Executive Order; however, State and local buy-in is critical for restoration of the Bay. As such the Committee has not provided the requested increase for 2012.

From within the amount provided, $18,828,000 is for state implementation grants and $9,627,000 is for Chesapeake Bay Operations, both equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted levels. TMDL development and implementation is funded at $1,000,000, enforcement at $1,017,000, and Chesapeake Stat at $821,000. The bill provides $5,000,000 to partially restore the Administration's cut in the fiscal year 2011 enacted levels. The bill does not provide the newly requested funding for air deposition activities.

The bill provides $2,000,000 in small watershed grants, as requested. The Committee recognizes that local governments utilize other programs to assist with the cleanup of the Bay and directs the Agency, from within the small watershed grant amount, to support a competitive grant to conduct a survey of local government policies and programs used to control polluted runoff from urban, suburban and agricultural lands within the Bay's four largest watersheds to provide all parties with information on the full scope of cleanup activities. The Agency should make the results of these surveys public to assist local government decision-makers with information on successful practices already in place, best management practices aimed at improving water quality, better implementation of existing policies, and road maps to help counties and municipalities decide how best to reduce pollution.

Puget Sound.—The Committee provides $30,000,000, which is $8,095,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $10,711,000 above the budget request, to manage and implement Washington State's Puget Sound Action Agenda, an approved Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) under Section 320 of the Clean Water Act. The Committee directs that an intended use list to guide the activities and project funding to restore Puget Sound be established.

The list shall be created by the Section 320 Agency designated by the State of Washington and shall include an identification and determination of the highest priority activities, projects and recipients necessary to implement the CCMP. This list shall be made available jointly by the Administrator and the Section 320 Agency for public comment prior to approval by the Administrator. After considering public comments, the Administrator shall review and approve the priority list upon a determination that projects listed are consistent with the goals and priorities of the approved comprehensive conservation and management plan. If the Administrator finds that the annual priority list is inconsistent with the CCMP, the Administrator shall recommend alternatives to the Section 320 Agency who shall then resubmit the annual priority list for approval. Subject to the availability of funds, the Administrator shall fund the projects that rank highest on the priority list.

The Committee directs the Agency to expeditiously obligate funds, in a manner consistent with the authority and responsibil-

ities under Section 320 and the National Estuary Program. Not more than 3 percent shall be used for EPA intramural costs. In addition, and as in the prior year, funds are provided for continued funding of the existing competitive grant to manage the Action Agenda and development of the intended use plan.

South Florida.—The Committee recommends $1,653,000, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $408,000 below the budget request.

Mississippi River Basin.—The Committee has not provided funding to initiate a new grant program in the Mississippi River basin. The Committee is pleased to see that the Agency has proposed a more focused approach to targeting the funding in such a large watershed. However, the Agency's proposal continues to lack definitive targets and goals, and it is unclear what results could be expected from this new program similar to the Section 319 non-point source grants in the STAG account.

Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE).—The Committee has not provided funding for the voluntary CARE program in 2012.

Other geographic activities.—The Committee has not provided funding for the Northwest Forest program as it lacks demonstrable results.

Information Exchange/Outreach.—The Committee recommends $120,936,000, which is $13,043,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $24,274,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommendation does not include funding for the Environmental Education Program. This program has not been reauthorized since 1996, yet Congress has continued to fund it despite a lack of demonstrated results. The recommendation also provides $48,771,000 for the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, equal to the fiscal year 2007 level. From within this amount, $3,285,000 has been provided for the Administrator's Immediate Office and the recommendation caps the FTEs for the office at 20 FTEs. All other activities within this project area are maintained at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

International Programs.—The Committee recommends $16,195,000, which is $2,873,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $3,252,000 below the budget request. The bill funds the Mexico Border program at half of the level requested as the outcomes associated with the non-water and wastewater infrastructure activities are unclear. Further, since the Committee recommendation eliminates the STAG water infrastructure grants in 2012, there will be an inherently reduced workload. The Committee recommendation includes funding for International Sources of Pollution at the fiscal year 2009 enacted level of $7,506,000, which is $796,000 below the budget request.

IT/Data Management/Security.—The Committee recommends $93,372,000, which is $6,177,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,041,000 below the budget request. The Committee has not provided additional funds for the increased compliance reporting or for base workforce costs which the agency should absorb.

Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic Review.—The Committee recommends $89,234,000, which is $33,423,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $39,376,000 below the budget request. On average, EPA produces 150 new regulations per year and the

process for the regulatory development is overseen by the Office of Regulatory Policy and Management. In addition, several of EPA's new policy initiatives are funded in this account including the Smart Growth Program and the Promoting a Greener Economy Initiative. These often are voluntary partnerships established without a Congressional mandate, and as such, the Committee has not included funding for the Smart Growth Program and the Promoting a Greener Economy Initiative in fiscal year 2012. The Committee's recommendation reduces by half the funding for program evaluation and regulatory review and analysis. EPA's regulatory agenda has had a chilling effect on infrastructure investments and the reductions come not only at a critical time for reducing spending but also at a time to reduce the pace of new regulations.

The recommended level maintains the fiscal year 2011 enacted level for the Administrative Law, Alternative Dispute Resolution, Civil Rights Compliance, and Legal Advice: Program Support. Funding for the Science Advisory Board has been maintained at the fiscal year 2008 level. Basic legal support for the environmental programs has been returned to the fiscal year 2006 levels.

Operations and Administration.—The Committee recommends $476,419,000, which is $19,598,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $31,116,000 below the budget request. The recommendation fully funds the request for rent, utilities and security and applies a $10,711,000 programmatic reduction to maintain funding for facility infrastructure and operations at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. In order to fund the operational lines at the fiscal year 2006 levels, the recommendation provides the following reductions to the request:

–$11,000,000 for acquisition management;

–$3,000,000 for central planning, budgeting and finance;

–$3,000,000 for financial assistance and IAG management; and

–$3,405,000 for human resources management;

EPA has the flexibility to redirect any funds from rent or utility savings in order to meet other identified needs within the recommended level.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.—The Committee recommends $112,643,000, which is $5,400,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $4,228,000 below the budget request. The Committee has not provided the $2,000,000 request to develop the e-manifest system despite the Committee's strong support for this proposal. An electronic manifest system would offer millions of dollars of administrative savings to the regulated community. However, EPA still has yet to obtain the requisite user fee authority to collect fees and fund the operational costs of the system. The Committee directs the program to absorb the requested pay increases within the funds provided.

Toxics risk review prevention.—The Committee recommends $100,123,000, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $15,174,000 below the budget request. The Committee recognizes the increasing workload and challenges associated with assessing and tracking the over 80,000 chemicals in commerce. The Committee supports those efforts by maintaining funding for the toxics and chemical review activities in a declining budget.

Water: Ecosystems.—The Committee recommends $47,947,000, which is $5,306,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and

$6,479,000 below the budget request. From within the amount provided, the Committee directs $26,748,000 to the National Estuary Program (NEP) and Coastal Waterways, maintaining funding at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level for each of the 28 NEPs under Section 320 of the Clean Water Act. The recommended level provides $21,199,000 for the Wetlands program as the Committee has eliminated previously reprogrammed funding in 2010 and 2011 for work on the Enhanced Coordination Procedures with the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Office of Surface Mining. The Committee has included bill language relieving EPA of the requirement to perform this work, rendering the associated resources no longer necessary.

Water: Human Health Protection.—The Committee recommends $98,324,000, which is $5,864,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $9,000,000 below the budget request. From within the amount provided, the Committee has provided the requested funding for the Beach/Fish programs and the requested $2,000,000 increase for the geological sequestration of carbon dioxide in the Underground Injection Control program. The Committee has not provided the $1,200,000 increase for the Regaining Ground Initiative on compliance. The Committee does not believe that increasing reporting or monitoring is the solution for increasing compliance. Rather, EPA should focus on collaborating with local stakeholders on compliance issues, including how to meet arsenic standards, in order to assist those communities as they work to ensure a clean drinking water supply that is protective of human health. The Committee has also included a $7,800,000 programmatic reduction to temper the litany of new EPA drinking water regulations and return funding for the Drinking Water regulatory office to fiscal year 2006 levels.

Water Quality Protection.—The Committee recommends $192,550,000 for this program, $31,197,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $32,936,000 below the budget request. From within the amount, funding for marine pollution has been maintained at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level, $1,468,000 below the budget request. The Committee has reduced the Surface Water Protection activities commensurate with the proportional reduction in the allocation from the 2010 enacted level. As previously noted in other program areas, the Committee does not support the Regaining Compliance Initiative as proposed, and has not provided the increase for the initiative. The Committee understands EPA reprioritized 2011 funding to initiate work on the proposed Urban Waters initiative. Since the Committee did not explicitly provide funds for this new program in 2011, the Committee views the initiative as a new request. As such, the Committee has not provided the $5,000,000 in funding to establish a new Urban Waters program.

Additional Guidance.—The Committee has included the following additional guidance with respect to funding provided under this account.

Administrator Priorities.—The Committee is aware via a 2010 reprogramming request from the Agency that the Administrator routinely sets aside funding within each budget to address Administrator priorities. Under the fiscal year 2010 budget this funding grew from $5 million to $6.75 million. The Committee notes that

such funding is not directly linked to any known performance and the bill therefore provides no such funding. The Committee directs the Agency to submit a report within 90 days of enactment that identifies how the fiscal year 2010 funding was used, by account, program area and program project. Each activity funded should include a justification for the effort and any anticipated results.

Arsenic Reporting.—Legitimate concerns have been raised relating to the challenges that many small and rural communities, particularly in the West, have in meeting national compliance standards set by the EPA for arsenic in drinking water. In 2001, the Agency adopted a new standard for arsenic in drinking water at 10 parts per billion (ppb), replacing the older standard of 50 parts per billion, in order to protect consumers served by public water systems from the effects of long-term exposure to this odorless and tasteless naturally occurring element. In many instances, small communities with arsenic levels only marginally higher than the national standard lack the population or tax base to build or operate a water treatment plant or the ability to take other corrective measures. The Committee believes that current options established by the Agency to assist communities in complying with the standard are not working. EPA and State regulatory agencies must do a better job to empower smaller communities to ensure their water is safe without requiring communities to consider unaffordable utility rate increases. The Committee therefore directs the Agency to do the following not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act: (1) promptly submit to Congress an overdue report—requested in the Fiscal Year 2005 Omnibus Appropriations Act (P.L. 108–447)—on the extent to which communities are being affected by the arsenic rule, and proposing compliance alternatives and making recommendations to minimize costs; (2) convene a working group composed of representatives from States, small publicly owned water systems, and treatment manufacturers, which shall submit to the Committee a report on barriers to the use of point-of-use and point-of-entry treatment units, package plants (including water bottled by the public water system), and modular units; and (3) in consultation with the working group, submit to the Committee a report on alternative affordability criteria that give extra weight to small, rural, and lower income communities.

Boiler MACT.—The Committee is encouraged by the suspended implementation of the boiler MACT rules and directs the Environmental Protection Agency to abandon the current proposed rule. This rule contains unattainable limits based on narrow data sets and is counterproductive to the national goal of increasing domestic sources of energy and would lead to wide-spread economic hardship in many industries.

Brown Marmorated Stink Bug.—The Committee appreciates the work of the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention regarding the brown marmorated stink bug. This pest is causing significant damage to agricultural products, particularly tree fruit in the mid-Atlantic States. The Committee encourages the Office to work collaboratively with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, including the Agricultural Research Service, the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, and state partners to expeditiously approve a control program as soon as the appropriate agents are evaluated for release.

Economic Analysis of Reciprocating Engine Rule.—The Committee is aware that on March 3, 2010, the EPA promulgated final rules for Compression Ignition Reciprocating Engines (75 Fed. Reg. 9648 et. seq.) under the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (EPA–HQ–OAR–2008–0708), requiring owners of compression engines (often diesel or diesel-natural gas fueled) to install catalytic converters on the engines to operate after May of 2013.

The Committee is concerned that such rule places a limitation on operation of emergency stationary engines to operate for no more than 15 hours per year as part of an emergency demand response program. The Committee is also concerned the rule clarified that no emergency engine was allowed to supply power to an electric grid and that no emergency engine was allowed to provide power as part of a financial arrangement. This aspect of the rule will make it difficult for municipalities to maintain emergency backup generating capacity.

The Committee is concerned that EPA failed to adequately address the economic impact such rule would have on small governmental jurisdictions that own or operate emergency engines subject to the rule. The Committee directs EPA to initiate an analysis within 60 days of enactment of this act and to report back to the Committee on the economic effect such rule would have on small government jurisdictions defined as a government of a city, county, town, school district or special district with a population of less than 50,000.

Endocrine Disruptors (ED).— The Committee continues to have concerns with the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program's (EDSP) slow progress and believes it needs additional guidance. The EPA Inspector General criticized the slow progress, noting several missed lawsuit-related test validation milestones. In order to spur the agency to action, the Committee directs EPA to: (1) rely on standardized laboratory performance criteria for EDSP testing; (2) include basic and clinical endocrinologists with a range of expertise and deep knowledge in endocrinology including effects of chemical stressors on the endocrine system of humans and wildlife in tier 1 assay testing results peer review; (3) take steps to ensure EDSP testing minimizes the use of animals and considers existing knowledge and targeted testing, and justifies use with appropriate statistical considerations; (4) evaluate the Tier 1 test chemicals in ToxCast assays and determine their performance in endocrine-relevant estrogenic, androgenic, and thyroid assays to refine toxicological prediction models; (5) utilize high throughput in vitro screening assay results to prioritize Tier 1 chemical testing and to inform future endocrine disruptor investigations; and (6) coordinate the Agency's capabilities with those of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, the National Toxicology Program, the National Chemical Genomics Center, and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration into an integrated, comprehensive endocrine screening program.

The Committee also directs EPA as part of the Agency's biennial budget justification to include: (a) information describing: coordination with other government research organizations that are part of the Tox21 Consortium, and in particular how the Agency works within the National Research Council's Tox 21 framework in its ED

research; (b) the status of EPA's eight chemical action plans; and (c) how the ED research provides supporting science for the Agency's regulatory efforts.

Personnel and Full Time Equivalents.—Many difficult decisions were required in order to identify the appropriate funding distribution for the fiscal year 2012 House budget recommendation. The Committee understands that the recommended budget will require many more difficult decisions as the Agency executes the fiscal year 2012 plan. The Committee has long been concerned about the growing disparity between EPA headquarters and regional FTE, many of whom are policy advisors to the Administrator or Assistant Administrators or who implement voluntary initiatives. The Committee recognizes that not all headquarters FTE are located in Washington DC, and a significant number of those FTE are lab and budget personnel in Research Triangle Park, Cincinnati, and Las Vegas. Nonetheless, in fiscal year 2010, EPA had nearly 800 more FTE in headquarters positions than in regional positions resulting in a payroll $210 million higher for headquarters personnel. Had the Committee not taken action to reduce the fiscal year 2011 budget, this gap would have grown by nearly 300 FTE under EPA's assumption for a flat 2011 budget. The Committee remains concerned about the distribution of regional FTE to headquarters under the final 2011 Operating Plan. As EPA executes the 2012 budget, the Agency is directed to bring the headquarters FTE in line with the regional FTE and to cap its FTE level at no more than the fiscal year 2010 level of 16,594 which is 609 FTE below the budget request, and the Agency's lowest FTE utilization level since 1992.

Pesticide Permitting.—The Committee is concerned with the EPA's movement toward requiring a permit under the Clean Water Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under FIFRA, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide. This rule would have far-reaching implications and move beyond the intended application of the Clean Water Act. In order to address this issue the Committee has included bill language in Title V of this Act clarifying the regulatory responsibilities under the Clean Water Act and FIFRA.

Recycling Programs.—The Committee recognizes that across the Nation recycling programs have proliferated in number and effectiveness over the past decades. However, there is limited aggregate data for policy makers and citizens to evaluate the success of such efforts in a timely manner. The Committee also understands there are limitations to ascertaining data from the various governments and business that have recycling programs but there should be a goal to understand the impact of these programs in aggregate. Therefore, EPA shall report to the Committee within 45 days after enactment of this Act, on the development of a process to collect additional data on the recovery rates achieved by the variety of U.S. recycling programs.

Regional Haze.—The Committee is aware that EPA has recently proposed Federal implementation plans to address regional haze, and the Committee has concerns about the costs, technology requirements and compressed compliance periods in those plans. In the Committee's view, EPA has not properly balanced the substan-

tial expense of these controls with the minimal visibility improvement the controls would cause, as required by the Clean Air Act (CAA). Improving visibility at Class I areas is an aesthetic value, not a health issue, and hence States have been given great leeway by the CAA to consider a host of economic factors in deciding what they should do to address visibility at Class I areas. Because of EPA's actions, the Committee directs EPA to defer action on finalizing any visibility Federal implementation plans for at least one year so that EPA and the affected states can work out their differences on matters such as compliance deadlines and the costs of proposed actions to address regional haze in order to adhere to the statutory direction of the CAA.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) provides audit, evaluation, and investigation products and advisory services to improve the performance and integrity of EPA programs and operations. The Inspector General (IG) will continue to perform the function of IG for the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board. This account funds personnel compensation and benefits, travel, and expenses (excluding rent, utilities, and security costs) for the Office of Inspector General. In addition to the funds provided under this heading, this account receives funds from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$44,701,000
Budget estimate, 2012	45,997,000
Recommended, 2012	41,099,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−3,602,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−4,898,000

The Committee recommends $41,099,000, which is $3,602,000 below the fiscal year 2011 level and $4,898,000 below the budget request. In addition, the Committee recommends $9,955,000 as a payment to this account from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. The Committee's recommendation funds the Inspector General at the fiscal year 2008 level given that the Inspector General does not fully utilize its FTE positions.

Exercising authorities provided in the Inspector General Reform Act, the IG requested an additional $4,760,000 above the President's request. The Committee appreciates the value of a strong Inspector General, and reiterates that the IG has not utilized the FTE positions requested in the President's budget for at least two years. The Committee believes the Inspector General should fully utilize resources requested in the President's budget before requesting amounts in addition to those of the Administration.

The IG is directed to continue to submit quarterly staffing reports to Congress until such time as the Committee informs the Inspector General that the quarterly staffing reports are no longer required.

The Committee has again included authorization for the EPA IG to serve as the IG for the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

The Buildings and Facilities account provides for the design and construction of EPA-owned facilities as well as for the repair, extension, alteration, and improvement of facilities used by the Agency. The funds are used to correct unsafe conditions, protect health and safety of employees and Agency visitors, and prevent deterioration of structures and equipment.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$36,428,000
Budget estimate, 2012	41,969,000
Recommended, 2012	36,428,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	0
Budget estimate, 2012	−5,541,000

The Committee recommends $36,428,000, which is equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $5,541,000 below the budget request. The Committee supports the proposed projects that will reduce agency operational and rent costs. EPA should prioritize 2012 projects based on anticipated cost savings and allocate funds accordingly.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

The Hazardous Substance Superfund (Superfund) program was established in 1980 by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act to clean up emergency hazardous materials, spills, and dangerous, uncontrolled, and/or abandoned hazardous waste sites. The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) expanded the program substantially in 1986, authorizing approximately $8,500,000,000 in revenues over five years. In 1990, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act extended the program's authorization through 1994 for $5,100,000,000 with taxing authority through calendar year 1995.

The Superfund program is operated by EPA subject to annual appropriations from a dedicated trust fund and from general revenues. Enforcement activities are used to identify and induce parties responsible for hazardous waste problems to undertake cleanup actions and pay for EPA oversight of those actions. In addition, responsible parties have been required to cover the cost of fund-financed removal and remedial actions undertaken at spills and waste sites by Federal and State agencies. Funds are paid from this account to the Office of Inspector General and Science and Technology accounts for Superfund related activities.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$1,280,908,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,236,231,000
Recommended, 2012	1,224,295,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−56,613,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−11,936,000

The Committee recommends $1,224,295,000 for the Hazardous Substance Superfund, $56,613,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $11,936,000 below the budget request. The changes to the request, as recommended by the Committee, appear in the table at the end of this report. The Committee provides the following additional detail by program area.

Audits, evaluations, and investigations.—The Committee recommends $9,955,000, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $54,000 below the budget request.

Enforcement.—The Committee has provided $181,615,000, which is $10,006,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $10,000,000 below the budget request. Of the funds provided, $159,844,000 shall be for Superfund: Enforcement. The EPA has proposed its largest enforcement budget ever, and the Committee's recommendation brings Superfund enforcement in line with 2006 levels.

Indoor air and radiation.—The Committee recommends $2,454,000, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $33,000 below the budget request.

Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic Review.—The Committee recommends $1,528,000, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $149,000 below the budget request.

Operations and Administration.—The Committee recommends $136,369,000, which is $279,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,700,000 below the budget request. The Committee is pleased to see that EPA fully offset rent and utility increases with reductions elsewhere in the Central, Budgeting and Planning line item. Funding for acquisition management and human resources has been maintained at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

Superfund Cleanup.—The Committee has provided $810,757,000 as requested, $41,497,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. Within this amount the Committee has provided $574,499,000 for the Remedial program and $194,895,000 for Emergency Response and Removal, as requested. The Committee is concerned that as budgets tighten EPA will continue to propose to reduce funding from cleanup accounts. However, only two of every three dollars appropriated from the Superfund Trust Fund are targeted for cleanup functions, with the remaining funds focused on administrative or enforcement costs. The Committee expects that future budget requests will propose a higher percentage of cleanup funding as part of the total request in addition to proposing funding sufficient to meet program goals, such as increasing the number of annual "construction completes" and more importantly "sites made ready for reuse" in this program.

The Committee commends EPA for proactively identifying methods to reduce contract costs and urges EPA to continue to identify contract efficiencies so that more funds can be spent on site remediation and cleanup. However, given the IG findings of criminal activity and kickbacks for contracts at the Federal Creosote site in New Jersey, the Committee is concerned about whether the controls EPA currently has in place for Superfund contracts are sufficient. The IG should report to the Committee within 90 days of enactment concerning EPA's implementation of IG recommendations, including ongoing efforts to tighten contracting controls.

Bill Language.—Bill language is included to pay $23,016,000 from this account to the Science and Technology account, and $9,955,000 to the Office of Inspector General account.

Additional Guidance.—The Committee has included the following additional guidance with respect to funding provided under this account.

Financial Assurance.—The Committee is concerned that the promulgation of new financial responsibility requirements pursuant to section 108(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 42 U.S.C. 9608(b)) will impose a severe economic burden on industries of the United States. Such a result would directly conflict with the President's general principles of regulation as provided in Executive Order No. 13563 of January 18, 2011, which include "promoting economic growth . . . and job creation". The Committee directs the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to complete a thorough analysis of the capacity of the financial and credit markets to provide the necessary instruments (surety bonds, letters of credit, insurance, and trusts) for meeting any new financial responsibility requirements pursuant to section 108(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9608(b)). Until the Administrator demonstrates that such an analysis has been completed, the Committee provides no funds for Environmental Protection Agency to develop, propose, finalize, implement, enforce, or administer any regulation that would establish any such new financial responsibility requirements. The Environmental Protection Agency should not, as a matter of policy and in this strained economy, impose a new regulatory program on industries of the United States if the financial and credit markets cannot serve the demand for additional financial assurance.

Superfund Special Accounts.—The Committee continues to have concerns about the large unobligated balances in the 939 special accounts, which hold site-specific settlement funds from responsible parties. The Committee similarly understands that funds in these accounts may be dedicated to specific sites where remediation strategies may still need to be developed. Nonetheless, the Committee expects EPA will accelerate the obligation of funds within these special accounts in 2012 to address risks posed by contamination at these sites.

Superfund Alternative Sites.—As in prior years, the Committee continues to direct the Agency to report annually, by Region, on the sites using the Superfund Alternative Approach Agreements, including intramural and extramural costs.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND PROGRAM

Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, authorized the establishment of a response program for cleanup of releases from leaking underground storage tanks. Owners and operators of facilities with underground tanks must demonstrate financial responsibility and bear initial responsibility for cleanup. The Federal trust fund is funded through the imposition of a motor fuel tax of one-tenth of a cent per gallon.

In addition to State resources, the Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) Trust Fund provides funding to clean up sites, enforces necessary corrective actions and recovers costs expended from the Fund for cleanup activities. The underground storage tank response program is designed to operate primarily through cooperative agreements with States. Funds are also used for grants to non-State entities, including Indian Tribes, under Section 8001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. The Energy Policy

Act of 2005 expanded the authorized activities of the Fund to include the underground storage tank program. In 2006, Congress amended section 9508 of the Internal Revenue Code to authorize expenditures from the trust fund for prevention and inspection activities.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$112,875,000
Budget estimate, 2012	112,481,000
Recommended, 2012	105,669,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−7,206,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−6,812,000

The Committee recommends $105,669,000 for the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund Program, $7,206,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $6,812,000 below the budget request. This brings funding for the program in line with the fiscal year 2008 enacted levels following increases over the previous few budget cycles.

Bill Language.—The Committee has included the proposed bill language which authorizes, for one year, the Administrator to use the LUST Trust Fund for tribal grants to develop and implement underground storage tank programs.

INLAND OIL SPILL PROGRAM

This appropriation, authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, provides funds to prepare for and prevent releases of oil and other petroleum products in navigable waterways. In addition, EPA is reimbursed for incident specific response costs through the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund managed by the United States Coast Guard.

EPA is responsible for directing all cleanup and removal activities posing a threat to public health and the environment; conducting site inspections; providing a means to achieve cleanup activities by private parties; reviewing containment plans at facilities; reviewing area contingency plans; pursuing cost recovery of fund-financed cleanups; and conducting research of oil cleanup techniques. Funds for this appropriation are provided through the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund which is composed of fees and collections made through provisions of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, the Comprehensive Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act, the Deepwater Port Act of 1974, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. Pursuant to law, the Trust Fund is managed by the United States Coast Guard.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$18,342,000
Budget estimate, 2012	23,662,000
Recommended, 2012	18,274,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−68,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−5,388,000

The Committee recommends $18,274,000 for the Inland Oil Spill program, $68,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $5,388,000 below the budget request. The Committee has not provided an additional $5,100,000 and 16 FTE requested for increased facility inspections under the latest SPCC rule, but recognizes these activities will be a priority within base funds.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

The State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) account provides grant funds for programs operated primarily by State, local, tribal and other governmental partners. The account includes two broad types of funds: (1) Infrastructure Assistance, which is used primarily by local governments for projects supporting environmental protection; and, (2) Categorical Grants, which assist State and tribal governments and other environmental partners with the operation of environmental programs.

In the STAG account, EPA provides funding for infrastructure projects through two State Revolving Funds (Clean Water and Drinking Water), geographic specific projects in Alaskan Native Villages and on the United States-Mexico Border, Brownfield revitalization projects, diesel emission reduction grants and other targeted infrastructure projects.

The State Revolving Funds (SRFs) provide Federal financial assistance to protect the Nation's water resources. The Clean Water SRF helps eliminate municipal discharge of untreated or inadequately treated pollutants and thereby helps maintain or restore the country's water to a swimmable and/or fishable quality. The Clean Water SRF provides resources for municipal, inter-municipal, State, and interstate agencies and tribal governments to plan, design, and construct wastewater facilities and other projects, including non-point source, estuary, stormwater, and sewer overflow projects. The Safe Drinking Water SRF finances improvements to community water systems so that they can achieve compliance with the mandates of the Safe Drinking Water Act and continue to protect public health.

The major Federal environmental statutes include provisions that allow the Federal government, through EPA, to delegate to the States and Tribes the day-to-day management of environmental programs. The Federal statutes were designed to recognize the States as partners and co-regulators, allowing the States to issue and enforce permits, carry out inspections and monitoring, and collect data. To assist the States in this task, the statutes also authorized EPA to provide grants to the States and Tribes. These grants, which cover every major aspect of environmental protection, include those programs authorized by sections 319 and 106 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (for non-point source pollution and the water quality permits programs), sections 105 and 103 of the Clean Air Act (for State and Local air quality management programs), section 128 of CERCLA (for the brownfields program management), section 1443(a) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (for public water system supervision), and section 3011 of RCRA (for hazardous waste financial assistance).

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$3,758,913,000
Budget estimate, 2012	3,860,430,000
Recommended, 2012	2,610,393,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−1,148,520,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−1,250,037,000

The Committee recommends $2,610,393,000 for the State and Tribal Assistance Grants account, $1,148,520,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,250,037,000 below the budget request. The changes to the request, as recommended by the Com-

mittee, appear in the table at the end of this report. The Committee provides the following additional detail by program area:

Infrastructure Assistance.—For infrastructure assistance, the Committee recommends $1,608,000,000, which is $1,046,680,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,051,041,000 below the budget request.

