AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

S. HRG. 114–29

THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

FEBRUARY 26, 2015

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

94–047 WASHINGTON : 2015

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska, *Chairman*

JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
MIKE LEE, Utah
JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
STEVE DAINES, Montana
BILL CASSIDY, Louisiana
CORY GARDNER, Colorado
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
JOHN HOEVEN, North Dakota
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee
SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, West Virginia

MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
RON WYDEN, Oregon
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan
AL FRANKEN, Minnesota
JOE MANCHIN III, West Virginia
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico
MAZIE K. HIRONO, Hawaii
ANGUS S. KING, JR., Maine
ELIZABETH WARREN, Massachusetts

KAREN K. BILLUPS, *Staff Director*
PATRICK J. MCCORMICK III, *Chief Counsel*
LUCY MURFITT, *Senior Counsel and Natural Resources Policy Director*
ANGELA BECKER-DIPPMANN, *Democratic Staff Director*
SAM E. FOWLER, *Democratic Chief Counsel*
BRYAN PETIT, *Democratic Senior Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

OPENING STATEMENTS

	Page
Murkowski, Hon. Lisa, Chairman, and a U.S. Senator from Alaska	1
Cantwell, Hon. Maria, Ranking Member, and a U.S. Senator from Washington	3

WITNESSES

Tidwell, Thomas, Chief, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture	6

ALPHABETICAL LISTING AND APPENDIX MATERIAL SUBMITTED

Cantwell, Hon. Maria	
Opening Statement	3
Murkowski, Hon. Lisa	
Opening Statement	1
Tidwell, Thomas	
Opening Statement	6
Written testimony	9
Responses to Questions for the Record	53

THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2015

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:50 a.m. in room SD–366, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Lisa Murkowski, Chairman of the Committee, presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. LISA MURKOWSKI, U.S. SENATOR FROM ALASKA

The Chairman. Good morning, we will call the Energy Committee meeting to order. Perhaps it's because we're starting a little bit earlier or perhaps it's because it's a snow day, but it can't possibly be because there's lack of interest in what goes within the Forest Service.

Chief Tidwell and Mr. Dixon, I welcome you to the Committee.

We are here for our third and our final budget hearing in the Energy Committee to review the President's request for the Forest Service for FY '16.

Again, Chief, I appreciate you being here this morning to explain the proposal.

It seems like we have the same conversation year after year about how the Forest Service is going to get the timber cut up, provide more economic opportunities for our rural and forested communities. Over the last decade the timber harvest from the Tongass has averaged just 35 million board feet a year. This is a forest the size of West Virginia, but we see severe restrictions including the roadless designation that really put most of it off limits.

The Secretary apparently has a plan to transition the timber harvest on the Tongass away from old growth to young growth. Chief, you and I have talked about this. These small operators are hanging on by their fingernails, and I keep repeating (and I will repeat again today) that I worry there's not going to be anything to transition to given what we have seen coming out of the Forest Service operations.

Some would suggest that is really the whole point of where we are going is to be in a situation where we are eliminating forestry from the Tongass' economic base. That is not something that is right, and it is not something I can tolerate.

When you look at what we are seeing, and I know you know because I know you have been briefed on this, but there are no logs

in the yard in the only sizeable mill. There is no federal assistance that has been given to retool a single mill to handle young growth in Southeast Alaska. I think that the Forest Service has broken the federal government's promise to actively manage our National Forests. Now the failure to reauthorize Secure Rural Schools is revealing this stark reality to forested communities across the West.

We have reached a point where if we're not cutting trees on federal lands and we hardly are, then counties and parishes and boroughs are going to be cutting their budgets. We are certainly seeing that in Alaska, and I would imagine in other Western states as well.

The timber industry can be sustainable but the funding required for Secure Rural Schools in the absence of timber harvesting simply is not sustainable. The Forest Service can't hide or make excuses any longer. Just 50 million dollars will be shared nationwide with our communities under the proposal or the process going forward of SRS.

In Alaska what that means to us is $537,000 spread out over the entire state. $537,000 in Alaska. We are going to work on forest management reform legislation to help resolve this situation, but the Forest Service has to be working with us.

Often we hear that recreation and tourism are the economic engines of the future, and I see this budget would increase funding for recreation programs. I agree with you that these programs are important. Certainly in Alaska we are very, very proud of our recreation industry, but recreation and tourism are not substitutes for responsible resource development on federal lands. They are complements to it.

We have, for the past 50 years, shown that resource development, recreation and tourism can easily co-exist. We are very proud of that fact, and we are very proud people want to come to Alaska. It is on their bucket list. It's the "before I die I want to see Alaska." Yet they know we are a resource production state, and our return tourists are what allow for that strong industry. So it's not like you've got a situation where we are not able to balance that within our state. I think we do it. We have done it successfully and sustainably.

Recreation and tourism also require public access, and these days, just as we are seeing with resource development, even these activities are being shut down by restrictive federal policies. When you were up in the state we had a good opportunity to understand what was going on in the Ketchikan area and Misty Fjords. We have commercial flightseeing operators who take people around to this pretty amazing place. The Forest Service on one hand is saying you need to move towards more recreation management, and on the other hand they are saying, sorry, we've got to limit the number of landings of float planes because they could impede the area's wilderness character.

You are knocking out float planes that would allow so many people to see the Misty Fjords. It is not possible to see it any other way. It's not like you can hike in. This is the way you can see it. This is the way that you can access it, yet we have got the Forest Service saying, no, it needs to manage this for wilderness character.

And it goes beyond just that. I am going to bring up in my questions the concern that I am hearing from so many. This is not just in Alaska, but so many others about the limitations on even being able to view pictures or films because of the limitations or the restrictions for individuals who would film on our public lands or Forest Service lands.