During calendar year 2009, the Committee provided over $11 billion for water and wastewater infrastructure assistance. In April 2011, the Committee provided an additional $2.49 billion for fiscal year 2011. As a result, EPA has $2.8 billion in unobligated SRF balances yet to be transferred to States. In addition, the States have yet to spend $3.57 billion that the Federal government has allocated for drinking water and wastewater projects. The Committee believes that EPA and the States must continue to push this $6.4 billion through the queue in order to address the pressing infrastructure needs facing the nation. As a result, and in light of mounting budget pressures the bill provides funding at the fiscal year 2008 enacted levels for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds: $689,000,000 and $829,000,000 respectively. While the Committee recognizes the importance of infrastructure investment, in times of limited funding it is imperative that the Committee have accurate information regarding the role of Federal funding in addressing the infrastructure needs of communities. Within one year of enactment of the bill, EPA should submit to the Committees on Appropriations a report that specifies the community names, locations, the prevailing water and wastewater rates, and rates as a percentage of total annual infrastructure costs for each community on each State's intended use plan for 2012.

The Committee continues to include bill language to allow EPA and the States to provide additional forms of subsidy to those communities which cannot afford the below market rates provided by an SRF loan. These subsidies, which can be in the form of negative interest loans, principle forgiveness or grants, will apply to 30 percent of the funds appropriated for the Drinking Water SRF and to 30 percent of the Clean Water SRF. The Committee has carried forward this authority recognizing that many small, rural and/or disadvantaged communities do not have the resources to borrow from the SRFs with the responsibility to pay back the loan, even with the lower interest rate offered by the SRFs. The Committee directs the Agency to report on how EPA and the States have used this authority including information on the number and amounts of loans awarded with additional subsidization, recipient communities, and descriptions of projects funded.

The Committee has not included bill language mandating that States must use 20 percent of their SRF grants for projects that are considered green infrastructure. While the Committee believes that decentralized, alternative infrastructure projects may prove to be an important component in the efforts to improve and restore our waters, the Committee also does not believe that this should be a mandatory function of the State Revolving Funds.

Alaska Native Villages.—Since 1995 the Committee has provided over $450,000,000 to address the lack of basic drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs in rural and Native communities. The Committee has continued to authorize the program since its

expiration in 2000 in order to continue to address the significant challenges in these rural communities despite the duplication of available funding relative to the State Revolving Funds. The Committee has not included funding for this unauthorized grant program in 2012 recognizing that low income and disadvantage communities may apply for water and wastewater infrastructure funding through the State Revolving Funds. Additional subsidies are available for those communities that may not be able to afford the traditional low-interest SRF loans.

Brownfields Infrastructure Projects.—The Committee has provided $60,000,000 for Brownfields infrastructure projects, $39,800,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $39,041,000 below the budget request. The Committee supports the cleanup work and the ability of this Federal program to leverage private investment and spur redevelopment. The Committee is concerned that, given the downturn in the redevelopment and real estate markets, these sites are not being made ready for reuse as evident by the lower outlay rates for the Recovery Act funding. Therefore, the Committee supports the continued work of the program, but at a reduced rate for 2012.

Diesel Emissions Reductions Grants (DERA).—The Committee does not agree with the President's proposal to terminate the DERA grants. The DERA grant program has clear, proven, quantifiable benefits and the Committee finds fault in eliminating this program in favor of the new programs throughout the President's proposal that lack a clear implementation plan and have no demonstrated benefits. The Committee has not provided funding for these programs elsewhere in the bill in order to partially restore the funding for DERA grants at $30,000,000, which is $19,900,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

U.S.-Mexico Border.—The Committee appreciates the Agency's increased commitment to ensure funds are liquidated quickly in the U.S.-Mexico border program. The Committee understands the changes the Agency has implemented clearly have had an impact at reducing unliquidated balances from over $300,000,000 in 2007 to $125,000,000 as of January 2010. While this demonstrates progress, the Committee is concerned that unliquidated obligations have increased in the past year to $136,000,000. In addition the program is carrying $15,700,000 in unobligated funds as of June 2011. As such the Committee has not provided funds for this program in 2012 and directs the agency to expeditiously obligate and spend previously appropriated funds.

Categorical Grants.—For categorical grants to States and other environmental partners for the implementation of delegated programs, the Committee recommends $1,002,393,000, which is $101,840,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $198,996,000 below the budget request. From within the amount provided, the Committee directs the following changes to the request:

1. $150,505,000 for non-point source grants (Sec. 319). The 2012 President's Budget proposed to reduce funding for these grants by $36,200,000 from the annualized 2010/2011 CR level as these grants lack a targeted strategy, have innate difficulties in measuring performance, and are partially duplicative of other agriculture grants. Under the final CR, the Administration reduced

funding for non-point source grants by $25,000,000 in order to redirect funds to other air and water grants. The Committee recommends $150,505,000 to reduce funding by $25,000,000 from the final 2011 enacted level, and $14,252,000 below the request.

2. $204,264,000 for pollution control grants (Sec. 106), $34,522,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted and $46,000,000 below the budget request. The fiscal year 2012 funding level represents a $25,000,000 reduction from the 2010 enacted level.

3. $201,580,000 for State and Local Air Quality grants, which is $34,527,000 below the 2011 enacted level and $103,920,000 below the budget request. The fiscal year 2012 funding level represents a $25,000,000 reduction from the 2010 enacted level.

4. $62,875,000 for tribal general assistance program grants, $4,864,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $8,500,000 below the budget request. The fiscal year 2012 funding level is maintained at the 2010 enacted level.

5. All other adjustments to the requested levels for Categorical grants withhold proposed increases in order to maintain level funding at the 2011 enacted levels. This includes no new funding for the multimedia tribal grants given the Committee's continued concerns about implementation.

Bill Language.—The Committee recommends the following new proposals to the STAG bill language:

(1) a provision that directs a subset of funds provided for water quality monitoring for State participation in national statistical surveys;

(2) language allocating 1.5 percent of the amounts appropriated for the State Revolving Funds to territories;

(3) a limitation on the use of funds available for additional subsidization for use toward new construction projects;

(4) authority for Tribes to transfer funds between the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds.

The Committee has incorporated the following changes to the proposed STAG bill language:

(1) deletes the green infrastructure requirement for the State Revolving Funds;

(2) deletes the authorization for the United States-Mexico Border infrastructure grants;

(3) deletes the authorization for the Alaska Native Villages infrastructure grants; and

(4) deletes the authority for EPA to issue new grants to Tribes for implementation of environmental programs;

(5) sets the additional subsidization requirement for the State Revolving Funds to no less than 30 percent; and

(6) removes a limitation on the amount of Clean Water State Revolving Funds that may be available for additional subsidization.

Additional Guidance.—The Committee has included the following additional guidance with respect to funding provided under this account:

Brownfields Technical Assistance Centers.—Within the funds provided for State and Tribal Assistance Grants, $2,000,000 is included for the EPA's Technical Assistance to Brownfield Communities program, equal to the 2011 enacted level and the budget request.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

The Committee recommendation continues the language, carried in prior years, concerning Tribal Cooperative Authority, the collection and obligation of pesticides fees, and additional transfer authorities for the purposes of implementing the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

The Committee has expanded upon the President's proposal to rescind prior year funds. Bill language has been included to rescind $140,000,000 from the STAG and Superfund accounts, and prohibits the Agency from taking the rescission against amounts designated by Congress as emergency funding.

The Committee has not included bill language to allow EPA to use funds to implement the Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE) projects as funding has not been provided for the CARE program in fiscal year 2012.

Bill language to provide additional oil spill transfer authority has not been included as the Administration has not demonstrated why delays in reimbursement from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund cannot be addressed administratively. As the Agency responsible for inland oil spills, EPA has a more compelling case to request authority to withdraw directly from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. Therefore, if this issue requires a legislative fix, the Committee questions why the Administration has not proposed to pursue such authority from the appropriate Committees of jurisdiction.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

The U.S. Forest Service manages 193 million acres of National Forests, Grasslands, and a Tallgrass Prairie, including lands in 44 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and cooperates with States, other Federal agencies, Tribes and private landowners to sustain the Nation's forests and grasslands. The Forest Service administers a wide variety of programs, including forest and rangeland research, State and private forestry assistance, cooperative forest health programs, an International program, National Forest System, and wildland fire management. The National Forest System (NFS) includes 155 National forests, 20 National grasslands, 20 National recreation areas, a National Tallgrass prairie, 6 National monuments, and 6 land utilization projects. The NFS is managed for multiple uses, beginning with wood, water and forage, and expanded under the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act to include recreation, grazing, fish and wildlife habitat management. More recently programs were developed to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Wilderness Act, and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The Forest Service celebrated its centennial in 2005.

Health and vitality of national forests.—The Committee is deeply concerned about the declining health of our national forests and mortality due to insects, disease and catastrophic wildfire. Across the country, our national forests face numerous challenges. In the

western United States alone, the Forest Service estimates at least 20 million acres of dead and dying forests due to bark beetles. As a result, the Committee has made active forest management the priority in its recommendations. Numerous scientific studies have shown that proactive management results in more resilient forested landscapes that are less susceptible to insects, disease and other threats. The Committee believes an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure—a concept that is certainly true for the prevention of catastrophic wildfires. The Committee strongly urges the Forest Service to increase and expand projects to improve the health and vitality of national forests. While protecting communities and vital infrastructure should be the priority, the Committee believes strategically treating landscapes is also vital to protecting wildlife, watersheds and other important values.

The Committee has included language in the Title IV General Provisions allowing the Forest Service to use a pre-decisional objection process in place of the current appeals process. The Committee notes that the current use of the pre-decisional objection process has improved Forest Service projects and public input and support of projects. The authority also saves the Service time and resources. The Committee believes this authority will help the Forest Service accomplish more work on the ground while maximizing appropriated dollars.

The Committee has taken a new approach in this bill by funding the Integrated Resource Restoration (IRR) initiative on a proof of concept pilot basis for the time being. In line with this endeavor, the Committee applauds the underlying effort by the Forest Service to focus the budgeting process on achieving overall goals in its multiple-use mandate. The Committee shares the Service's belief that a stove-piped budget can distract both Congress and Federal agencies from setting and accomplishing measurable, big-picture goals and recognizes that the Service should have the flexibility to set and meet goals to carry out its overall mission and should then be held accountable to Congress and the taxpayer. To this end, the Committee will be carefully evaluating whether the IRR pilot program helps the Service to better set, accomplish, and report management goals and enhance transparency and accountability.

The Committee recognizes the critical importance of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, which plays an enormous role in enabling rural communities that have lost their main source of revenue as Federal forest policies have shifted to continue funding critical education and infrastructure programs. Many rural counties, primarily those in the West, would be unable to provide their children with an adequate education without compensation for the loss of tax-base due to Federal presence. While the Committee is pleased to see that reauthorization of this program, which expires at the end of the fiscal year, was included in the request, the Committee is concerned that the request proposes moving this program from mandatory to discretionary spending. Doing so jeopardizes the long-term viability of the program, especially in difficult budget environments and particularly as this program has not been reauthorized beyond fiscal year 2011. The Committee strongly encourages the appropriate authorizing committees to take action on this issue to ensure that counties that benefit from this program do not see a lapse in needed benefits.

Forest Service Washington and regional offices.—The Committee is concerned about the amount of resources devoted to the Forest Service's Washington Office and nine regional offices. While the Committee supports the structure of the Forest Service and understands the need for these offices, they consume a great deal of the Forest Service's budget. The Committee believes that regional offices should carry out the goals of the Forest Service Chief, instead of creating new initiatives or policies, and more resources need to be devoted to much-needed projects and on-the-ground management of national forests. In light of limited funding, the Committee directs the Forest Service to examine the amount of personnel and resources in these offices in search of efficiencies and elimination of duplicative functions. The Forest Service should include these findings and recommendations in its fiscal year 2013 budget request.

Forest Service performance accountability.—The Committee is concerned that the Forest Service has had, and continues to have, performance and budgetary accountability problems. Numerous GAO and IG reports continue the theme, as discussed in the Committee's 2011 oversight hearing, that the Service lacks strategies and guidance for major programs and the Service lacks data on activities and costs so it cannot judge performance accountability. The Committee will continue to require greater accountability and transparency of Forest Service management and will not simplify or reduce performance measures until the Service more clearly demonstrates, in advance, how it plans to use its funds to improve the condition of public lands.

The amounts recommended by the Committee for each Forest Service appropriation account, compared with the budget estimates by activity, are shown in the table at the end of this report.

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

Forest and rangeland research and development conducts basic and applied scientific research. This research provides both credible and relevant knowledge about forests and rangelands and new technologies that can be used to sustain the health, productivity, and diversity of private and public lands to meet the needs of present and future generations. Research is conducted across the U.S. through five research stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, two Technology and Development Centers, and the International Institute of Tropical Forestry in Puerto Rico, as well as cooperative research efforts with many of the Nation's universities. The R&D Branch also manages the system of 80 Experimental forests, watersheds, rangelands, and Research Natural Areas.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$306,637,000
Budget estimate, 2012	295,773,000
Recommended, 2012	277,282,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−29,355,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−18,491,000

The Committee recommends $277,282,000 for forest and rangeland research, $29,355,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $18,491,000 below the budget request.

Funding for FIA under this heading is $66,805,000, which is $4,866,000 above the budget request. The Committee notes that an

additional $4,925,000 for the FIA program is provided within the state and private forestry appropriation under the forest resource information and analysis budget line item. This level fully funds the FIA program and should include the newly added states of Wyoming and Nevada as part of FIA data. The Committee also recommends no less than $29,161,000 for the forest products laboratory.

The Committee strongly supports the Forest Service research program and its products. Unfortunately declining budget allocations have forced the Committee to make difficult choices and instead focus limited funds on the on-the-ground management of national forests for future generations.

The Committee commends the Forest Service for its localized needs research in support of projects on national forests and encourages this to continue. Specifically, the Committee encourages the Forest Service to continue and complete research on the effectiveness of Multiple Indicator Monitoring for measuring bank alteration. The Committee also encourages additional research on whether Multiple Indicator Monitoring and other bank stability measures are effective in predicting actual harm to fish.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

Through cooperative programs with State and local governments, non-industrial private forest landowners, forest industry and conservation organizations, the Forest Service supports the protection and management of the nearly 500 million acres of non-Federal forested lands in the country. Technical and financial assistance is offered to improve management of private forests; conserve environmentally important forests; control insects and disease; enhance stewardship of urban and rural forests; and improve wildland fire management and protect communities from wildfire. The Forest Service provides special expertise and disease suppression for all Federal and tribal lands, as well as cooperative assistance with the States for State and private lands.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$277,596,000
Budget estimate, 2012	341,582,000
Recommended, 2012	208,608,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−68,988,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−132,974,000

The Committee recommends $208,608,000 for state and private forestry, $68,988,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $132,974,000 below the budget request. The reduction compared to the request is mostly due to the recommended cut of $132,000,000 in the forest legacy program.

The Committee strongly endorses the concept of incorporating State Forestry Assessments and Strategies into budget formulation and funding allocation processes for Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act programs. Consistent with the 2008 Farm Bill, the Committee recognizes the value of competitive grant procedures to address national and regional priorities. Moreover, the Committee also recognizes that providing flexibility to combine a percentage of the appropriations among programs authorized in the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act is likewise important to address state-spe-

cific priorities and needs consistent with the State Assessments and Strategies.

Accordingly, the Committee directs the Forest Service to develop a process in consultation with State Foresters that provides for the consideration and incorporation of appropriate findings and recommendations in State Assessments and Strategies into the annual budget preparation process for Cooperative Forestry Assistance programs. Further, the Committee directs the Forest Service to develop a process in coordination with State Foresters to respond to state-specific priorities identified in the State Assessments and Strategies by allowing state foresters flexibility, with appropriate accountability, to combine a percentage of the appropriations among programs authorized in the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act. Further, the Committee directs the Forest Service, in coordination with state foresters, to develop a process that supports an effective competitive grant procedure to address national and regional priorities. The Committee expects the Forest Service to report on the respective processes and recommendations within six months of enactment of this Act. The Committee notes that the Forest Service must still comply with the reprogramming requirements in this report.

Forest Health Management.—The Committee recommends $97,564,000 for forest health management, $7,994,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,991,000 below the budget request. The forest health program should continue to stress strategic funding allocations, and should continue the slow-the-spread, suppression and eradication efforts for gypsy moth and bark beetle work in the West.

Urban and Community Forestry.—The Committee recommends $29,042,000 for urban and community forestry, $2,998,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $3,335,000 below the budget request. The Committee notes the importance of this program to numerous urban areas and lauds the goal of increasing urban tree canopies which ultimately reduces energy costs and improves water quality.

International Forestry.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for International Forestry, $4,492,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $5,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee is supportive of International Forestry and does not support the budget request proposal to terminate this program. The budget request states that funding for this program would continue and be pulled from other line items, such as line items under the National Forest System. The Committee strongly disagrees with this and directs the Forest Service to use line items for their intended purpose.

International Forestry enables forestry experts for the Federal government to participate in negotiations for trade agreements and assist with forestry work abroad. This program plays a large role in protecting the U.S. forest products industry by improving the sustainability and legality of timber management overseas thereby reducing the amount of underpriced timber on the world market. Much of the funding for these activities is provided by other departments or agencies, including the Department of State, the United States Trade Representative and the U.S. Agency for International Development. The Forest Service has the responsibility of

housing this program so they may easily draw upon the expertise of the entire Forest Service. Though the program is funded at a low level, it leverages roughly three dollars for every dollar it receives from other funding sources. The Committee recognizes the Forest Service International Programs for its successful projects in the areas of invasive species control, illegal logging interventions and international negotiations, all of which directly benefit the United States.

Administrative Provisions.—The Committee retains bill language clarifying that the Service may sign direct funding agreements with foreign governments and institutions as well as other domestic agencies (including the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Department of State, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation), institutions and organizations to provide technical assistance and training programs overseas on forestry and rangeland management.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Within the National Forest System (NFS), which covers almost 193 million acres, there are nearly 600 congressionally designated areas, including 21 national recreation areas, 439 wilderness areas, 122 wild and scenic rivers, 6 national monuments, one national preserve and 11 national scenic areas. The NFS hosted over 174 million visits in 2009. The NFS includes over 152,000 miles of trails and roughly 17,900 recreation sites, including approximately 5,100 campgrounds and 38 major visitor centers. Wilderness areas cover 36 million acres, which account for approximately 60 percent of the wilderness in the contiguous 48 States. The NFS includes a substantial amount of the Nation's timber inventory. In fiscal year 2010 the Forest Service sold 2.6 billion board feet of timber from management of national forests. The Forest Service also has major habitat management responsibilities for more than 3,000 species of wildlife and fish, and 10,000 plant species and provides important habitat and open space for over 423 threatened or endangered species. NFS lands and waters provide 80 percent of the elk, mountain goat, and bighorn sheep habitat in the lower 48 States and extensive coldwater fish habitat, including salmon and steelhead. In addition, approximately 66 million Americans rely on drinking water that originates from NFS lands.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$1,542,248,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,704,526,000
Recommended, 2012	1,546,463,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+4,215,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−158,063,000

The Committee recommends $1,546,463,000 for the national forest system, $4,215,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $158,063,000 below the budget request.

The Committee is deeply concerned about the aftermath of wildfires in the Southwest. The Committee notes that the Wallow Fire has burned well over 500,000 acres, much of which was at high severity potentially prohibiting natural regeneration of the forest. The Committee believes the Wallow Fire warrants expedited actions for emergency rehabilitation far beyond the mechanisms

commonly used and encourages the Forest Service to apply for Alternative Arrangements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Committee strongly believes Alternative Arrangements will be necessary to protect human health and safety as well as the environment in the wake of the Wallow Fire. Without prompt action, there will likely be significant environmental impacts including conditions conductive to flooding, mudslides, and debris flows that threaten human life and property, water quality and soil productivity.

The Committee notes that similar to fiscal year 2011, the budget request included a major restructuring in which several major programs were combined into a new entity, Integrated Resource Restoration (IRR). The Committee has not approved this request but will allow a proof of concept pilot in three regions of the Forest Service as described below.

The Committee agrees with the goals for the new integrated effort, but is concerned that the dramatic shift in programs may not be practical for the entire national forest system. Instead the Committee directs the Forest Service to begin a proof of concept pilot program for regions one, three and four. This would include national forests and grasslands primarily in the states of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico and one forest in Wyoming. The Committee believes it's necessary to allow the use of the IRR concept in three regions for at least three years to realistically understand if the concept works. Until that time, the Forest Service is directed to initiate the pilot only in these three regions. The Committee has included bill language under the headings specified to facilitate the IRR in three places: National Forest System, of which $122,600,000 may be used for IRR; Capital Improvements and Maintenance of which $9,000,000 of the Legacy Roads & Trails program may be transferred to the National Forest System for the IRR pilot; and, Wildland Fire Management of which $27,100,000 from the hazardous fuels program may be transferred to the National Forest System for the IRR pilot.

The Committee is encouraged by the watershed condition framework and prioritization, and recommends the Service continue this important work. The Committee does not, however, support a competitive process for funding priority watershed stabilization projects. The Forest Service should instead focus its efforts on effective implementation of the overall IRR pilot and keep the competitive process to the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program (CFLR).

The Committee expects the IRR to achieve a combination of the following: retain and/or create local forest products jobs and businesses in rural communities, maintain and enhance watershed condition and function, integrate timber sales and stewardship contracting into restoration planning, improve fish and wildlife habitat, reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire, improve forest health and resiliency and relocate or remove unnecessary erosion-prone roads. The Committee understands that not all of these objectives can be met in each project and that management goals should be based on site specific conditions.

If the Forest Service can demonstrate more work accomplished with less funding and prove management efficiencies, the Committee will consider expanding the authority or maintaining the

authority for specific regions. The Committee strongly urges the Forest Service to use the IRR as an opportunity to dramatically increase active management of national forests to improve forest health and resilience for future generations. This can only be done with measurable performance goals and accountability.

Within 60 days of enactment, the Committee directs the Forest Service to present a plan for measuring performance and accountability with the Integrated Restoration Resource pilot. The plan should include traditional measures, such as timber targets and acres treated, while also including new measures such as watershed condition improvement. The Committee understands that it may take additional time to develop measures for watersheds. The Committee encourages the Forest Service to focus on broad goals.

Planning.—The Committee recommends $30,033,000 for planning, $15,000,000 below fiscal year 2011 levels. As mentioned above, the Committee does not accept the proposed merging of the planning and inventory & monitoring line items.

The Committee recognizes the Forest Service is in the process of reviewing comments and revising the draft planning rule. Nonetheless, the Committee has significant concerns about the implementation and cost of the planning rule as currently drafted. The draft rule places too many conflicting requirements on forest plans and will likely lead to increased litigation. The new inventory requirements for invertebrates will very likely cost millions upon millions of dollars and are virtually impossible to complete. The Committee believes the Forest Service must simplify the rule, ensure it is implementable, understandable to the public, and cost effective. The Committee retains language in Title IV General Provisions allowing forest management plans to expire if the Service has made a good faith effort to update plans commensurate with appropriated funds. The Committee modifies this language by allowing forest plans to be completed under the 1982 and 2000 planning rules and allows these plans to be used in place of revised plans that would be completed under the new planning rule (expected to be released in December of 2011).

Inventory and Monitoring.—The Committee recommends $165,219,000 for inventory and monitoring, $2,000,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. The Committee does not accept the proposed merging of this line item with the planning line item. The next budget justification should clearly indicate how these funds are allocated, what is accomplished, and how this relates to the pursuit of integrated forestry, habitat and watershed improving activities.

The Committee is concerned about the lack of monitoring related to livestock grazing allotments and strongly encourages the Forest Service to increase both annual and trend monitoring on allotments. The Committee directs the Forest Service to allocate a greater portion of monitoring funds for these efforts. The Committee also encourages the Forest Service to work with state agencies, universities, professional societies and other USDA agencies, such as the Natural Resource Conservation Service, to efficiently increase allotment monitoring.

Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness.—The Committee recommends $281,627,000 for recreation, heritage and wilderness,

equal to fiscal year 2011 enacted funding and $8,871,000 below the budget request.

Travel Management Rule.—The Committee is concerned about travel management plans on some national forests, though it notes that many national forests have completed plans with few problems. The Committee has been informed by several communities that travel management plans did not properly include public and community input and needs. Where communities are dissatisfied with travel management plans, the Committee directs the Forest Service to revise these plans. The Committee notes that travel management plans were defunded in House consideration of H.R. 1, the Full Year Continuing Appropriation Act, though they were not defunded in the final fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution. To avoid future defunding, the Forest Service needs to address plans that don't adequately meet community needs. Due to specific concerns related to all travel management plans in the State of California, the Committee includes language in Title IV General Provisions prohibiting the implementation of travel management plans in California until the agency completes additional analysis to include more routes. The language also prevents the agency from designating maintenance level 3 (ML–3) roads as highways. The Committee notes that the California State Patrol has confirmed numerous times that it does not consider ML–3 roads as highways.

The Committee notes that the implementation of the Travel Management Rule has resulted in a significant reduction in non-street legal off-highway vehicle access that continues to impact recreation and multiple-use on National Forest lands. In particular, some Regions and other administrative units of the National Forest System have proposed to restrict non-street legal off-highway vehicle use on unpaved maintenance-level 3 roads despite previously allowing for such, and in contradiction to state and local regulations that allow mixed-use on similarly surfaced roads outside a National Forest boundary. Therefore, the Committee directs the agency to allow for mixed-use of off-highway vehicles on maintenance-level 3 roads consistent with state and local policy, except where there exists a documented and substantive traffic safety issue.

Wyoming Wilderness Act.—The Committee directs the Forest Service to recognize that Congress intended to ensure that existing and historic motorized recreational uses were to continue in wilderness study areas designated in the 1984 Wyoming Wilderness Act. The Committee further directs the Forest Service to recognize that winter motorized uses including snowmobiles and commercial heliskiing have short term ephemeral effects that do not adversely impact the maintenance of wilderness character and do not preclude Congress from designating these areas as Wilderness. Recent decisions have misconstrued this intent, and the policy regarding ephemeral effects, and severely limited previously established winter motorized uses. This Committee directs the Forest Service to ensure that important historic and existing uses be allowed to continue on Wilderness Study Areas at commercially sustainable levels of use.

Grazing Management.—The Committee recommends $55,445,000 for grazing management, $5,707,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $10,000,000 above the budget request.

As mentioned above under monitoring and inventory, the Committee is concerned about the lack of both annual and trend monitoring for allotments. The Committee believes this data is necessary to inform future decisions and help defend Forest Service grazing actions in court. The Committee also encourages the Forest Service to coordinate monitoring with state agencies, universities, professional societies, permittees, and other USDA agencies, such as the Natural Resource Conservation Service, to efficiently increase allotment monitoring and gather high-quality data.

Forest Products.—The Committee recommends $336,722,000 for forest products, which is $673,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. The Committee expects the agency to increase its vegetation and timber management activities to sell not less than 3.0 billion board feet of forest products in fiscal year 2012. The Committee further expects the agency to prioritize the use of hazardous fuels reduction funding to projects that treat and reduce Fire Regime Condition Class II and III forests predominantly through mechanical treatments.

The Committee is concerned that recent mill closures in forested rural areas have diminished the Service's ability to actively manage national forests to prevent catastrophic wildfires, and large-scale insect and disease infestation. Forest products infrastructure is essential to improving the health and resilience of national forests while also contributing to the health of rural communities. The Committee directs the Forest Service to consider local infrastructure needs and capacity while planning forest management projects.

The Committee notes that over the last ten years the timber supply in Region 10 has been constrained to less than 10 percent of the allowable sale quantity in the current land management plan. As a result, all of the large mills and all but one mid-sized mill have closed. In an effort to restore confidence in the timber supply and to foster and allow investment in new facilities, the Forest Service pledged to prepare and offer four 10-year timber sales each with a volume of 150–200 million board feet. The agency recently converted the first two 10-year timber sales to smaller, stewardship projects. These projects will not accomplish the original objectives of restoring confidence and allowing investments in new facilities. The Committee directs the Forest Service to prepare and offer within three years, the four 10-year timber sales as promised.

Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management.—The Committee recommends $140,260,000 for wildlife and fish habitat management, which is equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. As mentioned under inventory & monitoring and grazing management, the Committee directs the Service to increase monitoring of threatened and endangered fish and their habitat, especially in grazing allotments. The Committee expects a portion of funding from this program to be allocated for this purpose.

Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund.—The Committee recommends $30,000,000 for the collaborative forest landscape restoration fund, $15,030,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $10,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee transferred $15,000,000 from wildland fire management, specifically hazardous fuels, to the national forest system to fund CFLR under one activity.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$459,644,000
Budget estimate, 2012	337,927,000
Recommended, 2012	366,088,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−93,556,000
Budget estimate, 2012	+28,161,000

The Committee recommends $366,088,000 for capital improvement and maintenance, $93,556,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $28,161,000 above the budget request.

Facilities Maintenance and Capital Improvement.—The Committee recommends $49,661,000 for facilities, $85,339,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $51,124,000 below the budget request.

Road Maintenance & Construction.—The Committee recommends $201,885,000 for road maintenance and construction, $6,690,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $44,067,000 above the budget request. The Committee notes that this level of funding is $26,000,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. Specifically, the Committee recommends $166,885,000 for road maintenance, $35,000,000 for the legacy roads program and $35,000,000 for road construction. The Committee is supportive of the proposal to build additional roads in the Tongass National Forest.

While the Forest Service is rightly focused on the removal of erosion-prone roads, the Committee believes it must also focus on road maintenance and construction. As the Forest Service states in its budget justification, "Virtually all activities on [Forest Service] lands require travel over the [national forest road] system . . ." These important activities include firefighting; forest management to improve habitat, watersheds and reduce fire risk; search and rescue; illegal drug interdiction; and, access to hunting, fishing, camping and other recreation. The Committee believes current road construction techniques can help to reduce erosion and prevent mass soil failures while also providing safe fish passage and proper storm water drainage. The Committee realizes the Forest Service has limited funds compared to road infrastructure needs and encourages the use of stewardship contracts and other combined projects (for example improving forest health and maintaining or reconstructing roads) to accomplish more work with less funding.

Legacy Road and Trail Remediation.—The Committee recommends $35,000,000 for the legacy road and trail remediation program, $9,910,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $40,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee has retained bill language governing this program and clarifying its purpose so the language does not need to be repeated yearly.

Back-country airstrips.—The Committee notes that backcountry airstrips are an appropriate use of certain National Forest System (NFS) lands that can provide enhanced access for a variety of legitimate activities. The Committee encourages the Forest Service to support, through cooperative relationships with pilots and other interested user groups, the operation and maintenance of appropriate, existing backcountry airstrips as part of a balanced, safe, and efficient forest transportation system. The Committee urges

the Forest Service to evaluate whether it is appropriate to establish additional backcountry airstrips on NFS lands as part of the land management planning process and consistent with applicable Federal Aviation Administration regulations (49 U.S.C. 1349). Further, the Committee directs the Forest Service to provide within 90 days upon enactment of this Act, an inventory of backcountry airstrips presently under Forest Service jurisdiction; a detailed description, including examples of the management, conservation, recreational, and public safety and security benefits and uses of existing airstrips; a description of any existing conflicts that presently hinder or may hinder operational use of any such airstrips in the future; a description of the primitive or wilderness values of the area in the vicinity of the airstrips, including environmental and habitat values that may be affected by the airstrip and its use; and an accounting of operation and maintenance costs incurred by the Forest Service in fiscal years 2010 and 2011 related to the present inventory of backcountry airstrips.

The Committee includes language in the Title IV General Provisions clarifying the role of forest roads in silvicultural operations as it relates to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

LAND ACQUISITION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$32,934,000
Budget estimate, 2012	90,000,000
Recommended, 2012	12,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−20,434,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−77,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $12,500,000 for land acquisition, $20,434,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $77,500,000 below the budget request. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

The Committee has included language in the front of the report regarding Land and Water Conservation Fund programs.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$1,048,000
Budget estimate, 2012	955,000
Recommended, 2012	955,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−93,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $955,000 for acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts, as requested.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$250,000
Budget estimate, 2012	227,000
Recommended, 2012	227,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−23,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $227,000 as requested for acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges under the Act of December 4, 1967 (16 U.S.C. 484a). Under the Act, deposits made by pub-

lic school districts or public school authorities to provide for cash equalization of certain land exchanges can be appropriated to acquire similar lands suitable for national forest system purposes in the same State as the national forest lands conveyed in the exchanges.

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$3,600,000
Budget estimate, 2012	3,262,000
Recommended, 2012	3,262,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−338,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $3,262,000 as requested, for the range betterment fund, to be derived from grazing receipts from the National Forests (Public Law 94–579, as amended) and to be used for range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements including seeding, reseeding, fence construction, weed control, water development, and fish and wildlife habitat enhancement in 16 western States.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$50,000
Budget estimate, 2012	45,000
Recommended, 2012	45,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−5,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $45,000, as requested, for gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research. Authority for the program is contained in Section 4(b) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1643(b); Public Law 95–307). Amounts appropriated and not needed for current operations may be invested in public debt securities. Both the principal and earnings from the receipts are available to the Forest Service.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS FOR SUBSISTENCE USES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$2,577,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0
Recommended, 2012	2,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−577,000
Budget estimate, 2012	+2,000,000

The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the management of national forest lands for subsistence uses in Alaska and does not support the budget request's termination of this program.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$1,968,042,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,515,062,000
Recommended, 2012	1,805,099,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−162,943,000
Budget estimate, 2012	+290,037,000

The Committee recommends $1,805,099,000 for wildland fire management, $162,943,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $290,037,000 above the request. The Committee recommends $1,006,052,000 for preparedness as requested; $538,720,000 for suppression as requested; $460,327,000 for other operations; and directs the Forest Service to utilize $200,000,000 in carryover emergency fire suppression funds. In addition, the Committee recommends $290,418,000 for the FLAME wildfire suppression reserve account which is equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. The Committee's recommendation exceeds levels necessary to fully fund the 10-year fire suppression average of $1,707,062,000. However, due to internal transfers, baseline funding for suppression and preparedness differ substantially from the fiscal year 2011 enacted levels. In response to Congressional direction, the budget request transferred $355,000,000 from the suppression activity into the preparedness activity. This transfer now allows the preparedness activity funding level to fully represent the cost of staffing the wildland fire management program. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

Wildfire Preparedness.—The Committee recommends $1,006,052,000 for wildfire preparedness as requested.

Wildfire Suppression Operations.—The Committee recommends $538,720,000 for fire suppression operations as requested. The Committee recommendation, combined with preparedness, fully meets the inflation adjusted, 10-year average actual expenditure on all emergency and discretionary funded suppression actions.

Hazardous Fuels.—The Committee recommends $334,584,000 for the hazardous fuels reduction activity, $15,000,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $80,569,000 above the budget request. The $15,000,000 reduction is due to the transfer of Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Act funding to the National Forest System. The recommendation also includes $5,000,000 for biomass utilization grants as requested.

The Committee is deeply concerned about the Forest Service's requirement that 75 percent of hazardous fuels funding be spent in the wildland urban interface. While the Committee agrees that protecting communities should be the top priority, many times protecting communities requires hazardous fuels work be done outside the wildland urban interface. The Committee also notes that the definition of wildland urban interface varies greatly across the country. The Committee directs the Forest Service to remove this requirement from its funding and instead focus hazardous fuels reduction dollars based on areas with the greatest need as determined by land managers.

The Committee also strongly encourages the Forest Service to focus on Fire Regime Condition Class II and III areas. These areas

are the most prone to catastrophic fire and many times require mechanical thinning followed by prescribed burns. The Committee realizes much of this work is more expensive than prescribed burning alone, but encourages the Committee to leverage hazardous fuels dollars by combining projects and using tools such as stewardship contracting and timber sales. Finally, the Committee also encourages the Forest Service to focus on the quality, not just quantity, of its fuels reduction work. Across the country and most recently in the Arizona fires, areas that have been thinned to historical stocking levels have survived severe wildfires. The Committee commends the Forest Service for its work in these areas and encourages it to do much more.

The Forest Service is directed to work with the Committee on an informal report on the Arizona and New Mexico wildfires of 2011. The informal report should include information on the number of acres burned, severity of acres burned, habitat for endangered species burned, and wilderness and roadless areas burned. The report should also include the number of acres that, as a result of such fires, need rehabilitation and restoration (areas where forest cover could be re-established), to be determined without regard to the availability of funding for such purposes, excluding wilderness areas or other areas that lack reasonable access for rehabilitation and restoration efforts. The report should also include the plans and goals of the Forest Service for rehabilitation and restoration in the impacted area, including how those plans are informed by the available science on the topic, and the estimated cost of fully implementing such plans and goals. Finally, the report should include an update on areas actively managed to improve forest health or habitat or to reduce fire risk or for other reasons and how those areas responded to fire.

The Committee is deeply concerned about the future of the heavy air-tanker fleet and directs the Secretary to develop a five-year long-term contract for heavy air tanker contractors with reviews based on performance such that it reasonably meets collateral requirements with a financial lender over the duration of the contract. The Secretary shall use sound analytical methodology when developing criteria for the heavy airtanker Request for Proposal (RFP), including the cost per unit of retardant delivered to the fire, the initial attack success based on air speeds and retardant capacity.

FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$290,418,000
Budget estimate, 2012	315,886,000
Recommended, 2012	290,418,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	0
Budget estimate, 2012	−25,468,000

The Committee recommends $290,418,000 for the FLAME wildfire suppression reserve fund, equal to fiscal year 2011 enacted funding and $25,468,000 below the budget request. As discussed under the wildland fire management account, the Committee fully funds the 10-year average expenditure for wildfire suppression.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

The Committee has continued most administrative provisions included in previous years. The Committee has continued the wildland fire transfer authority as enacted in fiscal year 2010.

The Committee continues previous language concerning interactions with foreign countries and clarifies that the Forest Service may sign direct funding agreements with foreign governments and institutions as well as other domestic agencies as described under the International Forestry header above.

The Committee continues the authority for transfers of $3,000,000 to the National Forest Foundation and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. The Committee recommendation does not provide administrative funds for use by the National Forest Foundation.

The recommendation provides, as requested, authority for the Forest Service to conduct priority projects with the Youth Conservation Corps and Public Lands Corps in accordance with P.L. 109–154.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

The provision of Federal health services to Indians is based on a relationship between Indian Tribes and the U.S. Government first set forth in the 1830s by the U.S. Supreme Court under Chief Justice John Marshall. Numerous treaties, statutes, constitutional provisions, and international law have reconfirmed this relationship. Principal among these is the Snyder Act of 1921, which provides the basic authority for most Indian health services provided by the Federal Government to American Indians and Alaska Natives. The Indian Health Service (IHS) provides direct health care services in 28 hospitals, 58 health centers, two school health centers, and 31 health stations. Tribes and tribal groups, through contracts and compacts with the IHS, operate 17 hospitals, 235 health centers, 13 school health centers, and 258 health stations (including 166 Alaska Native village clinics).

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$3,665,273,000
Budget estimate, 2012	4,166,139,000
Recommended, 2012	4,034,322,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+369,049,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−131,817,000

The Committee recommends $4,034,322,000 for Indian Health Services, $369,049,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $131,817,000 below the budget request. Except as otherwise indicated below, increases are to fully fund: mandatory pay increases for commissioned officers; inflation costs; and staffing of new facilities. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

Hospitals and health clinics.—The Committee recommends $1,858,433,000 for hospitals and health clinics programs, $95,568,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $105,453,000 below the budget request. The Committee directs the Service to continue the cooperative agreement with the National Indian Health Board from within existing funds.

Dental health.—The Committee recommends $166,492,000 for dental health, $13,858,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $4,367,000 below the request.

The Committee commends the Service's Division of Oral Health for its Early Childhood Caries (ECC) initiative to reduce the prevalence of early childhood caries among young American Indian and Alaska Native children by 25 percent and increasing dental access by 50 percent by 2015. The Committee understands that the Service will be releasing its first report in 2011. The Service is directed to update the Committee at least quarterly on the progress of the initiative and the ability of the Service to meet its goals in the allowed time frame.

The Committee is pleased to learn that the Service has fully implemented an electronic dental record (EDR) system at 60 sites and is in the process of connecting an additional 21 sites. However, the Committee is concerned that the Service has no current plans for the remaining 149 sites. The Service is strongly encouraged to make implementation of the EDR a priority as it works to fully implement the overall electronic health record system. Further, the Committee directs the Service to provide, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, a detailed schedule for implementation of the EDR assuming present funding levels.

The Committee understands that two of the four top leadership positions within the Division of Oral Health, including the Director's position, are vacant. An additional dentist is on detail outside of the Division. The Committee is concerned about the vacancies because the lack of staff undermines recent recruitment gains of dentists. The Committee urges the Service to fill the vacancies expeditiously.

Urban Health.—The Committee recommends $45,525,000 for urban health programs, $2,472,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,220,000 below the budget request. The requested increase to improve third party collections is funded at $944,000.

Contract Support Costs.—The Committee recommends $573,761,000 for contract support costs, $176,068,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $111,924,000 above the budget request. Two recent court cases found that the Bureau of Indian Affairs was legally obligated to pay the full amount of all contract support costs that it had contractually agreed with Indian tribes to pay, and limitations on the overall contract support cost appropriation does not overcome the Bureau's obligation to pay said costs. The Committee believes that both the Bureau and the Indian Health Service should pay all contract support costs for which it has contractually agreed and directs the Service to include the full cost of the contract support obligations in its fiscal year 2013 budget submission.

IHS Recruitment and Retention.—The Committee has been concerned for some time about the high vacancy rate for all IHS health care providers, including reports that interested candidates

are not being pursued by the Service. The Committee was pleased that the Director commissioned a report on the recruitment and retention of health care professionals. The report included 12 specific recommendations to improve the hiring and retention of health care providers for Indian Country. The Committee directs the Service to provide a report within 90 days of enactment of this Act on the status of the Service's plans to implement these reforms.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$403,947,000
Budget estimate, 2012	457,669,000
Recommended, 2012	427,259,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+23,312,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−30,410,000

The Committee recommends $427,259,000 for Indian health facilities, $23,312,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $30,410,000 below the request. These funds are to be supplemented with $20,000,000 in unobligated funds appropriated for fiscal year 2007 and prior years. Except as otherwise indicated below, increases are to fully fund: mandatory pay increases for commissioned officers; inflation costs; and staffing of new facilities. The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

Health Care Facilities Construction.—The Committee recommends $85,724,000 for health care facilities construction, $46,568,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $540,000 above the budget request.

The Committee remains concerned about the high unobligated balances in this account. The Committee directs the Service to evaluate its construction priority system and provide a detailed report to the Committee on its efforts within 30 days of enactment of this Act on the cause of these unobligated balances and a plan for reducing these balances.

The Committee notes that joint venture programs have been proven successful as a means of reducing the IHS construction backlog, for example, at the Carl Albert Hospital in Ada, Oklahoma. The Committee is encouraged by the success of this project and urges the IHS to use this project as a model for future joint venture programs. Furthermore, the Committee directs the Service to provide thorough outreach to tribal governments encouraging them to develop joint venture initiatives for the construction of IHS projects.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), an agency within the National Institutes of Health, was authorized in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 and in section 126(g) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 to conduct certain research and worker training activities as-

sociated with the nation's Hazardous Substance Superfund program.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$79,054,000
Budget estimate, 2012	81,085,000
Recommended, 2012	79,054,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	0
Budget estimate, 2012	−2,031,000

The Committee recommends $79,054,000 for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,031,000 below the budget request. The Committee supports the work of the NIEHS to provide scientific research and worker training to address and prevent diseases caused by environmental contamination. The Committee recognizes that NIEHS had to reprioritize 2010 funding in order to train workers and volunteers responding to the Deep Water Horizon oil spill in 2010. In doing so, NIEHS deferred funding for several 2010 and 2011 projects. As such the Committee finds sufficient justification to maintain the enacted funding level for NIEHS in fiscal year 2012.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), an agency in the Department of Health and Human Services, was created in section 104(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980. The Agency's mission is to serve the public through responsive public health actions to promote healthy and safe environments and prevent harmful toxic exposures. ATSDR assesses hazardous exposures in communities near toxic waste sites and advises the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other government agencies, community groups and industry partners on actions needed to protect people's health. In addition, ATSDR conducts toxicological and applied research to support environmental assessments, supports health surveillance systems and registries, develops and disseminates information on hazardous substances, provides education and training on hazardous exposures, and responds to environmental emergencies. Through a national network of dedicated scientists and public health practitioners in state health departments, regional EPA offices and headquarters, ATSDR has been at the forefront in protecting people from acute toxic exposures that occur from hazardous leaks and spills, environment-related poisonings, and natural and terrorism-related disasters.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$76,638,000
Budget estimate, 2012	76,337,000
Recommended, 2012	74,039,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−2,599,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−2,298,000

The Committee recommends $74,039,000 for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), $2,599,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,298,000 below the budget request. ATSDR has successfully reduced non-payroll costs in light of

increasing payroll pressures. However, the ATSDR budget justification does not clearly explain changes for FTE from one year to the next including an increase of 5 FTE from previous estimates for fiscal years 2010 and 2011. Therefore the Committee questions the justification for the increase in payroll costs and has targeted the reduction accordingly. The Committee recommends that ATSDR provide additional clarity on the rationale for FTE changes in the fiscal year 2013 budget justification.

Within the funds provided, $2,000,000 has been included to continue to the important epidemiological studies of health conditions caused by exposures to uranium released from mining and milling operations in the Navajo Nation.

The Committee supports ATSDR's current health studies of past community exposure to volatile organic compounds at the U.S. Marine Corps base at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina and urges the application of the studies' findings to research pertinent to smaller communities such as Endicott, New York, that have experienced exposure to volatile organic compounds.

The Committee is concerned about the findings in the April 2010 GAO report indicating that management deficiencies, and a failure to prioritize significant research, may lead to delays in releasing critical public health information. The Committee supports the GAO recommendations to develop or revise procedures that would ensure a risk assessment is conducted at the beginning of a project and that ATSDR establish a formal tracking system.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was established by Congress under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The Office of Environmental Quality (OEQ), which provides professional and administrative staff for the Council, was established in the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970. The Council on Environmental Quality has statutory responsibility for overseeing Federal agency implementation of the requirements of NEPA. CEQ also assists in coordinating environmental programs among the Federal agencies in the Executive Branch.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$3,153,000
Budget estimate, 2012	3,444,000
Recommended, 2012	2,661,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−492,000
Budget Estimate, 2012	−783,000

The Committee recommends $2,661,000 for the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality, $492,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $783,000 below the budget request. Commensurate with the appropriation, the authorized level for CEQ FTE is capped at 19, equivalent to the 2006 utilization level. Funding has not been provided for one additional NEPA coordinator and one additional ocean policy coordinator.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$10,777,000
Budget estimate, 2012	11,147,000
Recommended, 2012	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−777,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−1,147,000

The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (the Board), which is $777,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,147,000 below the budget request.

Bill Language.—The Committee continues to carry language, as in prior years, authorizing the EPA Inspector General to act as the Inspector General for the Board. The Committee has not provided funds to be transferred to the EPA IG who reports sufficient existing funding to cover these responsibilities.

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation was established by Public Law 93–531 to plan and conduct relocation activities associated with the settlement of a land dispute between the Navajo Nation and the Hopi Tribe.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$7,984,000
Budget estimate, 2012	9,570,000
Recommended, 2012	7,530,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−454,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−2,040,000

The Committee recommends $7,530,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation, $454,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,040,000 below the budget request.

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

PAYMENT TO THE INSTITUTE

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$8,283,000
Budget estimate, 2012	9,225,000
Recommended, 2012	7,900,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−383,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−1,325,000

The Committee recommends $7,900,000 for the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, $383,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,325,000 below the budget request.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Smithsonian Institution is the world's largest museum and research complex, with 19 museums and galleries, 20 libraries, numerous research centers and the National Zoological Park. Funded

by both private and Federal sources, the Smithsonian is unique in the Federal establishment. Created by an Act of Congress in 1846 to carry out the trust included in James Smithson's will, it has been engaged for 165 years in the "increase and diffusion of knowledge." In 2010, the Smithsonian attracted more than 30 million visitors to its museums, galleries, and zoological park. Additional millions also view Smithsonian traveling exhibitions and participate in the annual Folklife Festival on the National Mall. As custodian of the National Collections, the Smithsonian is responsible for more than 137 million art objects, natural history specimens, and artifacts. These scientific and cultural collections are a vital resource for global research and conservation efforts. The collections are displayed for the enjoyment and education of visitors and are available for research by the staff of the Institution and by thousands of visiting students, scientists, and historians each year.

The amounts recommended by the Committee for the Smithsonian Institution, compared with the budget estimates by activity, are shown in the table at the end of this report.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$634,889,000
Budget estimate, 2012	636,530,000
Recommended, 2012	626,971,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−7,918,000
Budget estimate, 2012	–9,559,000

The Committee recommends $626,971,000 for salaries and expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, $7,918,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $9,559,000 below the budget request.

The Committee commends the Smithsonian Institution, the largest museum and research complex in the world, for reaching new audiences and broadening access to a diverse array of educational activities and resources to nearly 5,000 school classrooms and millions of people worldwide. The Smithsonian Institution's efforts are complemented through non-Federal contributions, including a model of philanthropic giving, which exceeded $158 million last year.

The Committee also commends the Smithsonian for its selection as one of the ten best places to work in the Federal government. The Smithsonian ranked fourth overall in its first year as a participant in the annual survey conducted by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). The Committee believes the taxpaying public is best served by well-managed and top performing agencies with high employee morale. This ranking, combined with oversight provided by the General Accountability Office (GAO) and the Inspector General, provides further evidence that the Smithsonian Institution has made considerable progress toward improving governance and implementing sound management practices.

The Committee is concerned about the recent GAO report highlighting problems in identifying and repatriating Indian human remains and objects. Per GAO's recommendations, the Committee urges the Smithsonian to take actions to expand the oversight and reporting role of the special committee, establish an administrative appeals process, and develop a policy for the disposition of culturally unidentifiable items.

The Committee strongly supports efforts to create virtual natural history collections utilizing advanced information technologies to make regional and rural museum collections more accessible. The Committee encourages collaboration between the Smithsonian Institution and regional and rural natural history repositories to facilitate greater educational, scientific, and rural access to natural history collections throughout the United States.

The Committee also supports the joint venture between the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution creating a comprehensive compilation of audio and video recordings of personal histories and testimonials of individuals who participated in the Civil Rights movement.

The Committee remains committed to the preservation of Smithsonian Institution collections, including the priceless military uniform collection, at the National Museum of American History. The Committee urges the Smithsonian to continue placing a high priority on the preservation of these irreplaceable historical collections.

The Smithsonian Institution is directed to work with the Committee to standardize its annual budget submission justifications and supporting materials to clearly and succinctly indicate proposed increases and decreases in proposed funding levels using as a baseline enacted funding levels from the previous fiscal year.

FACILITIES CAPITAL

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$124,750,000
Budget estimate, 2012	225,000,000
Recommended, 2012	124,750,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	0
Budget estimate, 2012	−100,250,000

The Committee recommends $124,750,000 for facilities capital, equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $100,250,000 below the budget request.

The Committee supports revitalization of Smithsonian Institution facilities and the planning and design of future projects. The Committee also supports and remains committed to the construction of the congressionally authorized National Museum of African American History and Culture. However, the Committee notes that the Facilities Capital account has grown by more than 18 percent since fiscal year 2008. Funding the account to the request level would represent a 113 percent increase from fiscal year 2008. It is simply not feasible to recommend significant additional spending at this time, regardless of the merit of pending initiatives, when extraordinary fiscal restraint is warranted and necessary.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends $50,000,000 for construction of the National Museum of African American History and Culture. These funds, which will ensure that construction begins on time, complement $45,000,000 provided by the Committee in prior years for pre-construction planning and design. The Committee further directs that the balance of Facilities Capital funding be devoted to the highest and best use for revitalization efforts of Smithsonian Institution assets on a priority basis.

A growing number of projects necessitate the need for the Smithsonian Institution to set clear priorities within the Facilities Capital account. The Committee directs the Smithsonian to clearly es-

tablish and articulate specific funding needs as well as the priority order of all projects for Facilities Capital program initiatives.

Bill language.—The Committee has included bill language providing that any future procurement for construction of the National Museum of African American History and Culture may cover the full scope of the project, but that any contract for such procurement must contain a clause clarifying that any payment under the contract will be subject to the availability of funds.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

The National Gallery of Art is one of the world's great galleries. Its magnificent works of art, displayed for the benefit of millions of visitors annually, serves as an example of a successful cooperative endeavor between private individuals and institutions and the Federal Government. The many special exhibitions shown in the Gallery and throughout the country bring great art treasures to Washington, DC, and the Nation. In 1999, the Gallery opened a sculpture garden, which provides an opportunity for the public to have an outdoor, artistic experience in a contemplative setting.

Table of Allocations by Activity.—The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the table at the end of this report.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$110,525,000
Budget estimate, 2012	118,781,000
Recommended, 2012	112,185,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+1,660,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−6,596,000

The Committee recommends $112,185,000 for salaries and expenses of the National Gallery of Art, $1,660,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $6,596,000 below the budget request. Increases above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level are to address the most critical repairs to the Gallery's buildings and equipment on a priority basis. Within the amount provided, the Committee includes $3,481,000 as requested for the Gallery's Special Exhibition program.

Bill Language.—The Committee has included bill language specifying the amount provided for Special Exhibitions.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$48,125,000
Budget estimate, 2012	19,219,000
Recommended, 2012	13,938,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−34,187,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−5,281,000

The Committee recommends $13,938,000 for repair, restoration and renovation of buildings at the National Gallery of Art, $34,187,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $5,281,000 below the budget request. Reductions from the request are to defer design of West Building Exterior Site Renovations and Master Facilities Plan work.

The Committee supports the completion by January 2014 of repairs addressing a systemic structural failure of the anchors sup-

porting the 16,200 individual marble panels of the National Gallery's East Building exterior façade. A group of Committee members viewed the failure and agreed with the Gallery and expert engineering consultants that the situation posed a significant safety hazard to Gallery visitors and staff. The Committee provided $40,000,000 in fiscal year 2010 and $42,250,000 in fiscal year 2011 to pay the entire cost of this work which, when completed, will address the serious risk posed to public safety.

Bill Language.—The Committee has included bill language, as requested, relating to lease agreements of no more than 10 years that addresses space needs created by ongoing renovations in the Master Facilities Plan.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is a living memorial to the late President Kennedy and is the National Center for the Performing Arts. The Center houses nine stages, seven of which have a total of more than 7,300 seats. The Center consists of over 1.5 million square feet of usable floor space with visitation averaging 8,000 on a daily basis. The support systems in the building often operate at capacity 18 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$22,455,000
Budget estimate, 2012	23,200,000
Recommended, 2012	22,455,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	0
Budget estimate, 2012	−745,000

The Committee recommends $22,455,000 for operations and maintenance equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $745,000 below the budget request. The Committee recognizes that increasing operations and maintenance costs present challenges for all agencies funded in the bill, and finds it to be a sufficient justification for maintaining funding at the fiscal year 2011 enacted level as the budget authority for the bill has declined by seven percent.

CAPITAL REPAIR AND RESTORATION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$13,892,000
Budget estimate, 2012	13,650,000
Recommended, 2012	13,650,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−242,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $13,650,000 for capital repair and restoration as requested and $242,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars is a unique institution with a special mission to serve as a living memorial to President Woodrow Wilson. The Center performs this man-

date through its role as an international institute promoting policy-relevant research and dialogue to increase understanding and enhance the capabilities and knowledge of leaders, citizens, and institutions worldwide. The Woodrow Wilson Center hosts scholars and policy makers to do their own advanced study, research and writing as well as a facilitates debate and discussions among scholars, public officials, journalists and business leaders from across the country on major long-term issues facing this Nation and the world.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$11,203,000
Budget estimate, 2012	11,005,000
Recommended, 2012	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−1,203,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−1,005,000

The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, $1,203,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $1,005,000 below the budget request. The Center is funded at the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$154,690,000
Budget estimate, 2012	146,255,000
Recommended, 2012	135,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−19,690,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−11,255,000

The Committee recommends $135,000,000 for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), $19,690,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $11,255,000 below the budget request.

The Committee commends the NEA for its participation in the *Blue Star Museums* partnership involving Blue Star Families and some 1,100 museums in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and American Samoa. *Blue Star Museums* is a program that offers free admission to museums for all active duty, National Guard and Reserve military personnel and their families from Memorial Day through Labor Day. As a result of this partnership, more than 350,000 military family members are expected to visit participating museums this year.

The Committee values greatly the longstanding collaborative relationship between the NEA and the States. State Arts Agencies (SSAs) support the arts for communities at the grassroots level regardless of their geographic location, providing much of their funding to smaller organizations, community groups, and schools rather than well-established arts organizations. Based on this widely supported successful model, the Committee has funded state partnerships, including the underserved set-aside, at $46,000,000.

The Committee is committed to supporting proven national initiatives with broad geographic reach. The *Big Read, Challenge America,* and *Shakespeare in American Communities* are among the cost-effective grant programs with broad, bipartisan congres-

sional support that meet these criteria, supporting the NEA's goal of extending the arts to underserved populations in both urban and rural communities across the United States.

Since the Big Read's inception in 2006, the NEA has awarded $11 million in grants—leveraged with $24 million in private-sector funding—in every state, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and virtually every congressional district. The Committee remains firmly committed to the *Big Read* program and, because of its proven return on investment, directs that the *Big Read* be funded at no less than $3,000,000, with no fewer than 150 grants awarded to all 50 states and U.S. territories, in fiscal year 2012.

Similarly, *Shakespeare in American Communities* remains one of the most cost-effective, well-managed, and successful national programs reaching diverse audiences throughout the United States. The Committee directs that *Shakespeare in American Communities* be maintained as a national program funded at no less than $2,000,000 in fiscal year 2012.

The Committee does not support the budget request proposal to eliminate the National Heritage Fellowship program and the American Jazz Masters Fellowship program. The National Heritage Fellowship program, which was created in 1982, has celebrated over 350 cultural leaders from 49 states and five U.S. territories, focusing national attention on the keepers of America's deep and rich cultural heritage found in communities large and small, rural and urban. Similarly, the American Jazz Masters Fellowship, also created in 1982, has bestowed appropriate national recognition on a uniquely American art form Congress has proclaimed a national treasure. Accordingly, the Committee directs the NEA to continue these popular honorific fellowships in the same manner as it has in the past.

The Committee believes the proposal to establish a separate *NEA American Artist of the Year* honorific award is not warranted and could be perceived as an attempt to circumvent clear, long-established congressional guidelines prohibiting direct grant funding to individual artists.

The Committee views the NEA's newest initiative—known as *Our Town*—as an economic development and revitalization proposal more properly aligned with the goals and objectives of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. While the Committee believes that the NEA is well-positioned to provide expertise to HUD and other Federal agencies on promoting the arts in large and small communities, funding for this endeavor ought to be utilized through the considerable grant-making resources of HUD and other Federal agencies. The Committee believes that as competition for Federal dollars grows, limited direct grant funding dollars within the NEA should be devoted to core programs with a proven record of success.

In 1997, Congress established that 40 percent of NEA program funds be allocated to States through State Arts Agencies (SAAs) because they understand community priorities and are accessible to local arts organizations. By exempting *Our Town* from this requirement, the request would provide funding to communities without this necessary safeguard. The Committee is particularly concerned that funding for this program would gravitate toward large urban

centers with strong existing arts infrastructures at the expense of State Arts Agencies which are better positioned to reach underserved populations. This precedent could undermine support not only for SSAs but for the NEA more broadly.

While the Committee has expressed reservations about this initiative, it believes the program ought to be provided an opportunity to demonstrate its worth. Therefore, the Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the *Our Town* initiative, $3,000,000 below the budget request, to provide a limited number of grants to support arts development in local communities. Further, the Committee directs these funds be distributed in a manner consistent with the congressional requirement governing the allocation of funds to States.

The Committee notes that the NEA administrative budget has risen by 17 percent since fiscal year 2008. While this year's NEA request proposed an overall reduction in grant program funding, the request did not propose a corresponding reduction in administrative costs or FTEs. Accordingly, the Committee has reduced the administrative budget by almost nine percent and urges the NEA to cap FTEs in the coming fiscal year at the fiscal year 2008 level of 155 FTEs.

The Committee urges the NEA to take any and all necessary steps to work with the appropriate authorizing committees in a timely fashion to renew its congressional authorization.

Bill Language.—Each year, the Committee provides in bill language specific guidelines under which the Endowment is directed to distribute taxpayer dollars in support of the arts. With the exception of established honorific programs, grant funding to individual artists is strictly prohibited. The Committee directs that priority be given to providing services or grant funding for projects, productions, or programs that encourage public knowledge, education, understanding, and appreciation of the arts. Any reduction in support to the states for arts education should be no more than proportional to other funding decreases taken in other NEA programs.

Reforms originally instituted by the Committee in P.L. 108–447 relating to program priorities and grant guidelines are fully restated in Sections 419 and 420 of the bill. The Committee expects the NEA to adhere to them fully. These reforms maintain broad bipartisan support and continue to serve well both the NEA and the public interest.

The Committee has not included bill language contained in the request to establish a new category of honorific awards. However, the Committee has retained bill language in Section 419 from past years to continue the successful and popular National Heritage Fellowship program and American Jazz Masters Fellowship program.

Further, the Committee has not included two additional legislative changes proposed in the budget request. The first attempts to clarify supplanting language by stipulating allowed match for grants made to the states; the second seeks authority to issue guidance on the waive-of-match provision for states and regions.

The Committee views these proposals as generally reasonable and desirable, provided some flexibility is provided to the States in response to their individual and clearly defined circumstances. However, the Committee believes that these proposals should not be adopted without the full consultation and active participation of

State Arts Agencies. Anything less would result in a Federal mandate that could, in some instances, prove difficult for States in the future.

Therefore, the Committee directs the NEA to engage in a collaborative process, building upon its longstanding partnership with diverse State Arts Agencies, to fashion clarifying bill language for consideration by the Committee addressing matching requirements and waiver procedures.

The allocation of funding among NEA activities is shown in the table at the end of this report.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION (INCLUDING MATCHING GRANTS)

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$154,690,000
Budget estimate, 2012	146,255,000
Recommended, 2012	135,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−19,690,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−11,255,000

The Committee recommends a total of $135,000,000 for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), $19,690,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $11,255,000 below the budget request.

The Committee commends the NEH Federal/State Partnership for its ongoing, successful collaboration with state humanities councils in each of the fifty states as well as Washington, D.C., the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa. Every NEH dollar received by a council is matched by a local contribution. In recent years, the proportion of NEH program funds supporting the work of state humanities councils has grown to nearly 40 percent. The Committee urges the NEH to provide no less than 40 percent of program funds to support the critical work of state humanities councils.

The Committee does not support the budget request proposal to discontinue the *We the People* program. *We the People* was initiated on Constitution Day—September 17, 2002—and should remain a core NEH grant program designed to promote the teaching, study, and understanding of American history, culture, and democratic principles. Grants awarded through the *We the People* program leverage millions of non-Federal dollars supporting enrichment and educational materials provided to thousands of educators, schools, community colleges, and libraries nationwide. *We the People* is a proven, cost-effective national grant program with broad geographic reach and bipartisan congressional support. The Committee directs that it be sustained at no less than $4,750,000 in fiscal year 2012.

The Committee supports broadly the goals of the *Bridging Cultures* initiative which strives to promote civil discourse and a better understanding of our multi-cultural society. However, the Committee believes that the best use of limited dollars is for proven, cost-effective, and successful core grant programs. Therefore, the Bridging Cultures initiative is funded at $2,000,000, which is $2,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee supports the Documenting Endangered Languages grant program, which is working to preserve an estimated 3,000 endangered languages throughout the world. The Committee urges the NEH to provide priority consideration to preserving endangered Native American tribal languages.

The allocation of funding among NEH activities is shown in the table at the end of this report.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Commission of Fine Arts was established in 1910 to meet the need for a permanent body to advise the government on matters pertaining to the arts, and particularly to guide the architectural development of Washington, DC. Over the years the Commission's scope has been expanded to include advice on designs for parks, public buildings, public squares, as well as the design of National monuments, coins and medals, and overseas American military cemeteries. As a result, the Commission annually reviews more than 600 projects. In fiscal year 1988, the Commission was given responsibility for the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs program.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$2,289,000
Budget estimate, 2012	2,400,000
Recommended, 2012	2,234,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−55,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−166,000

The Committee recommends $2,234,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts, $55,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $166,000 below the budget request. The Commission of Fine Arts is funded at the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$2,994,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0
Recommended, 2012	0
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−2,994,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs program was established in Public Law 99–190 to support artistic and cultural programs in the Nation's Capital. As requested, no funding is proposed for this non-competitive grants program administered by the Commission of Fine Arts, a reduction of $2,994,000 from the fiscal year 2011 enacted level.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The ACHP was granted permanent authorization as part of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 2006 (Public Law 109–453). The ACHP promotes the preservation, enhancement, and productive use of our

nation's historic resources and advises the President and Congress on national historic preservation policy.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$5,896,000
Budget estimate, 2012	6,108,000
Recommended, 2012	5,498,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−398,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−610,000

The Committee recommends $5,498,000 for salaries and expenses of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), $398,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $610,000 below the budget request. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is funded at the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The National Capital Planning Act of 1952 designated the National Capital Planning Commission as the central planning agency for the Federal government in the National Capital Region. The three major functions of the Commission are to prepare and adopt the Federal elements of the National Capital Comprehensive Plan, prepare an annual report on a five-year projection of the Federal Capital Improvement Program, and review plans and proposals submitted to the Commission.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$8,490,000
Budget estimate, 2012	8,154,000
Recommended, 2012	8,133,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	−357,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−21,000

The Committee recommends $8,133,000 for salaries and expenses of the National Capital Planning Commission, $357,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $21,000 below the budget request. The recommendation does not include the requested amount for official reception expenses associated with hosting international visitors engaged in the planning and development of world capitals.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

In 1980, Congress passed legislation creating a 65 member Holocaust Memorial Council with the mandate to create and oversee a living memorial/museum to victims of the Holocaust. The museum opened in April 1993. Construction costs for the museum came solely from donated funds raised by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum Campaign, and appropriated funds were used for planning and development of programmatic components, overall administrative support, and annual commemorative observances. Since the opening of the museum, appropriated funds have been provided to pay for the ongoing operating costs of the museum as authorized by Public Law 102–529 and Public Law 106–292. Private funds support educational outreach throughout the United States.

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$49,024,000
Budget estimate, 2012	52,694,000
Recommended, 2012	50,524,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+1,500,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−2,170,000

The Committee recommends $50,524,000 for the Holocaust Memorial Museum, an increase of $1,500,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $2,170,000 below the budget request.

PRESIDIO TRUST

PRESIDIO TRUST FUND

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$14,970,000
Budget estimate, 2012	12,000,000
Recommended, 2012	12,000,000
Comparison:.	
Appropriation, 2011	−2,970,000
Budget estimate, 2012	0

The Committee recommends $12,000,000 for the Presidio Trust as requested, a decrease of $2,970,000 below the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. These funds fulfill the commitment made by Congress to support the transition of the Presidio Army Base to a mixed-use, financially independent facility by the year 2013 as authorized by P.L. 104–333. The Presidio's self-sufficiency plan stipulated that the Presidio Trust receive Federal appropriations through fiscal year 2012, at which time the Trust becomes responsible for funding the operations and maintenance of the Presidio in perpetuity.

Since its inception, the Trust has been effective at leveraging Federal dollars to attract private dollars. Private revenue and tenant investment in the Presidio over the past decade has exceeded $1.2 billion which is more than four times the amount of appropriated funding provided during the same period. This successful collaboration between the private and public sectors has saved taxpayers over $1 billion in capital costs and over $45 million in annual operating costs while also significantly reducing the Federal government's role in managing this national historic landmark.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission was created by Congress in 1999 through Public Law 106–79 for the purpose of establishing a permanent national memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe in World War II and 34th President of the United States. The Commission consists of 12 members, four members of the House of Representatives, four Senators, and four private citizens appointed by the President.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$0
Budget estimate, 2012	6,000,000
Recommended, 2012	2,000,000
Comparison:.	
Appropriation, 2011	+2,000,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−4,000,000

The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, $2,000,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $4,000,000 below the budget request. This represents one-third of the requested funding for salaries and expenses in order to complete construction of the Memorial by 2015.

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation enacted, 2011	$0
Budget estimate, 2012	83,768,000
Recommended, 2012	28,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2011	+28,000,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−55,768,000

The Committee recommends $28,000,000 for capital construction of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial, $28,000,000 above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and $55,768,000 below the budget request. This represents one-third of the requested funding for construction costs given that planned construction will not begin until two months before the end of the fiscal year. Bill language has been included to authorize the contracting officer to procure construction services as long as such contracts are contingent upon the availability of funds.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 401 continues a provision providing for public availability of information on consulting services contracts.

Section 402 continues a provision prohibiting activities to promote public support or opposition to legislative proposals.

Section 403 continues a provision providing for annual appropriations unless expressly provided otherwise in this Act.

Section 404 continues a provision limiting the use of personal cooks, chauffeurs or servants.

Section 405 provides for restrictions on departmental assessments unless approved by the Committees on Appropriations.

Section 406 continues a provision preventing the use of funds to sell giant sequoia trees on National Forest or Bureau of Land Management lands in a manner different than such sales were conducted in the past.

Section 407 continues a limitation on accepting and processing applications for patents and on the patenting of Federal lands; permits processing of grandfathered applications; and permits third-party contractors to process grandfathered applications.

Section 408 continues a provision limiting payments for contract support costs in past years to the funds available in law and accompanying report language in those years for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

Section 409 continues a provision allowing Forest Service land management plans to be more than 15 years old if the Secretary is acting in good faith to update such plans.

Section 410 continues a provision limiting preleasing, leasing, and related activities within the boundaries of National Monuments.

Section 411 continues a provision through fiscal year 2013 providing the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agri-

culture the authority to enter into reciprocal agreements with foreign wildfire organizations.

Section 412 continues a provision through fiscal year 2013 authorizing the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to give consideration to rural communities, local and nonprofit groups, and disadvantaged workers in entering into contracts for hazardous fuels and watershed projects.

Section 413 modifies a provision which restricts funding for acquisition of land from being used for declarations of taking or complaints in condemnation.

Section 414 modifies a provision addressing timber sales involving Alaskan western red cedar.

Section 415 modifies a provision continuing certain authorities to renew grazing permits or leases administered by the Forest Service or Department of the Interior through 2016.

Section 416 provides that none of the funds made available by this Act may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN).

Section 417 continues a provision which prohibits no-bid contracts and grants except under certain circumstances.

Section 418 continues a provision which requires public disclosure of certain reports.

Section 419 continues a provision which delineates the grant guidelines for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Section 420 continues a provision which delineates the program priorities for the programs managed by the National Endowment for the Arts.

Section 421 amends existing law to allow for the use of certain competitive grants funds.

Section 422 extends the Forest Service Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 authority through 2016.

Section 423 modifies a provision allowing Department of the Interior bureaus and the Forest Service to conduct joint programs to promote customer service and efficiency.

Section 424 retains a provision allowing the State of Utah, through contracts or cooperative agreements with the Forest Service, to perform certain activities on Forest Service lands through fiscal year 2013.

Section 425 requires that the Department of the Interior, the EPA, the Forest Service, and the Indian Health Service provide the Committees on Appropriations a quarterly report on the status of balances of appropriations.

Section 426 requires the President to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations no later than 120 days after the fiscal year 2013 budget is submitted to Congress describing in detail all Federal agency obligations and expenditures for climate change programs and activities in fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

Section 427 extends a provision allowing the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to enter into stewardship contracts with private entities to achieve land management goals on national forests or public lands that meet local and rural community needs through fiscal year 2023.

Section 428 continues a provision prohibiting the use of funds to promulgate or implement any regulation requiring the issuance of

permits under title V of the Clean Air Act for carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, water vapor, or methane emissions.

Section 429 continues a provision prohibiting the use of funds to implement any provision in a rule if that provision requires mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions from manure management systems.

Section 430 enables Indian Tribes and tribal organizations to consolidate funds supplied by any Federal department or agency to carry out the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act.

Section 431 provides a one year stay for actions related to greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources.

Section 432 prohibits the use of funds to develop, carry out, implement, or enforce proposed regulations published on June 18, 2010.

Section 433 prohibits the use of funds to carry out, implement, administer or enforce proposed enhanced coordination procedures issued on June 11, 2009 or guidance dated April 1, 2010.

Section 434 prohibits the use of funds to develop, propose, finalize, implement, administer or enforce any regulation that identifies fossil fuel combustion waste as hazardous waste.

Section 435 prohibits the use of funds to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce a change or supplement to a rule or guidance documents pertaining to the definition of waters under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Section 436 prohibits the use of funds to further develop, finalize, implement or enforce the proposed regulatory requirements published on April 20, 2011, or to develop or enforce any other new regulations or requirements designed to implement section 316(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Section 437 provides the Forest Service the authority to use a pre-decisional objection process in place of post-decisional appeals.

Section 438 clarifies Silvicultural Operations under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Section 439 prohibits the use of funds to expand the stormwater discharge program under section 402(p) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act until certain criteria are met.

Section 440 modifies claim maintenance structure for placer claims held by two or more persons, known as association placer claims.

Section 441 recognizes the authority of States to implement flexible air permitting programs.

Section 442 maintains current management of bighorn sheep as it relates to domestic sheep management for both the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

Section 443 clarifies current permitting activities for the outer continental shelf and sets parameters for the approval of exploration permits by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Section 444 provides direction to EPA and NAS on review of the IRIS process.

Section 445 prohibits the withdrawal of certain lands in the State of Arizona from the Mining Law of 1872 without the expressed consent of the Congress.

Section 446 prohibits the Forest Service in California from implementing the travel management rule without additional analysis

and prevents the agency from designating ML–3 roads as highways.

Section 447 prohibits EPA from using funds to take action against registered pesticides in a response to a final biological opinion under the Endangered Species Act.

Section 448 prohibits EPA from using funds to implement, administer or enforce the 2010 Portland Cement rule.

Section 449 prohibits the government from entering into contracts or agreements with any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months.

Section 450 prohibits EPA from using funds to implement, administer or enforce the lead renovation rule until EPA has approved a commercially available lead test kit.

Section 451 prohibits funds for contracts or agreements with entities with unpaid Federal tax liabilities that have not entered into payment agreements to remedy the liability.

Section 452 prohibits EPA from using funds to implement, administer or enforce the 2010 water quality rule for the State of Florida.

Section 453 prohibits EPA from using funds to prepare, propose, promulgate, finalize, implement, or enforce regulations for greenhouse gas emissions from new motor vehicles or motor engines after model year 2016, and to grant a waiver to a State or political subdivision thereof to adopt or enforce standards for greenhouse gas emissions from new motor vehicles or motor engines after model year 2016.

Section 454 prohibits EPA from using funds to modify the primary or secondary air standard for coarse particulate matter under the Clean Air Act.

Section 455 prohibits EPA from using funds to develop, propose, finalize, implement, enforce or administer any regulation that would establish new financial responsibility requirements under CERCLA.

Section 456 prohibits EPA from using funds to delineate new wetlands under the Clean Water Act in any county included in a major disaster declaration as a result of flooding in 2011.

Section 457 requires the Indian Health Service to disburse funds to Alaska Native regional health entities instead of individual villages when such villages reside within areas served by regional health entities.

Section 458 requires written notification to land owners adjacent to public and Federal land to be exchanged by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service.

Section 459 prohibits EPA from providing funds to any Great Lakes state that, as determined by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, has a more stringent performance standard or ballast water exchange standard than either a revised Coast Guard standard or the standard adopted by the International Maritime Organization.

Section 460 prohibits EPA from using funds to finalize proposed guidance on false or misleading pesticide labels.

Section 461 prohibits EPA from using funds to regulate ammonia or ammonium under the secondary air quality standard for nitrogen and sulfur oxides pursuant to the Clean Air Act.

Section 462 directs EPA to study the cumulative impacts of certain rules, guidelines and actions within 12 months, and prohibiting EPA from taking final actions with respect to two rules.

TITLE V—REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2011

Clarifies permitting responsibilities under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 601 establishes a Spending Reduction Account as required by Section 3(j) of H. Res. 5.

BILL-WIDE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The following items are included in accordance with various requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO.1

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Moran
Description of Motion: To strike numerous policy provisions in the bill.
Results: Defeated 19 yeas to 28 nays.

Members Voting Yea

Mr. Bishop
Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Dicks
Mr. Farr
Mr. Fattah
Mr. Honda
Mr. Jackson
Ms. Lee
Mrs. Lowey
Ms. McCollum
Mr. Moran
Mr. Olver
Mr. Pastor
Mr. Price
Mr. Rothman
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Schiff
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky

Members Voting Nay

Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Alexander
Mr. Austria
Mr. Bonner
Mr. Calvert
Mr. Carter
Mr. Cole
Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. Culberson
Mr. Dent
Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Flake
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Granger
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Latham
Mr. LaTourette
Mr. Lewis
Mrs. Lummis
Mr. Nunnelee
Mr. Rehberg
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Womack
Mr. Yoder
Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Moran
Description of Motion: To allow the Secretary of the Interior to collect nonrefundable oil and gas inspection fees on onshore and offshore lands and waters and increasing funding for the Superfund, Brownfields, and Indian Sanitation Facilities Construction programs.
Results: Defeated 20 yeas to 29 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.2

Members Voting Yea

Mr. Bishop
Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Dicks
Mr. Farr
Mr. Fattah
Mr. Honda
Mr. Jackson
Ms. Kaptur
Ms. Lee
Mrs. Lowey
Ms. McCollum
Mr. Moran
Mr. Olver
Mr. Pastor
Mr. Price
Mr. Rothman
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Schiff
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky

Members Voting Nay

Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Alexander
Mr. Austria
Mr. Bonner
Mr. Calvert
Mr. Carter
Mr. Cole
Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. Culberson
Mr. Dent
Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Flake
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Granger
Mr. Graves
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Latham
Mr. LaTourette
Mr. Lewis
Mrs. Lummis
Mr. Nunnelee
Mr. Rehberg
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Womack
Mr. Yoder
Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Dicks
Description of Motion: To strike the funding prohibition for Endangered Species Act listing and critical habitat designation and providing $24.6 million from within existing appropriations for such activities.
Results: Defeated 23 yeas to 26 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.3

Members Voting Yea

Mr. Bishop
Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Dent
Mr. Dicks
Mr. Farr
Mr. Fattah
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Honda
Mr. Jackson
Ms. Kaptur
Ms. Lee
Mrs. Lowey
Ms. McCollum
Mr. Moran
Mr. Olver
Mr. Pastor
Mr. Price
Mr. Rothman
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Schiff
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky
Mr. Wolf

Members Voting Nay

Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Alexander
Mr. Austria
Mr. Bonner
Mr. Calvert
Mr. Carter
Mr. Cole
Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. Culberson
Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Flake
Ms. Granger
Mr. Graves
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Latham
Mr. LaTourette
Mr. Lewis
Mrs. Lummis
Mr. Nunnelee
Mr. Rehberg
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Womack
Mr. Yoder
Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Moran
Description of Motion: To strike Section 445 relating to the Arizona Mineral Withdrawal Prohibition.
Results: Defeated 23 yeas to 26 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.4

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Bishop	Mr. Aderholt
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Alexander
Mr. Dicks	Mr. Austria
Mr. Farr	Mr. Bonner
Mr. Fattah	Mr. Calvert
Mr. Honda	Mr. Carter
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Cole
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. LaTourette	Mr. Culberson
Ms. Lee	Mr. Dent
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Diaz-Balart
Ms. McCollum	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Moran	Mr. Flake
Mr. Olver	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Pastor	Ms. Granger
Mr. Price	Mr. Graves
Mr. Rothman	Mr. Kingston
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Latham
Mr. Schiff	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Serrano	Mrs. Lummis
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Nunnelee
Mr. Wolf	Mr. Rehberg
Mr. Young	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Simpson
	Mr. Womack
	Mr. Yoder

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Serrano
Description of Motion: To strike Section 431 relating to the Stationary Source Greenhouse Gas Prohibition.
Results: Defeated 19 yeas to 29 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.5

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Bishop	Mr. Aderholt
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Alexander
Mr. Dicks	Mr. Austria
Mr. Farr	Mr. Bonner
Mr. Fattah	Mr. Calvert
Mr. Honda	Mr. Carter
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Cole
Ms. Lee	Mr. Crenshaw
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Culberson
Ms. McCollum	Mr. Dent
Mr. Moran	Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mr. Olver	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Flake
Mr. Price	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Rothman	Ms. Granger
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Graves
Mr. Schiff	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Latham
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. LaTourette
	Mr. Lewis
	Mrs. Lummis
	Mr. Nunnelee
	Mr. Rehberg
	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Simpson
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Womack
	Mr. Yoder
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Serrano to the amendment offered by Mr. Carter
Description of Motion: To limit the Portland Cement funding prohibition to the State of Texas.
Results: Defeated 19 yeas to 27 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.6

Members Voting Yea

Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Dicks
Mr. Farr
Mr. Fattah
Mr. Honda
Mr. Jackson
Ms. Kaptur
Ms. Lee
Mrs. Lowey
Ms. McCollum
Mr. Moran
Mr. Olver
Mr. Pastor
Mr. Price
Mr. Rothman
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Schiff
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky

Members Voting Nay

Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Alexander
Mr. Austria
Mr. Bonner
Mr. Calvert
Mr. Carter
Mr. Cole
Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. Culberson
Mr. Dent
Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Granger
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Latham
Mr. LaTourette
Mr. Lewis
Mrs. Lummis
Mr. Nunnelee
Mr. Rehberg
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Womack
Mr. Yoder
Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Diaz-Balart
Description of Motion: To prohibit funding for the Environmental Protection Agency to implement or enforce certain Florida Water Quality Standards.
Results: Adopted 26 yeas to 19 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.7

Members Voting Yea

Mr. Alexander
Mr. Austria
Mr. Bonner
Mr. Calvert
Mr. Carter
Mr. Cole
Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. Culberson
Mr. Dent
Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mr. Flake
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Granger
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Latham
Mr. LaTourette
Mr. Lewis
Mrs. Lummis
Mr. Nunnelee
Mr. Rehberg
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Womack
Mr. Yoder
Mr. Young

Members Voting Nay

Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Dicks
Mr. Farr
Mr. Fattah
Mr. Honda
Mr. Jackson
Ms. Kaptur
Ms. Lee
Mrs. Lowey
Ms. McCollum
Mr. Moran
Mr. Olver
Mr. Pastor
Mr. Price
Mr. Rothman
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Schiff
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Moran
Description of Motion: To strike Section 432 relating to the stream buffer rule funding prohibition.
Results: Defeated 19 yeas to 27 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.8

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Dicks	Mr. Alexander
Mr. Farr	Mr. Austria
Mr. Honda	Mr. Bonner
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Calvert
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Carter
Ms. Lee	Mr. Cole
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Crenshaw
Ms. McCollum	Mr. Culberson
Mr. Moran	Mr. Dent
Mr. Olver	Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mr. Pastor	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Price	Mr. Flake
Mr. Rothman	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Ms. Granger
Mr. Schiff	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Latham
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. LaTourette
Mr. Wolf	Mr. Lewis
	Mrs. Lummis
	Mr. Nunnelee
	Mr. Rehberg
	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Simpson
	Mr. Womack
	Mr. Yoder
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Austria
Description of Motion: To prohibit funding for the Environmental Protection Agency to finalize a new greenhouse gas standard for automobiles after model year 2016.
Results: Adopted 27 yeas to 20 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.9

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Aderholt	Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Alexander	Mr. Dicks
Mr. Austria	Mr. Farr
Mr. Bonner	Mr. Fattah
Mr. Calvert	Mr. Honda
Mr. Carter	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Cole	Ms. Lee
Mr. Crenshaw	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Culberson	Mrs. Lowey
Mr. Dent	Ms. McCollum
Mr. Diaz-Balart	Mr. Moran
Mrs. Emerson	Mr. Olver
Mr. Flake	Mr. Pastor
Mr. Frelinghuysen	Mr. Price
Ms. Granger	Mr. Rothman
Mr. Graves	Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Kingston	Mr. Schiff
Mr. Latham	Mr. Serrano
Mr. LaTourette	Mr. Visclosky
Mrs. Lummis	Mr. Wolf
Mr. Nunnelee	
Mr. Rehberg	
Mr. Rogers	
Mr. Simpson	
Mr. Womack	
Mr. Yoder	
Mr. Young	

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Flake
Description of Motion: To prohibit funding for the Environmental Protection Agency to modify the primary or secondary air standard for coarse particulate matter under the Clean Air Act.
Results: Adopted 29 yeas to 18 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.10

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Aderholt	Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Alexander	Mr. Dicks
Mr. Austria	Mr. Farr
Mr. Bonner	Mr. Fattah
Mr. Calvert	Mr. Honda
Mr. Carter	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Cole	Ms. Lee
Mr. Crenshaw	Mrs. Lowey
Mr. Culberson	Ms. McCollum
Mr. Dent	Mr. Moran
Mr. Diaz-Balart	Mr. Olver
Mrs. Emerson	Mr. Pastor
Mr. Flake	Mr. Price
Mr. Frelinghuysen	Mr. Rothman
Ms. Granger	Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Graves	Mr. Schiff
Mr. Kingston	Mr. Serrano
Mr. Latham	Mr. Visclosky
Mr. LaTourette	
Mr. Lewis	
Mrs. Lummis	
Mr. Nunnelee	
Mr. Rehberg	
Mr. Rogers	
Mr. Simpson	
Mr. Wolf	
Mr. Womack	
Mr. Yoder	
Mr. Young	

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Rehberg
Description of Motion: To prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from using funds to develop, propose, finalize, implement, enforce or administer any regulation that would establish new financial responsibility requirements under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.
Results: Adopted 28 yeas to 17 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.11

Members Voting Yea

Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Alexander
Mr. Austria
Mr. Bonner
Mr. Calvert
Mr. Carter
Mr. Cole
Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. Culberson
Mr. Dent
Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Flake
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Granger
Mr. Graves
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Latham
Mr. LaTourette
Mr. Lewis
Mrs. Lummis
Mr. Nunnelee
Mr. Rehberg
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Womack
Mr. Yoder
Mr. Young

Members Voting Nay

Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Dicks
Mr. Farr
Mr. Fattah
Mr. Honda
Mr. Jackson
Ms. Lee
Mrs. Lowey
Ms. McCollum
Mr. Moran
Mr. Pastor
Mr. Price
Mr. Rothman
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Schiff
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Ms. McCollum
Description of Motion: To increase funding for forestry programs and to increase grazing fees on lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management or the Secretary of Agriculture through the Forest Service.
Results: Defeated 19 yeas to 27 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.12

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Dicks	Mr. Alexander
Mr. Farr	Mr. Austria
Mr. Fattah	Mr. Bonner
Mr. Honda	Mr. Calvert
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Carter
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Cole
Ms. Lee	Mr. Crenshaw
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Culberson
Ms. McCollum	Mr. Dent
Mr. Moran	Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mr. Olver	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Flake
Mr. Price	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Rothman	Ms. Granger
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Graves
Mr. Schiff	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Latham
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. LaTourette
	Mr. Lewis
	Mrs. Lummis
	Mr. Nunnelee
	Mr. Rehberg
	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Simpson
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Womack

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mrs. Lummis
Description of Motion: To direct the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a cumulative assessment of the impacts of certain EPA regulations and prohibiting funding for the "Utility MACT" and "Transport" rules.
Results: Adopted 25 yeas to 20 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.13

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Aderholt	Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Alexander	Mr. Dicks
Mr. Austria	Mr. Farr
Mr. Bonner	Mr. Fattah
Mr. Calvert	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Carter	Mr. Honda
Mr. Cole	Ms. Kaptur
Mr. Crenshaw	Ms. Lee
Mr. Culberson	Mrs. Lowey
Mr. Dent	Ms. McCollum
Mr. Diaz-Balart	Mr. Moran
Mrs. Emerson	Mr. Olver
Mr. Flake	Mr. Pastor
Ms. Granger	Mr. Price
Mr. Graves	Mr. Rothman
Mr. Kingston	Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Latham	Mr. Schiff
Mr. LaTourette	Mr. Serrano
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Visclosky
Mrs. Lummis	Mr. Wolf
Mr. Nunnelee	
Mr. Rehberg	
Mr. Rogers	
Mr. Simpson	
Mr. Womack	

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

Date: July 12, 2011
Measure: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2012
Motion by: Mr. Lewis
Description of Motion: To report the bill to the House, as amended.
Results: Adopted 28 yeas to 18 nays.

ROLL CALL NO.14

Members Voting Yea

Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Alexander
Mr. Austria
Mr. Bonner
Mr. Calvert
Mr. Carter
Mr. Cole
Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. Culberson
Mr. Dent
Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Flake
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Granger
Mr. Graves
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Latham
Mr. LaTourette
Mr. Lewis
Mrs. Lummis
Mr. Nunnelee
Mr. Rehberg
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Womack
Mr. Yoder

Members Voting Nay

Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Dicks
Mr. Farr
Mr. Fattah
Mr. Honda
Ms. Kaptur
Ms. Lee
Mrs. Lowey
Ms. McCollum
Mr. Moran
Mr. Olver
Mr. Pastor
Mr. Price
Mr. Rothman
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Schiff
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is a statement of general performance goals and objectives for which this measure authorizes funding:

The Committee on Appropriations considers program performance, including a program's success in developing and attaining outcome-related goals and objectives, in developing funding recommendations.

RESCISSION OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the rescission recommended in the accompanying bill:

Department and activity:

Amounts recommended for rescission:

Department of the Interior: Land and Water Conservation Fund (contract authority) $30,000,000.

Environmental Protection Agency: State and Tribal Assistance Grants $140,000,000.

TRANSFERS OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the transfer of funds in the accompanying bill.

APPROPRIATION TRANSFERS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

Account from which transfer is made	Amount (000's)	Account to which transfer is made	Amount (000's)
Department of the Interior, National Park Service.	not specified	Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.	not specified
Department of the Interior, Operation of Indian Programs.	not specified	Tribal trust forestry accounts	not specified
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs Construction.	not specified	Bureau of Reclamation	not specified
Department of the Interior, Office of Insular Affairs.	not specified	Secretary of Agriculture	not specified
Department of the Interior, Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians.	not specified	Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of the Solicitor and Office of the Secretary accounts.	not specified
Department of the Interior, Wildland Fire Management.	not specified	Department of the Interior, for repayment of advances made during emergencies.	not specified
Department of the Interior, Wildland Fire Management.	up to $50,000	Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	up to $50,000
Department of the Interior, FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund.	not specified	Department of the Interior, Wildland Fire Management.	not specified
Department of the Interior, Working Capital Fund.	not specified	Department of the Interior, any account.	not specified
Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Substance Superfund.	not specified	Other Federal Agencies	not specified
Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Substance Superfund.	$9,955	Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Inspector General.	$9,955
Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Substance Superfund.	$23,016	Environmental Protection Agency, Science and Technology.	$23,016

APPROPRIATION TRANSFERS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

Account from which transfer is made	Amount (000's)	Account to which transfer is made	Amount (000's)
Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Programs and Management.	up to $250,000	Other Federal Department or Agency for Great Lakes Initiative.	up to $250,000
USDA, Forest Service, Capital Improvement and Maintenance.	not specified	General Fund of the Treasury	not specified
USDA, Forest Service, Capital Improvement and Maintenance.	up to $9,000	National Forest System	up to $9,000
USDA, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	not specified	USDA, Forest Service, for repayment of advances made during emergencies.	not specified
USDA, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	not specified	USDA, Forest Service, National Forest System.	not specified
USDA, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	not specified	USDA, Forest Service, Forest and Rangeland Research.	not specified
USDA, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	not specified	USDA, Forest Service, State and Private Forestry.	not specified
USDA, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	up to $10,000	Secretary of the Interior	up to $10,000
USDA, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	up to $27,100	USDA, Forest Service, National Forest System.	up to $27,100
USDA, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	up to $50,000	Department of the Interior, Wildland Fire Management.	up to $50,000
USDA, Forest Service, FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund.	not specified	USDA, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	not specified

DISCLOSURE OF EARMARKS AND CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

Neither the bill nor the report contains any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined by clause 9 of rule XXI.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII, CLAUSE 3(e) (RAMSEYER RULE)

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SECTION 6 OF THE ACT OF JULY 1, 1980

(Public Law 96–297)

SEC. 6. VISITOR CENTER.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) FUNDING.—The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc., shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of expenses of, the establishment of the visitor center. No Federal funds*, except funds awarded through competitive grants,* shall be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the visitor center.

SECTION 503 OF THE FOREST SERVICE REALIGNMENT AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

SEC. 503. AUTHORIZATION FOR CONVEYANCE OF FOREST SERVICE ADMINISTRATIVE SITES.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary to initiate the conveyance of an administrative site under this title expires on September 30, [2011] *2016*.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 330 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SEC. 330. [In fiscal years 2001 through 2011] *In fiscal year 2012 and each fiscal year thereafter*, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, subject to annual review of Congress, [may establish pilot programs] involving the land management agencies referred to in this section to conduct projects, planning, permitting, leasing, contracting and other activities, either jointly or on behalf of one another; may co-locate in Federal offices and facilities leased by an agency of either Department; and promulgate special rules as needed to test the feasibility of issuing unified permits, applications, and leases. The Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture may make reciprocal delegations of their respective authorities, duties and responsibilities in support of the "Service First" initiative agency-wide to promote customer service and efficiency. Nothing herein shall alter, expand or limit the applicability of any public law or regulation to lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service. To facilitate the sharing of resources under the Service First initiative, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture may make transfers of funds and reimbursement of funds on an annual basis, including transfers and reimbursements for multi-year projects, except that this authority may not be used to circumvent requirements and limitations imposed on the use of funds.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 347 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

STEWARDSHIP END RESULT CONTRACTING PROJECTS

SEC. 347. (a) IN GENERAL.—Until [September 30, 2013] *September 30, 2023*, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, via agreement or contract as appropriate, may enter into stewardship contracting projects with private persons or other public or private entities to perform services to achieve land manage-

ment goals for the national forests and the public lands that meet local and rural community needs.

* * * * * * *

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

* * * * * * *

TITLE IV—PERMITS AND LICENSES

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM

SEC. 402. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(l) LIMITATION ON PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall not require a permit under this section, nor shall the Administrator directly or indirectly require any State to require a permit, for discharges of stormwater runoff from roads, the construction, use, or maintenance of which are associated with silvicultural activities, or from other silvicultural activities involving nursery operations, site preparation, reforestation and subsequent cultural treatment, thinning, prescribed burning, pest and fire control, harvesting operations, or surface drainage.

* * * * * * *

(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—

(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:

(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act that is relevant to protecting water quality, if—

(i) the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation; or

(ii) the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.

(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (p).

(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:

(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.

(ii) Treatment works effluent.

(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 10101 OF THE OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

SEC. 10101. FEE.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) For each placer claim held by an association of 2 or more persons, the claim maintenance fee shall be charged—

(1) for each 20-acre tract that is subject to the claim; and

(2) for any remaining tract (after application of paragraph (1)) that is subject to the claim.

[(c)] *(d)* OIL SHALE CLAIMS SUBJECT TO CLAIM MAINTENANCE FEES UNDER ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 1992.—This section shall not apply to any oil shale claims for which a fee is required to be paid under section 2511(e)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–486; 106 Stat. 3111; 30 U.S.C. 242).

[(d)] *(e)* WAIVER.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

CLEAN AIR ACT

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—GENERAL

* * * * * * *

SEC. 328. AIR POLLUTION FROM OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF ACTIVITIES.

(a)(1) APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN AREAS.—Not later than 12 months after the enactment of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, following consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, the Administrator, by rule, shall establish requirements to control air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf sources located offshore of the States along the Pacific, Arctic and Atlantic Coasts, and along the United States Gulf Coast off the State of Florida eastward of longitude 87 degrees and 30 minutes ("OCS sources") to attain and maintain Federal and State ambient air quality standards and to comply with the provisions of part C of title I. For such sources located within 25 miles of the seaward boundary of such States, such requirements shall be the same as would be applicable if the source were located in the corresponding onshore area, and shall include, but not be limited to, State and local requirements for emission controls, emission limitations, offsets, permitting, monitoring, testing, and reporting*, except that any air quality impact of any OCS source shall be measured or modeled, as appropriate, and determined solely with respect to the impacts in the corresponding onshore area*. New OCS sources shall comply

with such requirements on the date of promulgation and existing OCS sources shall comply on the date 24 months thereafter. The Administrator shall update such requirements as necessary to maintain consistency with onshore regulations. The authority of this subsection shall supersede section 5(a)(8) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act but shall not repeal or modify any other Federal, State, or local authorities with respect to air quality. Each requirement established under this section shall be treated, for purposes of sections 113, 114, 116, 120, and 304, as a standard under section 111 and a violation of any such requirement shall be considered a violation of section 111(e).

* * * * * * *

(4) DEFINITIONS.—**[**For purposes of subsections (a) and (b)**]** *For purposes of this subsection and subsections (b) and (d)*—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF SOURCE.—The terms "Outer Continental Shelf source" and "OCS source" include any equipment, activity, or facility which—

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

Such activities include, but are not limited to, platform and drill ship exploration, construction, development, production, processing, and transportation. For purposes of this subsection, emissions from any vessel servicing or associated with an OCS source, including emissions while at the OCS source or en route to or from the OCS source within 25 miles of the OCS source, **[**shall be considered direct emissions from the OCS source**]** *shall be considered direct emissions from the OCS source but shall not be subject to any emission control requirement applicable to the source under subpart 1 of part C of title I of this Act. For platform or drill ship exploration, an OCS source is established at the point in time when drilling commences at a location and ceases to exist when drilling activity ends at such location or is temporarily interrupted because the platform or drill ship relocates for weather or other reasons*.

* * * * * * *

(d) PERMIT APPLICATION.—In the case of a completed application for a permit under this Act for platform or drill ship exploration for an OCS source—

(1) final agency action (including any reconsideration of the issuance or denial of such permit) shall be taken not later than 6 months after the date of filing such completed application;

(2) the Environmental Appeals Board of the Environmental Protection Agency shall have no authority to consider any matter regarding the consideration, issuance, or denial of such permit;

(3) no administrative stay of the effectiveness of such permit may extend beyond the date that is 6 months after the date of filing such completed application;

(4) such final agency action shall be considered to be nationally applicable under section 307(b); and

(5) judicial review of such final agency action shall be available only in accordance with section 307(b) without additional administrative review or adjudication.

* * * * * * *

FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT

* * * * * * *

SEC. 3. REGISTRATION OF PESTICIDES.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) MISCELLANEOUS.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Except as provided in section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator or a State may not require a permit under such Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 206 OF THE FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976

EXCHANGES

SEC. 206. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(j) In the case of any exchange involving public land or National Forest System land to be carried out (whether directly or through a third-party) under this Act or other applicable law, the Secretary concerned shall provide written notice of the proposed land exchange to each owner of non-Federal land adjoining the parcel of public land or National Forest System land proposed for exchange and each owner of non-Federal land adjoining the non-Federal land proposed to be acquired in the exchange. The Secretary shall determine adjoining landowners using the most-recent available tax records. For purposes of providing notification under this subsection, adjoining land means land sharing any length of border with the public land, National Forest System land, or non-Federal land subject to the proposed exchange, including contact solely at a boundary corner.

CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill, which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law. In most in-

stances these provisions have been included in prior appropriations Acts.

The bill includes the following changes in application of existing law:

OVERALL BILL

Providing that certain appropriations remain available until expended or extends the availability of funds beyond the fiscal year where programs or projects are continuing but for which legislation does not specifically authorize such extended availability. This authority tends to result in savings by preventing the practice of committing funds on low priority projects at the end of the fiscal year to avoid losing the funds.

Limiting, in certain instances, the obligation of funds for particular functions or programs. These limitations include restrictions on the obligation of funds for administrative expenses, travel expenses, the use of consultants, and programmatic areas within the overall jurisdiction of a particular agency.

Limiting official entertainment or reception and representation expenses for selected agencies in the bill.

Continuing ongoing activities of those Federal agencies, which require annual authorization or additional legislation, which has not been enacted.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Providing funds to the Bureau for the management of lands and resources.

Providing funds to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation under certain conditions.

Permitting the use of fees for processing applications for permit to drill.

Permitting the use of fees for conducting oil and gas inspections.

Permitting the use of mining fee collections for program operations.

Permitting the use of fees from communication site rentals.

CONSTRUCTION

Providing funds to the Bureau for construction.

LAND ACQUISITION

Requiring that funding for the program is derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

Providing funds for the Oregon and California Grant Lands.

Authorizing the transfer of certain collections from the Oregon and California Land Grants Fund to the Treasury.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

Allowing certain funds to be transferred to the Department of the Interior for range improvements.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

Allowing the use of certain collected funds for certain administrative costs and operation of termination of certain facilities.

Allowing the use of funds on any damaged public lands.

Authorizing the Secretary to use monies from forfeitures, compromises or settlements for improvement, protection and rehabilitation of public lands under certain conditions.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

Allowing certain contributed funds to be advanced for administrative costs and other activities of the Bureau.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Permitting the Bureau to enter into agreements with public and private entities, including States.

Permitting the Bureau to manage improvements to which the United States has title.

Permitting the payment of rewards for information on violations of law on Bureau lands.

Providing for cost-sharing arrangements for printing services.

Permitting the Bureau to conduct certain projects for State governments on a reimbursable basis.

Prohibiting the use of funds for the destruction of wild horses and burros.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Prohibiting funding for certain Endangered Species Act programs.

Permitting payment for information or rewards in the law enforcement program.

LAND ACQUISITION

Requiring that funding for the program is derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

Requiring that funding for the program is derived from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund.

STATE AND TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS

Specifying the State and tribal wildlife grants distribution formula, the planning and cost-sharing requirements, and limiting administrative costs.

Providing that no State, Territory, or other jurisdiction shall receive a grant if its conservation plan is disapproved.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Providing that programs may be carried out by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities.

Providing for repair of damage to public roads.

Providing options for the purchase of land not to exceed $1.

Permitting cost-shared arrangements for printing services.

Permitting the acceptance of donated aircraft.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Designating funds for Everglades restoration.

Providing for repair, rehabilitation and maintenance of National Park Service assets.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

Providing for expenses not otherwise provided for.

CONSTRUCTION

Providing funds for modified water deliveries to Everglades National Park with certain restrictions.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Rescinding $30,000,000 in Land and Water Conservation Fund contract authority.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

Requiring that funding for the program is derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Allowing certain franchise fees to be available for expenditure without further appropriation to extinguish or reduce liability for certain possessory interests.

Providing for the retention of administrative costs under certain Land and Water Conservation Fund programs.

Allows National Park Service funds to be transferred to the Federal Lands Highway Administration for purposes authorized under 23 U.S.C. 204 for reasonable administrative support costs.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Providing funds to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, hydrology, biology, and the mineral and water resources.

Providing funds to classify lands as to their mineral and water resources.

Funding engineering supervision to power permittees and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensees.

Funding the administration of the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641) to conduct inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries.

Providing certain funds only for cooperation with States and municipalities for water resources investigations.

Prohibiting the conduct of new surveys on private property without permission.

Requiring cost sharing for cooperative topographic mapping and water resource data collection activities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Allowing funds to be used for certain security, contracting, technical services, construction, maintenance, acquisition, and representation expenses.

Permitting the use of certain contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements.

Recognizing students and recent graduates as Federal employees for the purposes of travel and work injury compensation.

BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY, REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT

BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY

Permitting funds for mineral leasing and environmental study; enforcing laws and contracts; and for matching grants.

Permitting the use of certain excess receipts from Outer Continental Shelf leasing activities.

Providing that hereafter the term "qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues" as defined in section 102(9)(A) of Public Law 109–432 shall include only the portion of rental revenues that would have been collected at the rental rates in effect before August 5, 1993.

Providing for reasonable expenses related to volunteer beach and marine cleanup activities.

Provides that funds may be used which shall be derived from non-refundable inspection fees collected in 2012.

OIL SPILL RESEARCH

Providing that funds shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

Permitting payment to State and tribal personnel for travel and per diem expenses for training.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

Allowing the use of debt recovery to pay for debt collection.

Allowing that certain funds made available under title IV of Public Law 95–87 may be used for any required non-Federal share of the cost of certain projects.

Allowing funds to be used for travel expenses of State and tribal personnel while attending certain OSM training.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Permits the Secretary to transfer title for computer equipment to States and Tribes.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

Allowing the use of certain funds for official reception and representation expenses.

Limiting funds for welfare assistance payments, except for disaster relief.

Limiting funds for contract support costs.

Limiting the use of funds for school operations of Bureau-funded schools and other education programs.

Providing that the Bureau shall fund the school operations costs of the Jones Academy under certain conditions.

Permitting the use of tribal priority allocations for general assistance payments to individuals, for contract support costs, and school operations costs.

Providing for an Indian self-determination fund.

Limiting funds for administrative cost grants under certain circumstances.

Allowing the transfer of certain forestry funds.

Allows the use of funds to purchase uniforms or other identifying articles of clothing for personnel if it enhances the safety of Bureau field employees.

CONSTRUCTION

Providing for the transfer of Navajo irrigation project funds to the Bureau of Reclamation.

Providing that six percent of Federal Highway Trust Fund contract authority may be used for construction management costs.

Providing Safety of Dams funds on a non-reimbursable basis.

Requiring the use of administrative and cost accounting principles for certain school construction projects and exempting such projects from certain requirements.

Requiring conformance with building codes and health and safety standards.

Specifying the procedure for dispute resolution.

Limiting the control of construction projects when certain time frames have not been met.

Allowing reimbursement of construction costs from the Office of Special Trustee.

INDIAN GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Limiting funds for administrative expenses and for subsidizing total loan principal.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Allowing the use of funds for direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, and grants.

Allowing contracting for the San Carlos Irrigation Project.

Allowing the use of certain funds for expenses of exhibits.

Limiting the use of funds for certain contracts, grants and cooperative agreements.

Allowing Tribes to return appropriated funds.

Prohibiting funding of Alaska schools.

Limiting the number of schools and the expansion of grade levels in individual schools.

Specifying distribution of indirect and administrative costs for certain Tribes.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Allowing the use of certain funds for official reception and representation expenses.

Permitting payments to former Bureau of Mines workers.

Designating funds for consolidated appraisal services to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Designating funds for mineral revenue management activities.

Allowing certain payments authorized for the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program to be retained for administrative expenses.

Provides that no Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program payment be made to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than $100.

Allowing certain refunds of overpayments in connection with certain Indian leases.

Providing two percent deduction of State royalties to help cover Federal administrative costs.

INSULAR AFFAIRS, ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

Designating funds for various programs and for salaries and expenses of the Office of Insular Affairs and providing until expended for the former.

Allowing audits of the financial transactions of the Territorial and Insular governments by the GAO.

Providing grant funding under certain terms of the Agreement of the Special Representatives on Future United States Financial Assistance for the Northern Mariana Islands.

Allowing grants for the Pacific Basin Development Council.

Allowing a grant to the Close Up Foundation.

Providing for capital infrastructure in various Territories.

Allowing appropriations for disaster assistance to be used as non-Federal matching funds for hazard mitigation grants.

COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

Providing grants to Palau, the Marshall Islands, and Micronesia.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INSULAR AFFAIRS

Allowing, at the request of the Governor of Guam, for certain discretionary and mandatory funds to be used to assist securing certain rural electrification loans through the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

Limiting the amount of funding available for the historical accounting of Indian trust fund accounts.

Allowing transfers to other Department of the Interior accounts.

Providing no-year funding for certain Indian Self Determination Act grants.

Specifying that the statute of limitations shall not commence on any claim resulting from trust funds losses.

Exempting quarterly statements for Indian trust accounts $15 or less.

Requiring annual statements and records maintenance for Indian trust accounts.

Limiting use of funds to correct administrative errors in Indian trust accounts.

Permitting the use of recoveries from erroneous payments pursuant to Indian trust accounts.

DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

Providing funds for wildland fire management.

Limiting funds for renovation or construction of fire facilities.

Permitting the repayments of funds transferred from other accounts for firefighting.

Permitting the use of funds for lodging and subsistence of firefighters.

Permitting the use of grants, contracts and cooperative agreements for hazardous fuels reduction, including cost-sharing and local assistance.

Permitting cost-sharing of cooperative agreements with non-Federal entities under certain circumstances.

Permitting reimbursement to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for consultation activities under the Endangered Species Act.

Providing certain terms for leases of real property with local governments.

Providing funds for support of Federal emergency response actions.

Requiring the use of emergency supplemental unobligated balances before obligating other funds.

Providing for the transfer of funds between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture for wildland fire management.

FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND

Providing funds for the FLAME fund.

CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

Providing funds for response action, including associated activities, performed pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FUND

Providing funds for activities to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, and Public Law 101–337.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Allowing funds for the financial and business management system and information technology improvement.

Prohibiting use of funds to establish reserves in the working capital fund with exceptions.

Allowing assessments for reasonable charges for training services at the National Indian Program Center and use of these funds hereafter under certain conditions.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Allowing acquisition of aircraft.

Allowing the sale of existing aircraft with proceeds used to offset the purchase price of replacement aircraft.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Allowing transfer of funds for certain reconstruction of facilities, aircraft or utilities in emergency situations.

Allowing transfer of funds in certain emergency situations, including wildfires and oil spill response, if other funds provided in other accounts will be exhausted within 30 days and a supplemental appropriation is requested as promptly as possible.

Permitting the Department to use limited funding for certain services.

Permitting the transfer of funds between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians and limiting amounts for historical accounting activities.

Permitting the redistribution of certain Indian funds with limitations.

Permitting the conveyance of the Twin Cities Research Center.

Allowing payment of attorney fees for Federal employees related to the Cobell v. Salazar litigation.

Providing authority to the National Park Service to implement modifications to the restoration of the Everglades ecosystem.

Authorizing the acquisition of lands and leases for Ellis, Governors and Liberty Islands.

Extending the authority to hire Indian Probate judges.

Permitting the reorganization of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Enforcement and Regulation.

Permitting the Secretary of the Interior to enter into long-term agreements for wild horse and burro holding facilities.

Permitting Bureau of Indian Affairs operated schools to rent or lease certain space and retain receipts.

Requiring the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to mark hatchery salmon.

Addressing a matter of jurisdiction between the National Park Service and the Coast Guard on the Yukon River within the Yukon-Charley National Preserve.

Providing the Secretary of the Interior authority to hire college and graduate students who have completed internship programs with a land management agency.

Requiring the exhaustion of administrative review before litigants may file in Federal court.

Providing that certain rules published by the Secretary shall not be subject to judicial review if certain conditions are met.

Providing exemption for trailing livestock in fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014.

Requiring the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement to report to the Committee quarterly on permitting.

Allowing the Department of the Interior to lease certain land within Fort Pulaski National Monument.

Reinstating a demonstration program to allow certain tribes to maintain some autonomy from the Department of the Interior in the management of their trust funds and finances.

Prohibiting the use of funds to implement, administer or enforce Secretarial Order 3310.

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Providing for operating expenses in support of research and development.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

Allowing hire and maintenance of passenger motor vehicles and operation of aircraft and purchase of reprints and library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

Limiting amounts for official representation and reception expenses.

Providing two-year funding availability for administrative costs of Brownfields program.

Designating funding for specific Geographic Programs as specified in the explanatory statement to this Act.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

Allowing distribution of funds to purchase services from other agencies under certain circumstances.

Providing for the transfer of funds within certain agency accounts.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

Providing for grants to Federally-recognized Indian Tribes.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Limiting funding amounts for certain programs.

Specifies funding for capitalization grants for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds and allows certain amounts for additional subsidies.

Designating funds for specific sections of law.

Providing certain grants under authority of section 103, Clean Air Act.

Providing funding for environmental information exchange network initiatives grants, statistical surveys of water resources and enhancements to State monitoring programs, tribal grants, and underground storage tank projects.

Providing waivers for certain uses of Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds for State administrative costs for grants to Federally-recognized Indian Tribes and grants to specific Territories and Freely Associated States.

Requiring that not less than 30 percent of Clean Water and Drinking Water funds shall be used by States for forgiveness of principal or negative interest loans.

Prohibiting the use of funds for jurisdictions that permit development or construction of additional colonia areas.

Providing that hereafter the Administrator may transfer funds between Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Funds for Tribes in a manner similar as provided to States.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Allowing awards of grants to Federally-recognized Indian Tribes.

Authorizing the collection and obligation of pesticide registration service fees.

Allows transfer of funds from the "Environmental Programs and Management" account to support the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and provides for certain interagency agreements and grants to various entities in support of this effort.

Requiring that section 513 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act shall apply to certain construction projects.

Requiring that section 1450(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act shall apply to certain construction projects.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

Providing funds for forest and rangeland research.

Designating funds for the forest inventory and analysis program and the forest products lab.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

Providing for forest health management, including treatments of certain pests or invasive plants, and for restoring damaged forests, and for cooperative forestry, education and land conservation activities, and conducting an international program.

Deriving forest legacy funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Providing funds for the National Forest System.

Designating funds for forest products.

Depositing funds in the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund.

Designating funds in the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

Providing funds for construction, reconstruction, and maintenance and acquisition of buildings and other facilities and infrastructure; and for construction, capital improvement, decommissioning, and maintenance of forest roads and trails.

Designating funds for the Legacy Road and Trail Remediation program.

Requiring that funds becoming available in fiscal year 2012 for the road and trails fund (16 U.S.C. 501) shall be transferred to the Treasury.

Transferring funds to the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program.

LAND ACQUISITION

Deriving funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

Providing that six percent of range betterment funds may be used for administrative expenses.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

Permitting the use of funds for emergency rehabilitation and restoration and hazardous fuels reduction to support emergency response and wildfire suppression.

Providing for the use of funds on adjacent, non-Federal lands for hazard reduction.

Allowing the use of wildland fire funds to repay advances from other accounts.

Allowing reimbursement of States for certain wildfire emergency activities.

Designating funds for State fire assistance, volunteer fire assistance and forest health on Federal and State and private lands.

Providing for cost-shared cooperative agreements.

Providing for the transfer of wildland fire funds between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

Providing for the use of hazardous fuels reduction funds to create incentives for increased use of biomass on National Forest lands and for the Forest Biomass for Energy Program.

Depositing funds into the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund.

Requiring the use of emergency supplemental unobligated balances before obligating other funds.

FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND

Providing fund for the FLAME fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Permitting the purchase of passenger motor vehicles and proceeds from the sale of aircraft may be used to purchase replacement aircraft.

Allowing funds for certain employment contracts.

Allowing funds to be used for purchase and alteration of buildings.

Allowing for acquisition of certain lands and interests.

Allowing expenses for certain volunteer activities.

Providing for the cost of uniforms.

Providing for debt collections on certain contracts.

Allowing transfer of funds in certain emergency situations if all other funds provided for wildfire suppression will be exhausted within 30 days and the Secretary notifies the Committees 5 days in advance.

Allowing funds to be used through the Agency for International Development for work in foreign countries and to support other forestry activities outside of the United States.

Allowing the Forest Service, acting for the International Program, to sign certain funding agreements with foreign governments and institutions as well as with certain domestic agencies.

Limiting funds to support the Youth Conservation Corps and Public Lands Corps.

Limiting the use of funds for official reception and representation expenses.

Providing for matching funds for the National Forest Foundation and matching funds for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

Allowing funds to be used for technical assistance for certain rural communities.

Permitting funding assessments for facilities maintenance, rent, utilities, and other support services.

Prohibiting the transfer of funds under the Department of Agriculture transfer authority under certain conditions and preventing reprogramming without advance approval of the Appropriations Committees.

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

Providing that tribal contract and grant funding is deemed obligated at the time of grant or contract award and remains available until expended.

Providing no-year funds for contract medical care including the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund.

Providing for loan repayment under sections 104 and 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act with certain conditions and making the funds available for certain other purposes.

Providing funding and allocation direction for the methamphetamine, domestic violence, and substance abuse programs.

Providing that certain contracts and grants may be performed in two fiscal years.

Providing for use of collections and reporting of collections under Title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.

Providing no-year funding for scholarship funds.

Exempting certain tribal funding from fiscal year constraints.

Limiting contract support cost spending.

Providing for the collection of individually identifiable health information relating to the Americans with Disabilities Act by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Permitting the use of Indian Health Care Improvement Fund monies for facilities improvement and providing no-year funding availability.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Providing that facilities funds may be used to purchase land, modular buildings and trailers.

Providing for TRANSAM equipment to be purchased from the Department of Defense.

Prohibiting the use of funds for sanitation facilities for new homes funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Allowing for the purchase of ambulances.

Providing for a demolition fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Providing for per diem expenses for senior level positions.

Providing for payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, purchase of motor vehicles, aircraft and reprints.

Providing for purchase and erection of modular buildings.

Providing funds for uniforms.

Allowing funding to be used for attendance at professional meetings.

Providing that health care may be extended to non-Indians at Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and for the expenditure of collected funds.

Providing for transfers of funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Indian Health Service.

Prohibiting limitations on certain Federal travel and transportation expenses.

Limiting the use of funds for assessments or charges by the Department of Health and Human Services except under certain conditions.

Allowing de-obligation and re-obligation of funds applied to self-governance funding agreements.

Prohibiting the expenditure of funds to implement new eligibility regulations.

Permitting certain reimbursements for goods and services provided to Tribes.

Providing that reimbursements for training, technical assistance, or services include total costs.

Prohibiting changing the appropriations structure without approval of the Appropriations Committees.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

Providing for the conduct of health studies, testing, and monitoring.

Designating funds for Individual Learning Accounts and providing no-year funding.

Providing deadlines for health assessments and studies.

Limiting use of funds for administrative costs.

Limiting the number of toxicological profiles.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Limiting the use of funds for official reception and representation expenses.

Designating the appointment and duties of the chairman.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

Permitting use of funds for hire of passenger vehicles, uniforms or allowances, and limiting the use of funds for per diem expenses and the number of senior level positions.

Providing for the appointment of the EPA, Inspector General to serve as Inspector General for the Board.

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Defining eligible relocatees.

Prohibiting movement of any single Navajo or Navajo family unless a new or replacement home is available.

Limiting re-locatees to one new or replacement home.

Establishing a priority for relocation of Navajos to those certified eligible who have selected and received homesites on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Limiting certain lease terms.

Providing for purchase of passenger vehicles and certain rental, repair and cleaning of uniforms.

Designating funds for certain programs including the National Museum of African American History and Culture and providing no-year funds.

Providing that funds may be used to support American overseas research centers.

Allowing for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations.

FACILITIES CAPITAL

Designating funds for maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and construction and for consultant services.

Providing that any future procurement for construction of the National Museum of African American History and Culture may cover the full scope of the project.

Providing that any solicitation and contract for such procurement must contain a clause clarifying that any payment under the contract will be subject to the availability of funds.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Allowing payment in advance for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies.

Allowing for purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and employees and allowances therefor.

Allowing purchase or rental of devices for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds.

Providing for restoration and repair of works of art by contract under certain circumstances.

Providing no-year funds for special exhibitions.

REPAIR, RESTORATION, AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Providing lease agreements of no more than 10 years addressing space needs created by renovations under the Master Facilities Plan.

Permitting the Gallery to perform work by contract under certain circumstances.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Providing funds to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts Kennedy Center for operational and maintenance costs.

CAPITAL REPAIR AND RESTORATION

Providing funds to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts Kennedy Center for facility repair.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Provides funds for the support of projects and productions in the arts, including arts education and public outreach activities.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Specifies funds to carry out the matching grants program.

Allowing obligation of National Endowment for the Humanities current and prior year funds from gifts, bequests, and devises of money for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Prohibiting the use of funds for grants and contracts which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913.

Prohibiting the use of appropriated funds and permitting the use of non-appropriated funds for reception expenses.

Allowing the chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts to approve small grants under certain circumstances.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Permitting the charging and use of fees for its publications and accepting gifts related to the history of the Nation's Capital.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

Designating funds for equipment replacement and for repair, rehabilitation and for exhibition design and production and providing no year availability for these funds.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Provides funds for salaries and expenses associated with construction of a memorial dedicated to Dwight D. Eisenhower.

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Provides funds for construction of a memorial dedicated to Dwight D. Eisenhower.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Providing for public availability of information on consulting services contracts.

Prohibiting the use of funds to promote or oppose legislative proposals on which Congressional action is incomplete.

Providing for annual appropriations unless expressly provided otherwise in this Act.

Prohibiting the use of funds to provide personal cooks, chauffeurs or other personal servants to any office or employee.

Limiting assessments against programs funded in this bill.

Limiting funds for sale of giant sequoia trees in a manner different from the past.

Continuing a limitation on accepting and processing applications for patents and on the patenting of Federal lands; permitting processing of grandfathered applications; and permitting third-party contractors to process grandfathered applications.

Limiting the use of funds for contract support costs on Indian contracts.

Limiting funds for completing or issuing the five-year program under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act.

Limiting leasing and preleasing activities within National Monuments.

Providing the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture the authority through fiscal year 2013 to enter into reciprocal agreements with foreign firefighting organizations concerning the tort liability of firefighters.

Permitting consideration, when awarding contracts to local contractors who provide employment and training for dislocated and

displaced workers in economically disadvantaged rural communities, through fiscal year 2013.

Limiting takings for acquisition of lands except under certain conditions.

Modifying a provision addressing timber sales involving Alaskan Red Cedar.

Modifying a provision continuing certain authorities to renew grazing permits or leases administered by the Forest Service or Department of the Interior through 2016.

Providing that none of the funds made available by this Act may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN).

Prohibiting funds to enter into certain no-bid contracts except under certain conditions.

Requiring reports to Congress to be posted on public agency websites.

Continuing a provision that delineates grant guideline for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Continuing a provision that delineates the program priorities for the programs managed by the National Endowment for the Arts.

Amending existing law to allow for the use of certain competitive grants funds.

Extending the Forest Service Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 authority through 2016.

Modifying a provision allowing Department of the Interior bureaus and the Forest Service to conduct joint programs.

Allowing the State of Utah, through contracts or cooperative agreements with the Forest Service, to perform certain activities.

Requiring that the Department of the Interior, the EPA, the Forest Service, and the Indian Health Service provide the Committees on Appropriations a quarterly report on the status of balances of appropriations.

Requiring a government-wide report regarding expenditures on climate change.

Extending a provision allowing the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to enter into stewardship contracts.

Continuing a provision prohibiting the use of funds to promulgate or implement any regulation requiring the issuance of permits under title V of the Clean Air Act for carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, water vapor, or methane emissions.

Continuing a provision prohibiting the use of funds to implement any provision in a rule if that provision requires mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions from manure management systems.

Allowing Indian Tribes and tribal organizations to consolidate funds supplied by any Federal department or agency to carry out the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act.

Providing a one year stay for actions related to greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources.

Prohibiting the use of funds to develop, carry out, implement, or enforce proposed regulations published on June 18, 2010.

Prohibiting the use of funds to carry out, implement, administer or enforce proposed enhanced coordination procedures issued on June 11, 2009 or guidance dated April 1, 2010.

Prohibiting the use of funds to develop, propose, finalize, implement, administer or enforce any regulation that identifies fossil fuel combustion waste as hazardous waste.

Prohibiting the use of funds to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce a change or supplement to a rule or guidance documents pertaining to the definition of waters under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Prohibiting the use of funds to further develop, finalize, implement or enforce the proposed regulatory requirements published on April 20, 2011, or to develop or enforce any other new regulations or requirements designed to implement section 316(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Providing the Forest Service the authority to use a pre-decisional objection process in place of post-decisional appeals.

Clarifying Silvicultural Operations under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Prohibiting the use of funds to expand the stormwater discharge program under section 402(p) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act until certain criteria are met.

Modifying claim maintenance structure for placer claims held by two or more persons, known as association placer claims.

Recognizing the authority of States to implement flexible air permitting programs.

Maintaining current management of bighorn sheep as it relates to domestic sheep management for both the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

Clarifying current permitting activities for the outer continental shelf and setting parameters for the approval of exploration permits by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Providing direction to the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Academy of Sciences on review of the IRIS process.

Prohibiting the withdrawal of certain lands in the State of Arizona from the Mining Law of 1872 without the expressed consent of the Congress.

Prohibiting implementation of travel management rules in Region Five of the Forest Service.

Prohibiting EPA from taking action against registered pesticides in a response to a final biological opinion under the Endangered Species Act.

Prohibiting EPA from using funds to implement, administer or enforce the 2010 Portland Cement rule.

Prohibiting the government from entering into contracts or agreements with any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months.

Prohibiting EPA from using funds to implement, administer or enforce the lead renovation rule until EPA has approved a commercially-available lead test kit.

Prohibiting funds for contracts or agreements with entities with unpaid Federal tax liabilities that have not entered into payment agreements to remedy the liability.

Prohibiting EPA from using funds to implement, administer or enforce the 2010 water quality rule for the State of Florida.

Prohibiting EPA from using funds to prepare, propose, promulgate, finalize, implement, or enforce regulations for greenhouse gas

emissions from new motor vehicles or motor engines after model year 2016, and to grant a waiver to a State or political subdivision thereof to adopt or enforce standards for greenhouse gas emissions from new motor vehicles or motor engines after model year 2016.

Prohibiting EPA from using funds to modify the primary or secondary air standard for coarse particulate matter under the Clean Air Act.

Prohibiting EPA from using funds to develop, propose, finalize, implement, enforce or administer any regulation that would establish new financial responsibility requirements under CERCLA.

Prohibiting EPA from using funds to delineate new wetlands under the Clean Water Act in any county included in a major disaster declaration as a result of flooding in 2011.

Requiring the Indian Health Service to disburse funds to Alaska Native regional health entities instead of individual villages when such villages reside within areas served by regional health entities.

Requiring written notification to land owners adjacent to public and Federal land to be exchanged by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service.

Prohibiting EPA from providing funds to any Great Lakes state that, as determined by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, has a more stringent performance standard or ballast water exchange standard than either a revised Coast Guard standard or the standard adopted by the International Maritime Organization.

Prohibiting EPA from using funds to finalize proposed guidance on false or misleading pesticide labels. Prohibiting EPA from using funds to regulate ammonia or ammonium under the secondary air quality standard for nitrogen and sulfur oxides pursuant to the Clean Air Act.

Directing EPA to study the cumulative impacts of certain rules, guidelines and actions within 12 months, and prohibiting EPA from taking final actions with respect to two rules.

TITLE V—REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2011

Provides clarity regarding the process for permitting the use of pesticides near and around water bodies.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law:

[Dollars in thousands]

	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriations in last year of authorization	Appropriations in this bill
Bureau of Land Management:				
All discretionary programs	2002	Such sums	1,681,437	1,025,422
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:				
Resource Management:				
Endangered Species Act Amendments of 1988.	1992	41,500	42,373	141,561
Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Species Prevention and Control.	2002	6,000	6,000	8,244
Marine Mammal Protection Act Amendments of 1994.	1999	14,768	2,008	5,810
Klamath River Basin Fishery Resources Restoration Act.	2006	21,000	3,350	718

[Dollars in thousands]

	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriations in last year of authorization	Appropriations in this bill
Great Ape Conservation	2010	5,000	2,500	1,969
Marine Turtle Conservation Act	2009	5,000	2,000	983
Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act; the Safe, Accountable. Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act.	2011	% based on prior-year exercise taxes collected.	73,482	75,388
Coastal Barrier Resources Act of 1982; amended by Improvement Act of 2000 & Reauthorization Act of 2005.	2010	2,000	2,000	390
Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act.	2010	350	250	250
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act; amended by Reauthorization Act of 2006.	2010	25,000	7,537	7,537
Partners for Fish and Wildlife Act	2011	75,000	60,134	39,400
National Park Service:				
Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Water Trails.	2011	3,000	1,000	525
U.S. Geological Survey:				
Earthquake Hazards Program	2010	88,900	88,900	55,979
Bureau of Indian Affairs:				
The No Child Left Behind Act	2007	Such sums	549,293	670,853
Indian Tribal Justice	2007	Such sums	12,013	23,445
Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act.	1997	30,000	26,116	33,879
Transportation Equity Act	2009	27,000	26,046	25,431
Environmental Protection Agency:				
Hazardous Substance Superfund	1994	5,100,000	1,480,853	1,224,295
Clean Air Act	1997	Such sums	450,000	618,821
Clean Water Act	1990	135,000		312,073
National Estuary Program	2010	35,000	33,000	26,748
Great Lakes	2008	79,000	60,000	250,000
Lake Champlain Basin	2008	11,000	3,000	1,399
Long Island Sound Restoration	2010	40,000	7,000	2,962
Lake Pontchartrain	2011	20,000	1,000	955
Non-Point Source Management Program	1991	130,000	51,000	150,505
Chesapeake Bay Restoration	2005	40,000	23,000	50,000
FIFRA	1991	95,000	112,000	110,523
Toxic Substances Control Act	1983	62,000	69,000	100,123
State Programs	1983	2,000	0	15,000
Resource Conservation Act—General Authorization.	1988	80,000	75,000	112,643
Environmental Education	1996	9,000	9,000	0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants.				
Alaska Native Villages	1979	2,000	Not available	0
BEACH Act	2005	30,000	9,920	9,880
Brownfields Projects	2006	200,000	89,000	49,495
Clean Water SRF	1992	1,800,000	2,400,000	689,000
CERCLA/Brownfields Cat Grant	2006	50,000	49,000	50,000
Drinking Water SRF	2003	1,000,000	963,000	829,000
Grants for State Public Water	2003	100,000	93,000	105,489
Lead Containment Control Act of 1988.	1992	Such sums	Not available	14,535
Pollution Prevention Act	1993	8,000	6,800	4,930
Radon Abatement Act	1991	10,000	9,000	8,058
State Hazardous Waste Program Grants.	1988	60,000	67,000	103,139
Toxic Substances Control Act	1983	1,500	5,100	5,089
Underground Injection Control Grants.	2003	15,000	11,000	10,869
USDA Forest Service, National Forest Foundation.	1997	Such sums	2,000	3,000
National Endowment for the Arts	1993	Such sums	174,460	135,000
National Endowment for the Humanities	1993	Such sums	177,403	135,000

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how the authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year. This information follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 2012: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies				
General purpose discretionary	27,473	27,465	30,766	[1] 30,439
Mandatory	456	442	456	456

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

Five-Year Outlay Projections

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the following table contains five-year projections associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill:

BUDGET AUTHORITY (DISCRETIONARY)

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2012	.....	.....	.....	[2] 18,958
2013	.....	.....	.....	5,551
2014	.....	.....	.....	2,178
2015	.....	.....	.....	871
2016 and future years	.....	.....	.....	115

[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year authority.

ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2012	NA	5,288	NA	2,588

NA: Not applicable.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Pursuant to section 6(e) of the rules of the Committee on Appropriations, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States which states "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." Appropriations contained in this Act are made pursuant to this specific power granted by the Constitution.

DETAILED TABLE OF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

The following table provides the amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity and sub-activity. The reprogramming guidelines apply to levels outlined below.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of Lands and Resources					
Land Resources:					
Soil, water and air management	62,989	46,303	46,303	-16,686	---
Range management	76,915	71,603	87,532	+10,617	+15,929
Forestry management	9,945	9,730	9,945	---	+215
Riparian management	22,805	23,052	22,718	-87	-334
Cultural resources management	16,816	25,614	16,131	-685	-9,483
Wild horse and burro management	75,753	75,008	63,986	-11,767	-11,022
Subtotal	265,223	251,310	246,615	-18,608	-4,695
Wildlife and Fisheries:					
Wildlife management	37,430	36,973	37,430	---	+457
Fisheries management	13,599	13,354	13,354	-245	---
Subtotal	51,029	50,327	50,784	-245	+457
Threatened and endangered species	22,159	21,668	21,668	-491	---
Recreation Management:					
Wilderness management	19,664	19,587	18,421	-1,243	-1,166
Recreation resources management	49,153	57,170	49,153	---	-8,017
Subtotal	68,817	76,757	67,574	-1,243	-9,183

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Energy and Minerals:					
Oil and gas	70,130	39,632	74,582	+4,452	+34,950
Oil and gas permit processing fund	45,500	32,500	32,500	-13,000	---
(Pilot offices, Sec. 365, permit processing fund)	(21,000)	(20,973)	(20,973)	(-27)	---
Subtotal, Oil and gas/permit processing fund	115,630	72,132	107,082	-8,548	+34,950
Oil and gas offsetting permit processing fees	-45,500	-32,500	-32,500	+13,000	---
Inspection fees	---	37,950	---	---	-37,950
Offsetting collections, inspection fees	---	-37,950	---	---	+37,950
Coal management	9,724	7,054	7,054	-2,670	---
Other mineral resources	10,597	8,415	10,415	-182	+2,000
Renewable energy	---	19,735	19,735	+19,735	---
Subtotal, Energy and minerals	90,451	74,836	111,786	+21,335	+36,950
Realty and Ownership Management:					
Alaska conveyance	29,108	16,622	16,622	-12,486	---
Cadastral survey	12,392	12,015	12,015	-377	---
Land and realty management	56,400	32,657	32,657	-23,743	---
Subtotal	97,900	61,294	61,294	-36,606	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Resource Protection and Maintenance:					
Resource management planning	42,426	40,621	35,621	-6,805	-5,000
Abandoned mine lands	---	19,851	19,851	+19,851	---
Resource protection and law enforcement	27,685	27,067	27,067	-618	---
Hazardous materials management	17,028	16,668	16,668	-360	---
Subtotal	87,139	104,207	99,207	+12,068	-5,000
Transportation and Facilities Maintenance:					
Operations	6,047	---	---	-6,047	---
Annual maintenance	31,879	41,226	38,226	+6,347	-3,000
Deferred maintenance	34,429	30,008	30,008	-4,421	---
Subtotal	72,355	71,234	68,234	-4,121	-3,000
Land and resources information systems	16,697	15,852	15,852	-845	---
Workforce and Organizational Support:					
Information systems operations	15,343	14,697	14,697	-646	---
Administrative support	50,287	49,209	49,209	-1,078	---
Bureauwide fixed costs	91,307	93,576	91,307	---	-2,269
Subtotal	156,937	157,482	155,213	-1,724	-2,269
Challenge cost share	1,202	9,467	---	-1,202	-9,467
National landscape conservation system, base program	31,870	39,345	20,000	-11,870	-19,345
(National landscape conservation system,total program)	(74,635)	---	---	(-74,635)	---
Subtotal, Management of lands and resources	961,779	933,779	918,227	-43,552	-15,552

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Mining Law Administration:					
Administration	36,696	39,696	39,696	+3,000	---
Offsetting collections	-47,696	-54,000	-54,000	-6,304	---
Subtotal, Mining Law Administration	-11,000	-14,304	-14,304	-3,304	---
Total, Management of lands and resources	950,779	919,475	903,923	-46,856	-15,552
Construction					
Appropriation	4,617	3,576	3,576	-1,041	---
Land Acquisition					
Land Acquisition	18,584	46,620	---	-18,584	-46,620
Inholding, emergency, and hardship	1,497	1,500	3,000	+1,503	+1,500
Acquisition management	1,875	1,880	1,880	+5	---
Total, Land acquisition	21,956	50,000	4,880	-17,076	-45,120
Oregon and California Grant Lands					
Western Oregon resources management	96,929	98,056	98,056	+1,127	---
Western Oregon information and resource data systems	2,124	1,926	1,926	-198	---
Western Oregon transportation & facilities maintenance	11,136	11,002	11,002	-134	---
Western Oregon construction and acquisition	314	310	310	-4	---
Western Oregon national monument	831	749	749	-82	---
Total, Oregon and California grant lands	111,334	112,043	112,043	+709	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Range Improvements					
Improvements to public lands	7,873	7,873	7,873	---	---
Farm Tenant Act lands	1,527	1,527	1,527	---	---
Administrative expenses	600	600	600	---	---
Total, Range improvements	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Service Charges, Deposits, and Forfeitures					
Rights-of-way processing	16,400	16,400	16,400	---	---
Energy and minerals cost recovery	2,600	7,300	7,300	+4,700	---
Recreation cost recovery	1,000	1,500	1,500	+500	---
Adopt-a-horse program	500	450	450	-50	---
Repair of damaged lands	5,600	3,100	3,100	-2,500	---
Cost recoverable realty cases	900	900	900	---	---
Timber purchaser expenses	100	50	50	-50	---
Commercial film and photography fees	200	200	200	---	---
Copy fees	2,000	1,100	1,100	-900	---
Trans Alaska pipeline	4,000	1,125	1,125	-2,875	---
Subtotal (gross)	33,300	32,125	32,125	-1,175	---
Offsetting fees	-33,300	-32,125	-32,125	+1,175	---
Total, Service Charges, Deposits & Forfeitures	---	---	---	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Miscellaneous Trust Funds and Permanent Operating Funds					
Current appropriations	15,200	19,700	19,700	+4,500	---
TOTAL, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT	1,113,886	1,114,794	1,054,122	-59,764	-60,672
(Mandatory)	(25,200)	(29,700)	(29,700)	(+4,500)	---
(Discretionary)	(1,088,686)	(1,085,094)	(1,024,422)	(-64,264)	(-60,672)
UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE					
Resource Management					
Ecological Services:					
Endangered species:					
Candidate conservation	11,448	11,426	10,670	-778	-756
Listing and critical habitat:					
Critical habitat	9,472	10,431	---	-9,472	-10,431
Listing	11,430	8,847	---	-11,430	-8,847
International listing	---	1,500	---	---	-1,500
Petitions	---	3,866	---	---	-3,866
Subtotal	20,902	24,644	---	-20,902	-24,644

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Consultation and HCPs	61,877	62,888	53,462	-8,415	-9,426
Recovery	81,219	83,692	74,575	-6,644	-9,117
Subtotal, Endangered species	175,446	182,650	138,707	-36,739	-43,943
Habitat conservation:					
Partners for fish and wildlife	55,304	59,400	39,400	-15,904	-20,000
Conservation planning assistance	36,791	38,368	21,368	-15,423	-17,000
Coastal programs	15,137	15,436	13,436	-1,701	-2,000
National wetlands inventory	5,292	5,238	4,238	-1,054	-1,000
Subtotal, Habitat conservation	112,524	118,442	78,442	-34,082	-40,000
Environmental contaminants	13,316	13,825	11,825	-1,491	-2,000
Subtotal, Ecological services	301,286	314,917	228,974	-72,312	-85,943
National Wildlife Refuge System:					
Wildlife and habitat management	226,963	240,241	199,859	-27,104	-40,382
Visitor services	75,631	77,621	72,906	-2,725	-4,715
Refuge law enforcement	38,071	37,558	31,637	-6,434	-5,921
Conservation planning	11,862	8,283	11,723	-139	+3,440
Refuge maintenance	139,532	139,172	139,172	-360	---
Subtotal	492,059	502,875	455,297	-36,762	-47,578

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Migratory Birds, Law Enforcement & International Conservation:					
Migratory bird management	52,175	54,423	50,423	-1,752	-4,000
Law enforcement	62,930	62,634	58,634	-4,296	-4,000
International affairs	13,119	12,991	12,991	-128	---
Subtotal	128,224	130,048	122,048	-6,176	-8,000
Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Conservation:					
National fish hatchery system operations	48,856	42,761	46,149	-2,707	+3,388
Maintenance and equipment	18,180	18,060	18,060	-120	---
Aquatic habitat and species conservation	71,903	75,191	64,134	-7,769	-11,057
Subtotal	138,939	136,012	128,343	-10,596	-7,669
Cooperative landscape conservation & adaptive science:					
Cooperative landscape conservation	14,727	20,247	10,000	-4,727	-10,247
Adaptive science	16,243	17,236	10,000	-6,243	-7,236
Subtotal	30,970	37,483	20,000	-10,970	-17,483
General Operations:					
Central office operations	42,720	39,941	38,777	-3,943	-1,164
Regional office operations	42,836	42,299	41,480	-1,356	-819

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Servicewide bill paying	36,360	36,097	32,941	-3,419	-3,156
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	7,537	8,537	7,537	---	-1,000
National Conservation Training Center	23,930	23,658	23,658	-272	---
Subtotal	153,383	150,532	144,393	-8,990	-6,139
Total, Resource Management	1,244,861	1,271,867	1,099,055	-145,806	-172,812
Construction					
Construction and rehabilitation:					
Line item construction projects	9,810	12,149	2,365	-7,445	-9,784
Bridge and dam safety programs	1,851	1,855	1,855	+4	---
Nationwide engineering service	9,143	9,084	7,584	-1,559	-1,500
Total, Construction	20,804	23,088	11,804	-9,000	-11,284
Land Acquisition					
Acquisitions	35,374	108,990	---	-35,374	-108,990
Highlands Conservation Act	---	5,000	4,000	+4,000	-1,000
Inholdings/emergencies and hardships	4,990	5,000	3,000	-1,990	-2,000
Exchanges	1,996	2,000	---	-1,996	-2,000
Acquisition management	10,534	13,570	6,570	-3,964	-7,000
User pay cost share	1,996	2,000	1,477	-519	-523
Refuge land protection planning	---	3,440	---	---	-3,440
Total, Land acquisition	54,890	140,000	15,047	-39,843	-124,953

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Landowner Incentive Program					
Rescission of prior year balances	-4,941	---	---	+4,941	---
Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund					
Grants and administration:					
Conservation grants	11,101	17,000	---	-11,101	-17,000
HCP assistance grants	10,000	13,500	---	-10,000	-13,500
Snake River Water Rights Act of 2004	4,987	---	---	-4,987	---
Administration	2,854	3,354	2,854	---	-500
Subtotal, Grants and administration	28,942	33,854	2,854	-26,088	-31,000
Land acquisition:					
Species recovery land acquisition	11,000	19,646	---	-11,000	-19,646
HCP land acquisition grants to states	19,938	46,500	---	-19,938	-46,500
Subtotal, Land acquisition	30,938	66,146	---	-30,938	-66,146
Total, Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund	59,880	100,000	2,854	-57,026	-97,146
National Wildlife Refuge Fund					
Payments in lieu of taxes	14,471	---	13,980	-491	+13,980

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
North American Wetlands Conservation Fund					
North American Wetlands Conservation Fund	37,425	50,000	20,000	-17,425	-30,000
Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund					
Migratory bird grants	3,992	5,000	---	-3,992	-5,000
Multinational Species Conservation Fund					
African elephant conservation fund	1,735	1,950	1,477	-258	-473
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund	2,604	2,450	1,969	-635	-481
Asian elephant conservation fund	1,735	1,950	1,477	-258	-473
Great ape conservation fund	2,170	1,950	1,969	-201	+19
Marine turtle conservation fund	1,736	1,450	983	-753	-467
Total, Multinational Species Conservation Fund	9,980	9,750	7,875	-2,105	-1,875
State and Tribal Wildlife Grants					
State wildlife grants (formula)	49,900	67,000	20,000	-29,900	-47,000
State wildlife grants (competitive)	4,990	20,000	---	-4,990	-20,000
Tribal wildlife grants	6,986	8,000	2,000	-4,986	-6,000
Total, State and tribal wildlife grants	61,876	95,000	22,000	-39,876	-73,000
TOTAL, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE	1,503,238	1,694,705	1,192,615	-310,623	-502,090

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
Operation of the National Park System					
Park Management:					
Resource stewardship	343,640	356,276	336,742	-6,898	-19,534
Visitor services	239,817	251,299	240,817	+1,000	-10,482
Park protection	362,143	364,895	362,143	---	-2,752
Facility operations and maintenance	695,020	706,538	691,020	-4,000	-15,518
Park support	442,967	448,679	442,967	---	-5,712
Subtotal	2,083,587	2,127,687	2,073,689	-9,898	-53,998
External administrative costs	166,463	169,190	166,463	---	-2,727
Total, Operation of the National Park System	2,250,050	2,296,877	2,240,152	-9,898	-56,725
National Recreation and Preservation					
Recreation programs	587	585	585	-2	---
Natural programs	11,172	13,376	11,172	---	-2,204
Cultural programs	24,882	24,804	24,804	-78	---
International park affairs	1,646	1,638	1,638	-8	---
Environmental and compliance review	433	431	431	-2	---
Grant administration	1,749	1,740	1,740	-9	---
Heritage Partnership Programs	17,401	8,993	8,993	-8,408	---
Total, National Recreation and Preservation	57,870	51,567	49,363	-8,507	-2,204

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Historic Preservation Fund					
State historic preservation offices	46,407	50,000	42,500	-3,907	-7,500
Tribal grants	7,984	11,000	7,000	-984	-4,000
Total, Historic Preservation Fund	54,391	61,000	49,500	-4,891	-11,500
Construction					
General Program:					
Line item construction and maintenance	121,159	70,347	70,347	-50,812	---
Emergency and unscheduled	3,853	3,861	3,861	+8	---
Housing	4,955	2,965	2,965	-1,990	---
Dam safety	2,495	1,250	1,250	-1,245	---
Equipment replacement	13,723	13,750	13,750	+27	---
Planning, construction	10,104	7,712	7,712	-2,392	---
Construction program management	38,527	37,590	37,590	-937	---
General management plans	14,830	14,646	14,646	-184	---
Rescission of prior year balances	-25,000	---	---	+25,000	---
Total, Construction	184,646	152,121	152,121	-32,525	---
Land and Water Conservation Fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Land Acquisition and State Assistance					
Assistance to States:					
State conservation grants (formula)	37,126	78,000	---	-37,126	-78,000
State conservation grants (competitive)	---	117,000	---	---	-117,000
Administrative expenses	2,794	5,000	2,794	---	-2,206
Subtotal	39,920	200,000	2,794	-37,126	-197,206
National Park Service:					
Acquisitions	32,767	109,000	---	-32,767	-109,000
American Battlefield Protection Program	8,982	10,000	2,000	-6,982	-8,000
Emergencies and hardships	1,007	12,000	1,250	+243	-10,750
Acquisition management	7,134	12,000	7,250	+116	-4,750
Inholdings, donations, and exchanges	5,000	17,000	5,000	---	-12,000
Subtotal	54,890	160,000	15,500	-39,390	-144,500
Total, Land Acquisition and State Assistance	94,810	360,000	18,294	-76,516	-341,706
Rescission	-625	---	---	+625	---
TOTAL, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE	2,611,142	2,891,565	2,479,430	-131,712	-412,135

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
Surveys, Investigations, and Research					
Ecosystems:					
Status and Trends	22,403	22,079	20,985	-1,418	-1,094
Fisheries: Aquatic and Endangered Resources	23,694	22,660	22,660	-1,034	---
Wildlife: Terrestrial and Endangered Resources	49,078	48,544	44,230	-4,848	-4,314
Terrestrial, Freshwater and Marine Environments	35,763	40,230	37,227	+1,464	-3,003
Invasive Species	10,795	14,086	10,580	-215	-3,506
Cooperative Research Units	19,104	18,824	14,438	-4,666	-4,386
Total, Ecosystems	160,837	166,423	150,120	-10,717	-16,303
Climate and Land Use Change:					
Climate Variability:					
Climate Science Centers	20,921	25,573	25,573	+4,652	---
Research and Development	28,468	24,141	15,055	-13,413	-9,086
Carbon Sequestration	9,955	14,345	---	-9,955	-14,345
Science Support for DOI Bureaus	4,990	8,860	---	-4,990	-8,860
Subtotal	64,334	72,919	40,628	-23,706	-32,291

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Land Use Change:					
Land Remote Sensing	62,387	21,975	73,792	+11,405	+51,817
Geographic Analysis and Monitoring	11,420	11,511	11,511	+91	---
Subtotal	73,807	33,486	85,303	+11,496	+51,817
Total, Climate and Land Use Change	138,141	106,405	125,931	-12,210	+19,526
Energy, Minerals, and Environmental Health:					
Minerals Resources	52,168	44,164	52,168	---	+8,004
Energy Resources	27,750	27,392	27,750	---	+358
Contaminant Biology	9,216	8,695	9,216	---	+521
Toxic substances hydrology	10,778	8,267	10,778	---	+2,511
Total, Energy, Minerals, and Env Health	99,912	88,518	99,912	---	+11,394
Natural Hazards:					
Earthquake Hazards	55,979	52,326	55,979	---	+3,653
Volcano Hazards	24,464	23,359	24,464	---	+1,105
Landslide Hazards	3,318	3,278	3,318	---	+40
Global Seismographic Network	5,379	5,332	5,379	---	+47
Geomagnetism	2,097	2,073	2,097	---	+24
Coastal and Marine Geology	44,728	47,501	44,728	---	-2,773
Total, Natural Hazards	135,965	133,869	135,965	---	+2,096

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Water Resources:					
Groundwater Resources	8,481	6,947	8,481	---	+1,534
National Water Quality Assessment	64,234	57,540	64,234	---	+6,694
National Streamflow Information Program	27,100	26,913	30,000	+2,900	+3,087
Hydrologic Research and Development	11,932	12,008	12,008	+76	---
Hydrologic Networks and Analysis	30,719	33,940	30,719	---	-3,221
Cooperative Water Program	63,471	62,252	65,561	+2,090	+3,309
Water Resources Research Act Program	6,486	---	6,500	+14	+6,500
Total, Water Resources	212,423	199,600	217,503	+5,080	+17,903
Core Science Systems:					
Biological Information Management and Delivery	18,563	15,113	15,113	-3,450	---
Nat'l Geological & Geophysical Data Pres Program	998	---	600	-398	+600
National Cooperative Geological Mapping	27,712	25,397	27,712	---	+2,315
National Geospatial Program	65,755	65,365	65,755	---	+390
Total, Core Science Systems	113,028	105,875	109,180	-3,848	+3,305
Administration and Enterprise Information:					
Science Support	77,229	79,620	77,229	---	-2,391
Security and Technology	23,430	21,072	21,072	-2,358	---
Information Resources	17,988	15,863	15,863	-2,125	---
Total, Admin and Enterprise Information	118,647	116,555	114,164	-4,483	-2,391

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Facilities:					
Rental Payments and Operations & Maintenance	97,427	93,485	93,485	-3,942	---
Deferred Maintenance and Capital Improvement	7,292	4,807	7,292	---	+2,485
Construction	---	2,500	---	---	-2,500
Total, Facilities	104,719	100,792	100,777	-3,942	-15
Total, Surveys, Investigations, and Research	1,083,672	1,018,037	1,053,552	-30,120	+35,515
National Land Imaging					
National Land Imaging	---	99,817	---	---	-99,817
TOTAL, UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY	1,083,672	1,117,854	1,053,552	-30,120	-64,302
BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT, REGULATION, AND ENFORCEMENT (Formerly the Minerals Management Service)					
Ocean Energy Management					
Offshore Energy and Minerals Management:					
Renewable energy	23,192	23,073	21,413	-1,779	-1,660
Leasing and environmental program	65,352	75,410	75,410	+10,058	---
Resource evaluation	35,057	34,733	34,733	-324	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Regulatory program	88,368	143,319	110,319	+21,951	-33,000
Information management program	20,484	20,468	20,468	-16	---
Subtotal	232,453	297,003	262,343	+29,890	-34,660
Royalty Management:*					
Compliance and asset management	67,559	---	---	-67,559	---
Revenue and operations	41,805	---	---	-41,805	---
Subtotal	109,364	---	---	-109,364	---
*now ONRR under Office of the Secretary					
General Administration:					
Executive direction	5,751	3,040	3,040	-2,711	---
Policy and management improvement	5,441	10,039	10,039	+4,598	---
Administrative operations	21,215	12,324	12,324	-8,891	---
General support services	29,665	21,022	21,022	-8,643	---
Subtotal	62,072	46,425	46,425	-15,647	---
Total (gross)	403,889	343,428	308,768	-95,121	-34,660
Use of receipts and cost recovery fees	-154,890	-160,163	-160,163	-5,273	---
Inspection fees	-10,000	-62,000	-10,000	---	+52,000
Total, Ocean Energy Management	238,999	121,265	138,605	-100,394	+17,340

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Oil Spill Research					
Oil spill research	11,744	14,923	14,923	+3,179	---
Subtotal, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement	250,743	136,188	153,528	-97,215	+17,340
OCS Connect (rescission)(Sec. 128, P.L. 111-242)	-25,000	---	---	+25,000	---
TOTAL, BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT, REGULATION, AND ENFORCEMENT	225,743	136,188	153,528	-72,215	+17,340
OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT					
Regulation and Technology					
Environmental restoration	161	---	---	-161	---
Environmental protection	94,578	87,438	92,019	-2,559	+4,581
Technology development and transfer	15,455	14,478	14,478	-977	---
Financial management	513	506	506	-7	---
Executive direction	16,219	15,947	15,947	-272	---
Civil penalties	100	100	100	---	---
Total, Regulation and Technology	127,026	118,469	123,050	-3,976	+4,581

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund					
Environmental restoration	15,015	9,495	9,495	-5,520	---
Technology development and transfer	5,751	3,550	3,550	-2,201	---
Financial management	6,443	6,406	6,406	-37	---
Executive direction	8,308	7,992	7,992	-316	---
Total, Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund	35,517	27,443	27,443	-8,074	---
TOTAL, OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT	162,543	145,912	150,493	-12,050	+4,581
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
Operation of Indian Programs					
Tribal Government:					
Aid to tribal government	31,886	30,541	30,541	-1,345	---
Consolidated tribal government program	71,710	76,520	71,710	---	-4,810
Self governance compacts	148,951	155,084	148,951	---	-6,133
Contract support	219,560	195,490	228,000	+8,440	+32,510
Indian self determination fund	1,996	2,000	2,000	+4	---
New tribes	310	315	315	+5	---
Small and needy tribes	---	2,950	2,950	+2,950	---
Road maintenance	26,390	25,431	25,431	-959	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Tribal government program oversight	8,786	8,762	8,762	-24	---
Subtotal	509,589	497,093	518,660	+9,071	+21,567
Human Services:					
Social services	33,879	35,627	33,879	---	-1,748
Welfare assistance	74,761	74,911	74,911	+150	---
Indian child welfare act	11,053	10,867	10,867	-186	---
Housing improvement program	12,598	12,619	12,619	+21	---
Human services tribal design	430	430	430	---	---
Human services program oversight	3,900	3,373	3,373	-527	---
Subtotal	136,621	137,827	136,079	-542	-1,748
Trust - Natural Resources Management:					
Natural resources, general	4,547	5,124	5,124	+577	---
Irrigation operations and maintenance	11,910	11,939	11,939	+29	---
Rights protection implementation	28,442	29,602	29,602	+1,160	---
Tribal management/development program	6,782	8,651	6,782	---	-1,869
Endangered species	1,248	1,247	1,247	-1	---
Integrated resource information program	2,105	2,109	2,109	+4	---
Cooperative landscape conservation	419	200	419	---	+219
Agriculture and range	28,863	28,883	28,883	+20	---
Forestry	43,644	44,195	43,644	---	-551
Water resources	10,150	10,839	10,150	---	-689
Fish, wildlife and parks	11,340	13,342	11,341	+1	-2,001
Resource management program oversight	6,632	6,121	6,121	-511	---
Subtotal	156,082	162,252	157,361	+1,279	-4,891

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Trust - Real Estate Services	145,821	125,457	122,596	-23,225	-2,861
Education:					
Elementary and secondary programs (forward funded)	520,048	526,117	520,048	---	-6,069
(Tribal grant support costs)	(46,280)	(46,373)	(46,373)	(+93)	---
Post secondary programs (forward funded)	64,192	64,321	64,321	+129	---
Subtotal, forward funded education	584,240	590,438	584,369	+129	-6,069
Elementary and secondary programs	76,939	122,730	102,730	+25,791	-20,000
Post secondary programs	61,603	60,380	60,380	-1,223	---
Education management	29,916	22,006	22,006	-7,910	---
Subtotal, Education	752,698	795,554	769,485	+16,787	-26,069
Public Safety and Justice:					
Law enforcement	305,893	330,391	318,391	+12,498	-12,000
Tribal courts	27,088	23,445	23,445	-3,643	---
Fire protection	1,109	873	873	-236	---
Subtotal	334,090	354,709	342,709	+8,619	-12,000
Community and economic development	36,856	34,865	34,865	-1,991	---
Executive direction and administrative services	258,089	251,935	251,935	-6,154	---
(housing improvement, road maint, etc. in bill lang)	(59,545)	(48,049)	(48,049)	(-11,496)	---
Total, Operation of Indian Programs	2,329,846	2,359,692	2,333,690	+3,844	-26,002

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Construction					
Education	140,509	52,104	102,104	-38,405	+50,000
Public safety and justice	17,864	11,329	11,329	-6,535	---
Resources management	42,075	33,012	33,012	-9,063	---
General administration	2,039	2,035	2,035	-4	---
Construction management	7,093	6,512	6,512	-581	---
Total, Construction	209,580	104,992	154,992	-54,588	+50,000
Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians					
White Earth Land Settlement Act (Admin)	624	625	625	+1	---
Hoopa-Yurok settlement fund	250	250	250	---	---
Pyramid Lake water rights settlement	142	142	142	---	---
Nez Perce/Snake River	15,432	9,450	9,450	-5,982	---
Navajo Water Resources Development Trust Fund	5,988	6,000	6,000	+12	---
Navajo Gallup Water Settlement	---	4,388	4,388	+4,388	---
Duck Valley Water Rights Settlement	11,976	12,000	12,000	+24	---
Puget Sound regional shellfish settlement	6,487	---	---	-6,487	---
Soboba Band/Luiseno Indian Settlement	5,488	---	---	-5,488	---
Total, Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians	46,387	32,855	32,855	-13,532	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Indian Guaranteed Loan Program Account					
Indian guaranteed loan program account	8,199	3,114	8,114	-85	+5,000
TOTAL, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	2,594,012	2,500,653	2,529,651	-64,361	+28,998
DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES					
Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses					
Executive direction	18,210	---	---	-18,210	---
Policy, management and budget	36,663	---	---	-36,663	---
Hearings and appeals	7,151	---	---	-7,151	---
Central administrative services	41,586	---	---	-41,586	---
Bureau of Mines workers compensation	570	---	---	-570	---
Indian Arts and Crafts Board	1,308	---	---	-1,308	---
Consolidated Appraisal services	12,112	---	---	-12,112	---
National Museum of American Latino Commission	998	---	---	-998	---
Leadership and Administration	---	129,418	119,032	+119,032	-10,386
Management Services	---	34,643	21,755	+21,755	-12,888
Office of Natural Resources Revenue	---	119,609	109,364	+109,364	-10,245
Total, Office of the Secretary, Salaries and expenses	118,598	283,670	250,151	+131,553	-33,519

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Insular Affairs					
Assistance to Territories					
Territorial Assistance					
Office of Insular Affairs	9,262	9,480	9,262	---	-218
Technical assistance	15,271	13,804	13,804	-1,467	---
Maintenance assistance fund	2,443	2,241	2,241	-202	---
Brown tree snake	2,994	3,000	2,994	---	-6
Coral reef initiative	998	1,000	998	---	-2
Water and wastewater projects	791	---	791	---	+791
Empowering Insular Communities	1,996	4,120	1,996	---	-2,124
Subtotal, Territorial Assistance	33,755	33,645	32,086	-1,669	-1,559
American Samoa operations grants	22,707	22,752	22,752	+45	---
Northern Marianas covenant grants	27,720	27,720	27,720	---	---
Total, Assistance to Territories	84,182	84,117	82,558	-1,624	-1,559
Compact of Free Association					
Compact of Free Association - Federal services	2,808	2,818	2,808	---	-10
Discretionary payments - program grant assistance	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Enewetak support	499	236	499	---	+263
Compact payments, Palau (section 122)	12,000	---	---	-12,000	---
Total, Compact of Free Association	17,307	3,054	3,307	-14,000	+253
Total, Insular Affairs	101,489	87,171	85,865	-15,624	-1,306
Office of the Solicitor					
Legal services	47,510	49,481	47,510	---	-1,971
General administration	16,244	16,385	16,244	---	-141
Ethics	1,192	2,610	1,192	---	-1,418
Total, Office of the Solicitor	64,946	68,476	64,946	---	-3,530
Office of Inspector General					
Audit and investigations	38,800	39,203	38,800	---	-403
Administrative services and information management	9,693	10,268	9,693	---	-575
Total, Office of Inspector General	48,493	49,471	48,493	---	-978
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians					
Federal Trust Programs					
Program operations, support, and improvements	157,942	150,103	150,103	-7,839	---
(Office of Historical Accounting)	(31,534)	(31,171)	(31,171)	(-363)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Executive direction	2,736	2,216	2,216	-520	---
Total, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians	160,678	152,319	152,319	-8,359	---
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES	494,204	641,107	601,774	+107,570	-39,333
(Mandatory)	(27,720)	(27,720)	(27,720)	---	---
(Discretionary)	(466,484)	(613,387)	(574,054)	(+107,570)	(-39,333)
DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS					
Wildland Fire Management					
Fire Operations:					
Preparedness	290,452	276,964	276,964	-13,488	---
Fire suppression operations	398,951	270,611	270,611	-128,340	---
Subtotal, Fire operations	689,403	547,575	547,575	-141,828	---
Other Operations:					
Hazardous fuels reduction	183,314	156,763	183,314	---	+26,551
Burned area rehabilitation	33,203	13,046	13,046	-20,157	---
Fire facilities	6,137	6,137	6,137	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Joint fire science	6,000	6,000	6,000	---	---
Rural fire assistance	---	---	7,000	+7,000	+7,000
Subtotal, Other operations	228,654	181,946	215,497	-13,157	+33,551
Subtotal, Wildland fire management	918,057	729,521	763,072	-154,985	+33,551
Rescission of unobligated balances	-200,000	---	---	+200,000	---
Use of emergency suppression funds	---	---	-189,000	-189,000	-189,000
Total, Wildland fire management	718,057	729,521	574,072	-143,985	-155,449
FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Account					
FLAME wildfire suppression reserve account	60,878	92,000	92,000	+31,122	---
Total, all wildland fire accounts	778,935	821,521	666,072	-112,863	-155,449
Central Hazardous Materials Fund					
Central hazardous materials fund	10,155	10,149	10,149	-6	---
Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund					
Damage assessments	3,896	3,743	3,743	-153	---
Program management	1,937	1,906	1,406	-531	-500
Restoration support	616	614	614	-2	---
Total, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund	6,449	6,263	5,763	-686	-500

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Working Capital Fund	85,651	73,119	57,019	-28,632	-16,100
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS	881,190	911,052	739,003	-142,187	-172,049
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
State royalty administrative cost deduction (BOEMRE)..	-42,000	-42,000	-42,000	---	---
(net receipt sharing - both on and offshore)					
Geothermal Energy Receipts (Sec. 423)	-8,000	---	---	+8,000	---
Geothermal receipts amendment (P.L. 111-212)	8,000	---	---	-8,000	---
TOTAL, GENERAL PROVISIONS	-42,000	-42,000	-42,000	---	---
TOTAL, TITLE I, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	10,627,630	11,111,830	9,912,168	-715,462	-1,199,662
Appropriations	(10,913,196)	(11,141,830)	(9,942,168)	(-971,028)	(-1,199,662)
Rescissions	(-285,566)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(+255,566)	---
(Mandatory)	(52,920)	(57,420)	(57,420)	(+4,500)	---
(Discretionary)	(10,574,710)	(11,054,410)	(9,854,748)	(-719,962)	(-1,199,662)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY					
Science and Technology					
Air toxics and quality	120,517	---	---	-120,517	---
Clean Air and Climate	---	134,370	120,082	+120,082	-14,288
(Climate protection program)	---	(16,345)	(16,345)	(+16,345)	---
Climate protection program	16,828	---	---	-16,828	---
Enforcement	15,293	15,326	15,293	---	-33
Homeland security	46,176	42,036	42,036	-4,140	---
Indoor air and Radiation	1,264	6,758	6,758	+5,494	---
IT / Data management / Security	3,657	4,108	3,657	---	-451
Operations and administration	69,660	76,521	70,050	+390	-6,471
(Rent)	(30,237)	(35,661)	(35,661)	(+5,424)	---
(Utilities)	(19,851)	(20,195)	(20,195)	(+344)	---
(Security)	(10,327)	(10,714)	(10,714)	(+387)	---
Pesticide licensing	6,578	6,831	6,578	---	-253
Research: Air, Climate and Energy	---	108,000	93,000	+93,000	-15,000
Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability	---	138,057	125,514	+125,514	-12,543
(Research: Computational toxicology)	(21,054)	(21,211)	(21,054)	---	(-157)
(Research: Endocrine disruptor)	(15,950)	(16,888)	(15,950)	---	(-938)
Research: Clean air	102,404	---	---	-102,404	---
Research: Human health and ecosystems	243,894	---	---	-243,894	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Research: Land protection	13,372	---	---	-13,372	---
Research: National priorities	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Research: Pesticides and toxics	27,285	---	---	-27,285	---
Research: Safe and sustainable water resources	117,297	118,776	108,532	-8,765	-10,244
Research: Sustainable and Healthy Communities	---	171,026	154,324	+154,324	-16,702
Research: Sustainability	25,486	---	---	-25,486	---
Water: Human health protection	3,769	3,787	3,787	+18	---
Total, Science and Technology	813,480	825,596	754,611	-58,869	-70,985
(transfer from Superfund)	(26,780)	(23,016)	(23,016)	(-3,764)	---
Environmental Programs and Management					
Air toxics and quality	207,272	---	---	-207,272	---
Brownfields	23,680	26,397	23,680	---	-2,717
Clean Air and Climate	---	315,286	263,741	+263,741	-51,545
(Climate protection program)	---	(111,419)	(91,997)	(+91,997)	(-19,422)
Climate protection program	107,530	---	---	-107,530	---
Compliance	106,874	119,648	106,874	---	-12,774
Enforcement	255,850	268,218	226,656	-29,194	-41,562
(Environmental justice)	(6,856)	(7,397)	(6,856)	---	(-541)
Environmental protection: National priorities	---	---	15,000	+15,000	+15,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Geographic programs:					
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative	299,400	350,000	250,000	-49,400	-100,000
Chesapeake Bay	54,391	67,350	50,000	-4,391	-17,350
San Franciso Bay	5,333	4,847	4,847	-486	---
Puget Sound	38,095	19,289	30,000	-8,095	+10,711
Long Island Sound	5,333	2,962	2,962	-2,371	---
Gulf of Mexico	4,572	4,464	4,464	-108	---
South Florida	1,653	2,061	1,653	---	-408
Upper Mississippi River Basin	---	6,000	---	---	-6,000
Lake Champlain	3,048	1,399	1,399	-1,649	---
Lake Pontchartrain	1,143	955	955	-188	---
CARE(Community Action for a Renewed Environment)	1,865	2,384	---	-1,865	-2,384
Other geographic activities	1,209	1,296	---	-1,209	-1,296
Subtotal	416,042	463,007	346,280	-69,762	-116,727
Homeland security	12,856	11,300	11,300	-1,556	---
Indoor air and Radiation	25,887	33,770	33,770	+7,883	---
Information exchange / Outreach	133,979	145,210	120,936	-13,043	-24,274
(Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination)	(7,491)	(10,795)	(6,515)	(-976)	(-4,280)
(Environmental education)	(9,713)	(9,885)	---	(-9,713)	(-9,885)
International programs	19,068	19,447	16,195	-2,873	-3,252
IT / Data management / Security	99,549	95,413	93,372	-6,177	-2,041
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review	122,657	128,610	89,234	-33,423	-39,376

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Operations and administration	496,017	507,535	476,419	-19,598	-31,116
(Rent)	(162,578)	(170,807)	(170,807)	(+8,229)	---
(Utilities)	(13,182)	(11,221)	(11,221)	(-1,961)	---
(Security)	(30,836)	(29,266)	(29,266)	(-1,570)	---
Pesticide licensing	116,889	110,523	110,523	-6,366	---
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)	118,043	116,871	112,643	-5,400	-4,228
Toxics risk review and prevention	100,123	115,297	100,123	---	-15,174
(Endocrine disruptors)	(8,554)	(8,268)	(8,268)	(-286)	---
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST)	12,966	12,866	12,866	-100	---
Water: Ecosystems					
National estuary program / Coastal waterways	26,748	27,058	26,748	---	-310
Wetlands	26,505	27,368	21,199	-5,306	-6,169
Subtotal	53,253	54,426	47,947	-5,306	-6,479
Water: Human health protection	104,188	107,324	98,324	-5,864	-9,000
Water quality protection	223,747	225,486	192,550	-31,197	-32,936
Total, Environmental Programs and Management	2,756,470	2,876,634	2,498,433	-258,037	-378,201
Office of Inspector General					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations	44,701	45,997	41,099	-3,602	-4,898
(transfer from Superfund)	(9,955)	(10,009)	(9,955)	---	(-54)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Buildings and Facilities					
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure	7,055	8,038	7,055	---	-983
Operations and administration	29,373	33,931	29,373	---	-4,558
Total, Buildings and Facilities	36,428	41,969	36,428	---	-5,541
Hazardous Substance Superfund					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations	9,955	10,009	9,955	---	-54
Compliance	1,234	1,222	1,222	-12	---
Enforcement	191,621	191,615	181,615	-10,006	-10,000
Homeland security	41,707	41,834	41,834	+127	---
Indoor air and radiation	2,454	2,487	2,454	---	-33
Information exchange / Outreach	1,431	1,433	1,433	+2	---
IT / Data management / Security	17,408	16,080	16,080	-1,328	---
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review	1,528	1,677	1,528	---	-149
Operations and administration	136,648	138,069	136,369	-279	-1,700
(Rent)	(43,798)	(47,112)	(47,112)	(+3,314)	---
(Utilities)	(3,741)	(3,765)	(3,765)	(+24)	---
(Security)	(8,396)	(8,282)	(8,282)	(-114)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability*	4,027	3,342	3,342	-685	---
Research: Sustainable Communities**	20,546	17,706	17,706	-2,840	---
Research: Sustainability	95	---	---	-95	---
Superfund cleanup:					
Superfund: Emergency response and removal	200,498	194,895	194,895	-5,603	---
Superfund: Emergency preparedness	9,345	9,263	9,263	-82	---
Superfund: Federal facilities	31,135	26,242	26,242	-4,893	---
Superfund: Remedial	605,368	574,499	574,499	-30,869	---
Superfund: Support to other Federal agencies	5,908	5,858	5,858	-50	---
Subtotal	852,254	810,757	810,757	-41,497	---
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,280,908	1,236,231	1,224,295	-56,613	-11,936
(transfer to Inspector General)	(-9,955)	(-10,009)	(-9,955)	---	(+54)
(transfer to Science and Technology)	(-26,780)	(-23,016)	(-23,016)	(+3,764)	---
* Formerly Research: Human health and ecosystems					
** Formerly Research: Land Protection					
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund (LUST)					
Enforcement	789	832	789	---	-43
Operations and administration	1,854	1,591	1,591	-263	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Research: Sustainable Communities*	397	454	454	+57	---
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST)	109,835	109,604	102,835	-7,000	-6,769
(LUST/UST)	(12,410)	(11,982)	(11,982)	(-428)	---
(LUST Cooperative agreements)	(63,066)	(63,192)	(56,423)	(-6,643)	(-6,769)
(Energy Policy Act grants)	(34,359)	(34,430)	(34,430)	(+71)	---
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund	112,875	112,481	105,669	-7,206	-6,812
* Formerly Research: Land Protection					
Inland Oil Spill Program (formerly Oil Spill Response)					
Compliance	135	138	138	+3	---
Enforcement	2,288	2,902	2,288	---	-614
Oil	14,698	19,472	14,698	---	-4,774
Operations and administration	537	536	536	-1	---
Research: Sustainable Communities*	684	614	614	-70	---
Total, Inland Oil Spill Program	18,342	23,662	18,274	-68	-5,388
* Formerly Research: Land Protection					
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)					
Alaska Native villages	9,980	10,000	---	-9,980	-10,000
Brownfields projects	99,800	99,041	60,000	-39,800	-39,041
Clean water state revolving fund (SRF)	1,521,950	1,550,000	689,000	-832,950	-861,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Diesel emissions grants	49,900	---	30,000	-19,900	+30,000
Drinking water state revolving fund (SRF)	963,070	990,000	829,000	-134,070	-161,000
Mexico border	9,980	10,000	---	-9,980	-10,000
Subtotal, Infrastructure assistance grants	2,654,680	2,659,041	1,608,000	-1,046,680	-1,051,041
Categorical grants:					
Beaches protection	9,880	9,900	9,880	---	-20
Brownfields	49,396	49,495	49,396	---	-99
Environmental information	9,980	10,200	9,980	---	-220
Hazardous waste financial assistance	103,139	103,412	103,139	---	-273
Lead	14,535	14,855	14,535	---	-320
Multi-media Tribal Implementation	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Nonpoint source (Sec. 319)	175,505	164,757	150,505	-25,000	-14,252
Pesticides enforcement	18,674	19,085	18,674	---	-411
Pesticides program implementation	13,493	13,140	13,140	-353	---
Pollution control (Sec. 106)	238,786	250,264	204,264	-34,522	-46,000
(Water quality monitoring)	(18,463)	(11,300)	(11,300)	(-7,163)	---
Pollution prevention	4,930	5,039	4,930	---	-109
Public water system supervision	105,489	109,700	105,489	---	-4,211
Radon	8,058	8,074	8,058	---	-16
State and local air quality management	236,107	305,500	201,580	-34,527	-103,920
Toxics substances compliance	5,089	5,201	5,089	---	-112
Tribal air quality management	13,273	13,566	13,273	---	-293
Tribal general assistance program	67,739	71,375	62,875	-4,864	-8,500

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Underground injection control (UIC)	10,869	11,109	10,869	---	-240
Underground storage tanks	2,495	1,550	1,550	-945	---
Wetlands program development	16,796	15,167	15,167	-1,629	---
Subtotal, Categorical grants	1,104,233	1,201,389	1,002,393	-101,840	-198,996
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants	3,758,913	3,860,430	2,610,393	-1,148,520	-1,250,037
Subtotal, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	8,822,117	9,023,000	7,289,202	-1,532,915	-1,733,798
Rescission	-140,000	-50,000	-140,000	---	-90,000
TOTAL, TITLE II, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	8,682,117	8,973,000	7,149,202	-1,532,915	-1,823,798
Appropriations	(8,822,117)	(9,023,000)	(7,289,202)	(-1,532,915)	(-1,733,798)
Rescissions	(-140,000)	(-50,000)	(-140,000)	---	(-90,000)
TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
FOREST SERVICE					
Forest and Rangeland Research					
Forest inventory and analysis	66,805	61,939	66,805	---	+4,866
Research and development programs	239,832	233,834	210,477	-29,355	-23,357

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
(Global Climate Change Science)	(31,793)	(28,357)	---	(-31,793)	(-28,357)
Total, Forest and rangeland research	306,637	295,773	277,282	-29,355	-18,491
State and Private Forestry					
Forest Health Management:					
Federal lands forest health management	56,737	55,613	54,501	-2,236	-1,112
Cooperative lands forest health management	48,821	43,942	43,063	-5,758	-879
Subtotal	105,558	99,555	97,564	-7,994	-1,991
Cooperative Fire Protection:					
State fire assistance	32,358	33,201	32,537	+179	-664
Volunteer fire assistance	6,680	7,000	6,680	---	-320
Subtotal	39,038	40,201	39,217	+179	-984
Cooperative Forestry:					
Forest stewardship	32,548	29,449	28,860	-3,688	-589
Forest Legacy	52,894	135,000	3,000	-49,894	-132,000
Subtotal	52,894	135,000	3,000	-49,894	-132,000
Community Forest and Open Space Conservation	1,000	5,000	1,000	---	-4,000
Urban and Community Forestry	32,040	32,377	29,042	-2,998	-3,335
Forest resource information and analysis	5,026	---	4,925	-101	+4,925
Subtotal, Cooperative Forestry	123,508	201,826	66,827	-56,681	-134,999

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
International forestry	9,492	---	5,000	-4,492	+5,000
Total, State and Private Forestry	277,596	341,582	208,608	-68,988	-132,974
National Forest System					
Land management planning	45,033	205,602	30,033	-15,000	-175,569
Inventory and monitoring	167,219	---	165,219	-2,000	+165,219
Recreation, heritage and wilderness	281,627	290,498	281,627	---	-8,871
Grazing management	49,738	45,445	55,445	+5,707	+10,000
Forest products	336,049	---	336,722	+673	+336,722
Vegetation and watershed management	184,341	---	184,341	---	+184,341
Wildlife and fish habitat management	140,260	---	140,260	---	+140,260
(Integrated Resource Restoration)	---	(854,242)	---	---	(-854,242)
Restoration of Management and Resources	---	659,242	---	---	-659,242
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund	14,970	40,000	30,000	+15,030	-10,000
Priority Watersheds & Jobs Stabilization	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
Legacy Roads and Trails	---	75,000	---	---	-75,000
Minerals and geology management	83,560	78,805	83,560	---	+4,755
Landownership management	91,765	85,875	91,765	---	+5,890
Law enforcement operations	144,254	144,059	144,059	-195	---
Valles Caldera National Preserve	3,432	---	3,432	---	+3,432
Total, National Forest System	1,542,248	1,704,526	1,546,463	+4,215	-158,063

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Capital Improvement and Maintenance					
Facilities:					
Maintenance	90,450	82,661	42,661	-47,789	-40,000
Construction	44,550	18,124	7,000	-37,550	-11,124
Subtotal	135,000	100,785	49,661	-85,339	-51,124
Roads:					
Maintenance	167,868	148,944	166,885	-983	+17,941
Construction	27,327	8,874	35,000	+7,673	+26,126
Subtotal	195,195	157,818	201,885	+6,690	+44,067
Trails:					
Maintenance	69,821	63,422	63,846	-5,975	+424
Construction	18,560	18,766	18,560	---	-206
Subtotal	88,381	82,188	82,406	-5,975	+218
Deferred maintenance	9,158	9,136	9,136	-22	---
Legacy road and trail remediation	44,910	---	35,000	-9,910	+35,000
Subtotal, Capital improvement and maintenance	472,644	349,927	378,088	-94,556	+28,161
Deferral of road and trail fund payment	-13,000	-12,000	-12,000	+1,000	---
Total, Capital improvement and maintenance	459,644	337,927	366,088	-93,556	+28,161

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Land Acquisition					
Acquisitions	19,235	72,500	---	-19,235	-72,500
Acquisition management	9,000	12,000	7,000	-2,000	-5,000
Cash equalization	400	1,000	1,000	+600	---
Critical inholdings/wilderness protection	4,299	4,500	4,500	+201	---
Total, Land Acquisition	32,934	90,000	12,500	-20,434	-77,500
Acquisition of land for national forests, special acts	1,048	955	955	-93	---
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges	250	227	227	-23	---
Range betterment fund	3,600	3,262	3,262	-338	---
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	50	45	45	-5	---
Management of national forest lands for subsistence uses	2,577	---	2,000	-577	+2,000
Wildland Fire Management					
Fire operations:					
Wildland fire preparedness	673,650	1,006,052	1,006,052	+332,402	---
Wildland fire suppression operations	995,511	538,720	538,720	-456,791	---
Subtotal, Fire operations	1,669,161	1,544,772	1,544,772	-124,389	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Other operations:					
Hazardous fuels	349,584	62,015	334,584	-15,000	+272,569
(Hazardous Fuels Base Program)*	(334,614)	(249,015)	---	(-334,614)	(-249,015)
(Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund)**	(9,980)	---	---	(-9,980)	---
(Biomass Grants)	(4,990)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(+10)	---
Rehabilitation	11,477	---	---	-11,477	---
Fire plan research and development	23,869	21,734	21,734	-2,135	---
Joint fire sciences program	7,984	7,262	7,262	-722	---
Forest health management (federal lands)	20,710	12,983	17,983	-2,727	+5,000
Forest health management (co-op lands)	11,405	6,366	10,366	-1,039	+4,000
State fire assistance	64,870	45,564	61,032	-3,838	+15,468
Volunteer fire assistance	8,982	6,366	7,366	-1,616	+1,000
Subtotal, Other operations	498,881	162,290	460,327	-38,554	+298,037
Subtotal, Wildland fire management	2,168,042	1,707,062	2,005,099	-162,943	+298,037
* Non-WUI haz fuels moved to IRR under FY12 request					
**Moved to IRR under FY12 request					
Rescission	-200,000	-192,000	---	+200,000	+192,000
Use of emergency suppression funds	---	---	-200,000	-200,000	-200,000
Total, Wildland fire management	1,968,042	1,515,062	1,805,099	-162,943	+290,037
FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Account					
FLAME wildfire suppression reserve account	290,418	315,886	290,418	---	-25,468

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rescission	-200,000	---	---	+200,000	---
Total, all wildland fire accounts	2,058,460	1,830,948	2,095,517	+37,057	+264,569
Forest Service payments to communities (leg proposal)	---	328,000	---	---	-328,000
Total, Forest Service without Wildland fire	2,626,584	2,774,297	2,417,430	-209,154	-356,867
TOTAL, FOREST SERVICE	4,685,044	4,933,245	4,512,947	-172,097	-420,298
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE					
Indian Health Services					
Clinical Services:					
IHS and tribal health delivery					
Hospital and health clinic programs	1,762,865	1,963,886	1,858,433	+95,568	-105,453
Dental health program	152,634	170,859	166,492	+13,858	-4,367
Mental health program	72,786	81,117	78,023	+5,237	-3,094
Alcohol and substance abuse program	194,409	211,693	202,102	+7,693	-9,591
Contract health services	779,927	948,646	836,685	+56,758	-111,961
(Catastrophic health emergency fund)	(47,904)	(58,000)	(51,500)	(+3,596)	(-6,500)
Subtotal	2,962,621	3,376,201	3,141,735	+179,114	-234,466

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Preventive Health:					
Public health nursing	63,943	70,613	68,646	+4,703	-1,967
Health education	16,649	18,190	17,680	+1,031	-510
Community health representatives program	61,505	65,746	63,867	+2,362	-1,879
Immunization (Alaska)	1,930	2,064	2,005	+75	-59
Subtotal	144,027	156,613	152,198	+8,171	-4,415
Urban health program	43,053	46,745	45,525	+2,472	-1,220
Indian health professions	40,661	42,016	41,934	+1,273	-82
Tribal management	2,581	2,762	2,757	+176	-5
Direct operations	68,583	73,636	70,095	+1,512	-3,541
Self-governance	6,054	6,329	6,317	+263	-12
Contract support costs	397,693	461,837	573,761	+176,068	+111,924
Total, Indian Health Services	3,665,273	4,166,139	4,034,322	+369,049	-131,817
Indian Health Facilities					
Maintenance and improvement	53,807	57,078	55,439	+1,632	-1,639
Sanitation facilities construction	95,665	79,710	77,002	-18,663	-2,708
Health care facilities construction	39,156	85,184	85,724	+46,568	+540
Facilities and environmental health support	192,701	210,992	205,083	+12,382	-5,909
Equipment	22,618	24,705	24,011	+1,393	-694
Subtotal, Indian Health Facilities	403,947	457,669	447,259	+43,312	-10,410

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Use of prior year unobligated balances	---	---	-20,000	-20,000	-20,000
Total, Indian Health Facilities	403,947	457,669	427,259	+23,312	-30,410
TOTAL, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE	4,069,220	4,623,808	4,461,581	+392,361	-162,227
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	79,054	81,085	79,054	---	-2,031
AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY					
Toxic substances and environmental public health	76,638	76,337	74,039	-2,599	-2,298
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES	4,224,912	4,781,230	4,614,674	+389,762	-166,556
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	3,153	3,444	2,661	-492	-783

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	10,777	11,147	10,000	-777	-1,147
OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION					
Salaries and expenses	7,984	9,570	7,530	-454	-2,040
INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT					
Payment to the Institute	8,283	9,225	7,900	-383	-1,325
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION					
Salaries and Expenses					
Museum and Research Institutes:					
National Air and Space Museum	18,359	18,246	18,246	-113	---
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory	24,336	24,035	24,035	-301	---
Major scientific instrumentation	3,814	3,822	3,814	---	-8
Universe Center	200	300	200	---	-100
National Museum of Natural History	48,318	48,163	48,163	-155	---
National Zoological Park	23,306	23,352	23,306	---	-46
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center	3,765	3,773	3,756	-9	-17
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute	14,867	12,239	12,239	-2,628	---
Biodiversity Center	500	2,100	500	---	-1,600
Arthur M. Sackler Gallery/Freer Gallery of Art	6,123	6,135	6,113	-10	-22
Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage	2,295	2,300	2,282	-13	-18

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum	4,051	4,244	4,051	---	-193
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden	4,347	4,356	4,347	---	-9
National Museum of African Art	4,452	4,461	4,452	---	-9
World Cultures Center	300	300	300	---	---
Anacostia Community Museum	2,059	2,063	2,048	-11	-15
Archives of American Art	1,876	1,880	1,858	-18	-22
National Museum of African American History and Culture	13,298	13,437	12,894	-404	-543
National Museum of American History	22,392	22,637	22,349	-43	-288
National Museum of the American Indian	32,335	31,900	31,900	-435	---
National Portrait Gallery	5,987	5,999	5,967	-20	-32
Smithsonian American Art Museum	9,325	9,343	9,245	-80	-98
American Experience Center	300	800	300	---	-500
Subtotal, Museums and Research Institutes	246,605	245,885	242,365	-4,240	-3,520
Mission enabling:					
Program support and outreach:					
Outreach	9,592	9,291	9,291	-301	---
Communications	2,490	2,594	2,342	-148	-252
Institution-wide programs	11,607	10,928	10,839	-768	-89
Office of Exhibits Central	3,006	3,012	2,982	-24	-30
Museum Support Center	1,870	1,874	1,858	-12	-16
Museum Conservation Institute	3,230	3,236	3,119	-111	-117
Smithsonian Institution Archives	2,189	2,193	2,054	-135	-139
Smithsonian Institution Libraries	9,963	9,983	9,963	---	-20
Subtotal, Program support and outreach	43,947	43,111	42,448	-1,499	-663

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Chief Information Officer	45,526	46,144	43,536	-1,990	-2,608
Administration	33,293	33,949	33,293	---	-656
Inspector General	2,602	2,607	2,602	---	-5
Facilities services:					
Facilities maintenance	70,000	72,107	70,000	---	-2,107
Facilities operations, security and support	192,916	192,727	192,727	-189	---
Subtotal, Facilities services	262,916	264,834	262,727	-189	-2,107
Subtotal, Mission enabling	388,284	390,645	384,606	-3,678	-6,039
Total, Salaries and expenses	634,889	636,530	626,971	-7,918	-9,559
Facilities Capital					
Revitalization	91,940	84,830	59,580	-32,360	-25,250
Facilities planning and design	32,810	140,170	65,170	+32,360	-75,000
General Program reduction	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Facilities Capital	124,750	225,000	124,750	---	-100,250
TOTAL, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION	759,639	861,530	751,721	-7,918	-109,809

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART					
Salaries and Expenses					
Care and utilization of art collections	36,828	36,708	36,708	-120	---
Operation and maintenance of buildings and grounds	29,209	35,499	31,209	+2,000	-4,290
Protection of buildings, grounds and contents	23,729	23,509	23,509	-220	---
General administration	20,759	23,065	20,759	---	-2,306
Total, Salaries and Expenses	110,525	118,781	112,185	+1,660	-6,596
Repair, Restoration and Renovation of Buildings					
Base program	48,125	19,219	13,938	-34,187	-5,281
TOTAL, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART	158,650	138,000	126,123	-32,527	-11,877
JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS					
Operations and maintenance	22,455	23,200	22,455	---	-745
Capital repair and restoration	13,892	13,650	13,650	-242	---
TOTAL, JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS	36,347	36,850	36,105	-242	-745

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS					
Salaries and expenses	11,203	11,005	10,000	-1,203	-1,005
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and Administration					
Grants:					
Direct grants	67,243	58,208	54,200	-13,043	-4,008
Challenge America grants	7,984	8,000	6,000	-1,984	-2,000
New Our Town	---	5,000	2,000	+2,000	-3,000
Subtotal	75,227	71,208	62,200	-13,027	-9,008
State partnerships:					
State and regional	39,469	34,737	37,000	-2,469	+2,263
Underserved set-aside	10,683	9,402	9,000	-1,683	-402
Subtotal	50,152	44,139	46,000	-4,152	+1,861
Subtotal, Grants	125,379	115,347	108,200	-17,179	-7,147

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Program support	1,876	2,845	1,750	-126	-1,095
Administration	27,435	28,063	25,050	-2,385	-3,013
Total, Arts	154,690	146,255	135,000	-19,690	-11,255
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and Administration					
Grants:					
Bridging Cultures	1,500	4,000	2,000	+500	-2,000
Federal/State partnership	42,450	40,100	38,000	-4,450	-2,100
Preservation and access	16,500	15,600	12,750	-3,750	-2,850
Public programs	15,000	13,800	12,000	-3,000	-1,800
Research programs	16,250	14,900	12,250	-4,000	-2,650
Education programs	13,750	13,550	12,000	-1,750	-1,550
Program development	500	500	500	---	---
We The People Initiative grants	3,219	---	4,750	+1,531	+4,750
Digital Humanities Initiatives	4,000	4,250	3,500	-500	-750
Subtotal, Grants	113,169	106,700	97,750	-15,419	-8,950
Matching Grants:					
Treasury funds	4,800	2,750	2,000	-2,800	-750
Challenge grants	9,471	8,750	8,000	-1,471	-750
Subtotal, Matching grants	14,271	11,500	10,000	-4,271	-1,500

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Administration	27,250	28,055	27,250	---	-805
Total, Humanities	154,690	146,255	135,000	-19,690	-11,255
TOTAL, NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES	309,380	292,510	270,000	-39,380	-22,510
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses	2,289	2,400	2,234	-55	-166
NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS					
Grants	2,994	---	---	-2,994	---
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION					
Salaries and expenses	5,896	6,108	5,498	-398	-610
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	8,490	8,154	8,133	-357	-21

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM					
Holocaust Memorial Museum	49,024	52,694	50,524	+1,500	-2,170
PRESIDIO TRUST					
Operations	14,970	12,000	12,000	-2,970	---
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	---	6,000	2,000	+2,000	-4,000
Capital construction	---	83,768	28,000	+28,000	-55,768
Total, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION	---	89,768	30,000	+30,000	-59,768
TOTAL, TITLE III, RELATED AGENCIES	10,299,035	11,258,880	10,458,050	+159,015	-800,830
Appropriations	(10,699,035)	(11,450,880)	(10,458,050)	(-240,985)	(-992,830)
Rescissions	(-400,000)	(-192,000)	---	(+400,000)	(+192,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2011
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2012
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Cabin user fee (Sec. 417)	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---
TOTAL, TITLE IV, GENERAL PROVISIONS	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---
GRAND TOTAL	29,610,782	31,343,710	27,519,420	-2,091,362	-3,824,290
Appropriations	(30,436,348)	(31,615,710)	(27,689,420)	(-2,746,928)	(-3,926,290)
Rescissions	(-825,566)	(-272,000)	(-170,000)	(+655,566)	(+102,000)
Discretionary total	29,559,000	31,289,290	27,465,000	-2,094,000	-3,824,290

DISSENTING VIEWS

We take no pleasure in opposing the FY 2012 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, but the deep cuts in important environmental and natural resource programs and the breathtaking array of special interest legislative riders and funding limitations leave us no choice.

To begin with, this bill was saddled with an exceedingly low 302(b) allocation. The bill is $2.086 billion, or 7 percent, below the FY 2011 appropriations level and $3.818 billion, or 12.7 percent, below the President's request. While some in the majority may wear these cuts as a badge of honor, the harm to the environment and our efforts to preserve America's natural heritage are too great to ignore.

We do note and commend the work Chairman Simpson did in chairing 22 hearings and receiving testimony from numerous agency and public witnesses. We appreciate the inclusive stance taken in developing this bill and recognize the difficulties in crafting a bill within the Subcommittee's allocation. We acknowledge Chairman Simpson's efforts to protect funding for programs serving American Indians. We only wish that this protection could have been extended to other important portions of this bill.

There is perhaps no greater example of the majority's misplaced funding decisions than the cuts that would be imposed on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). After the EPA budget was cut by 16 percent in the current fiscal year, the majority is now proposing a further reduction of 18 percent in the agency's budget for next year. These cuts are meant to diminish clean air and water programs at both the Federal and State level.

The Washington Post reported on June 20, 2011 that "because the EPA passes the vast majority of its money through to the states, it has meant that these governments—not Washington—are taking the biggest hits." The cuts proposed in this bill would substantially diminish the ability of the states to carry out their responsibilities under the law.

The air we breathe and the water we drink are endangered by the funding and policy decisions made in this bill. The consequences of these decisions will be felt in communities across the nation, especially with the ever-growing backlog of clean water and safe drinking water infrastructure projects. Cuts of nearly 40 percent to the Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water grant programs will only increase the backlog and leave many local communities at risk from aging or underdeveloped water and sewer systems.

We are extremely disappointed at the majority's decision to prohibit funds for Endangered Species Act (ESA) listings and critical habitat designations. These are the vital first steps needed to begin the recovery process for species at risk of extinction. Under the guise of sending a signal to the authorizing committee, this bill at-

tacks the very heart of the Endangered Species Act. In fact, the bill includes funding for a multitude of expired authorizations and in addition it contains numerous legislative authorizations. But when it comes to endangered species, the ESA's expired authorization is singled out as an excuse to do nothing.

During full committee consideration, we offered an amendment to restore the language and funding for ESA listings and critical habitat designations that have been included in the bill for many years. Unfortunately, this amendment was defeated by a vote of 23–26. Ironically, the bill does allow funds to be used to downgrade species protection through de-listing or reclassification from endangered to threatened species.

Wildlife programs in general are underfunded by the bill; there are deep cuts in programs that assist in the recovery of endangered species or help prevent their listing in the first place. This shortsighted approach undercuts the protection of species that not only have significant environmental value but also great economic value. In reality, the protection of species boosts tourism in many areas; spending by hunters and fishermen brings millions of dollars to local economies.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) has been one of the great conservation success stories of the past 50 years, but funding in this bill for LWCF activities would be the lowest since the program was created in 1965 and it would represent a 78 percent cut from the current fiscal year. Many park and recreation areas exist today because of the funds provided by the LWCF. We owe it to present and future generations to keep faith with the original promise of the LWCF—as we deplete the oil and gas resources of the Outer Continental Shelf, we committed to use a portion of the proceeds to invest in the future of America's natural, scenic, and recreational resources.

We are blessed in this country with great natural beauty and a wealth of natural resources; we have established a conservation system for some of the best of these resources that are the envy of the world. Our national parks and forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, and other conservation units deserve better than what this bill provides.

Funding for the National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) exemplifies the majority's lack of appreciation for our natural heritage. The conservation system on our public lands includes national monuments, wild and scenic rivers, and national trails. Under the bill, the NLCS would be cut by one-third below the current year appropriation and 50 percent below the Obama Administration's request.

Cultural activities and institutions, while a small portion of the bill, are a vital part of our communities and they enhance our quality of life. The disproportionate size of the cuts to these programs in relation to the overall funding in the bill is deeply disconcerting. For example, in the span of three years, appropriations for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities would be reduced from $167 million in each account in FY 2010, to $155 million in FY 2011 and, under the majority's proposal for FY 2012, to $135 million. This level is significantly below the amounts these agencies received 20 years ago.

Also during full committee consideration, we attempted to restore funding to three of the many programs cut by the bill. The amendment would have provided needed funding for the Superfund, Brownfields, and Indian Sanitary Facilities programs. To pay for these increases the amendment would have required highly profitable oil and gas companies to pay a greater share of the Federal Oil and Gas Leasing Program.

If our national budget is truly about shared sacrifice, we can start by asking the oil and gas companies to pay their fair share; they have profited so handsomely from the resources owned by the American public. Unfortunately, the Moran amendment failed. We regret that there are Members who would rather side with the oil and gas companies than provide potable water for Native American homes or clean up polluted sites.

The only thing more disappointing than the funding cuts is the scope and extent to which the majority has filled this bill with legislative riders and funding limitations. This is not so much a spending bill as it is a wish list for special interests. A large portion of this bill has nothing to do with deficit reduction and everything to do with carrying out an ideological agenda.

The list of special interest provisions is long: NEPA waivers, limitations on judicial review, the blocking of pollution controls, even the exposure of the Grand Canyon to the well-known hazards of uranium mining. The bill even has funding limitations on actions not being proposed by the Administration. It seems to us that special interest riders have become the new earmarks. Whole texts of legislative proposals have been included in the bill. We are struck by the sheer volume of these proposals as well as the majority's inconsistency on this matter. On one hand, they reject certain funding and authorizations for programs such as endangered species, saying the authorizing committees need to do this work; yet they turn around and add substantial legislative text claiming the Appropriations Committee needed to do this work for the authorizers. The Appropriations Committee has now become the "go-to place" for special interest provisions.

The numerous attacks on the environment in this bill are misplaced. There are those who want to make these controversies into a made-up struggle between humans and the environment. But it is a false dichotomy because we are all part of the environment and attacks on the environment are attacks on us all.

Clean air and clean water, as well as thriving plant and animal populations, are vital components of the infrastructure of our communities. Just as we need to invest in the physical infrastructure of our communities, so must we invest in our natural infrastructure.

We protect nature, not for nature's sake, but for our own sake. As the late distinguished Member of the House, Morris K. Udall, once noted: *"The more we exploit nature, the more our options are reduced, until we have only one: to fight for survival."*

Our constituents and, more importantly, our environment deserve better than what this bill is offering. We oppose the FY 2012 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill and recommend our colleagues do likewise.

NORM DICKS.
JIM MORAN.

○