Chief, I told Secretary Jewell earlier this week and I think it bears repeating, this Administration is actively impeding many of our best economic opportunities in the West. It is depriving thousands who live in our states of the ability to find a good job, earn a good wage and live a good life.

Before I conclude my comments I think I would be remiss if I did not mention the elephant in the budget which is wildfire suppression funding. This budget, again, proposes a wildfire suppression cap adjustment, and I share the primary goal of that proposal. We absolutely have to stop the cycle of fire borrowing, but I also know that there are concerns about the mechanics, particularly in this constrained budget environment. There are several legislative proposals to consider here, and I do hope we can work on them with you, Chief, as well as the Budget Committee.

I look forward to your responses this morning. I'll turn to my Ranking Member, and then we will get started. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARIA CANTWELL, U.S. SENATOR FROM WASHINGTON

Senator CANTWELL. Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to thank Chief Tidwell and Budget Director Dixon for being here. I am sure any member that comes to participate in this morning's hearing is going to have very detailed questions for you given the nature of the areas that we represent, so thank you for your budget proposal.

It is a pleasure to have you and the leadership of your team. The health and vibrance of America's national forests are of particular interest to the American people and, as I said, to the individual States we represent. I believe the President's budget is a strong proposal that will enable the Forest Service to fulfill its motto of, "caring for the land and serving the people."

The budget not only improves the health of our land but also continues your predecessor's legacy of managing the forest to provide the greatest good to the greatest number of people in the long run. This proposal also demonstrates a strong commitment to the full range of national forest ecosystem services including water quality improvement, recreational opportunity for the public, energy for the nation, wildlife habitat, and timber and non-timber forest products.

But as you know, Chief, as we have discussed, there are particular issues that Washingtonians are worried about. I will look forward to bringing up some of those in the Q and A part of this hearing today.

Last year the Pacific Northwest saw the number of acres destroyed by wildfire increase by 200 percent above the yearly average. In Washington we experienced the worst wildfire in our history. In 24 hours the Carlton Complex burned 156,000 acres and, at its peak, moved at five acres per second, destroyed over 300

homes and accounted for seven percent of the total acres destroyed by wildfires in the United States last year.

Most of my Western colleagues have, in recent hearings, shared similar stories, and this is a problem we must confront immediately. In this respect I want to commend you on your budget's three-pronged approach to address our nation's wildfire problem.

Stable funding. This budget would ensure that the Forest Service would not have to transfer funding from its land management accounts to pay for fire suppression. I support fixing the Forest Service fire transfer problem which has placed enormous strain on its budget for more than a decade. That is why I joined Senators Wyden and Crapo as original co-sponsors of the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act legislation that is endorsed by this budget.

Secondly, in management. I also support provisions in this budget that would increase the land management activities that reduce fire risk, improve water quantity and quality and enhance carbon sequestration.

Third, collaboration with private landowners. I appreciate your collaboration just this morning on reviewing some of the activities that happened in the Carlton Complex Fire with one of our larger employers, Gemplers Farm, who were part of the response to that fire.

I am also excited about your engaging private landowners to take steps to reduce the risks posed by fires, and I would like to share a few important facts that demonstrate why this collaboration is so important.

Today there are 46 million homes, that is 40 percent of all the houses in the U.S., located in the Wildland-Urban Interface. In the 1990s, only about four percent of homes were located in this interface. Fire experts cite housing development in the Wildland Urban Interface as the number one reason firefighting costs have increased over the last 15 years. Only 16 percent of the Wildland-Urban Interface has been developed. When 50 percent is developed, suppression costs could rise to a dramatic $4 to $5 billion annually.

Given these facts I am particularly interested in discussing with the Forest Service efforts to make prescribed fire a tool that is more accessible to private landowners. I learned reading your budget that wildfires helped the forest conditions on 70 percent of the acres they burned last year, and these were conditions the Forest Service planned to spend money to create. The ARPS Canopy Model you developed in 2014, when deployed more broadly, will be a great example of using technology to help get that reintroduced onto private land in a safe and effective manner.

Although there is a great deal to be pleased about in this budget there are a few items that are confusing and need further explanation.

I am pleased to see that you still plan to reduce hazardous fuels on 1.73 million acres in that Wildland-Urban Interface; however, I am concerned about your intention to treat fewer acres that are supported by Community Wildfire Protection Plans. 70,000 communities are at risk for wildfire, but only 15,000 have a Community Wildfire Protection Plan.

It appears you intend to prioritize projects in places where local officials have not reached an agreement on which treatments to

use. This seems inconsistent with the Administration's emphasis on collaboration. I definitely want to talk to you about that.

Similarly, I do not understand why the budget proposes a six-percent cut in Preparedness funding. $63 million. Your own Fire Budget Analysis tool concluded that every dollar cut from Preparedness funding results in an increase of 1.7 dollars in the cost of suppression. I look forward to discussing those issues further.

I want to just bring up in my statement the importance of recreation. The Chairman just brought that up as well. I'm pleased that this year's budget builds on our recent track record of success with a proposed modest increase of $2 million for recreation.

Recreation on our national forests contributes $13 billion to the economy and 194,000 jobs. They are created from the National Forest system, and that's about 40 percent of the National Forest contribution to our GDP. The economic impact of recreation on our national forests is more than four times as large as our harvesting timber which provides for 2,000 jobs and creates $2.7 billion annually, so actually timber harvesting is among the lowest contributors on the national forests today. It ranks right around livestock grazing in national forests in terms of job impact. Truthfully, today only about three percent of the domestically produced timber comes from the National Forests.

Revitalizing and expanding recreation on our National Forests is an initiative that Senators on both sides of the aisle can get behind, and today youth spend 50 percent less time in our natural areas than they did 20 years ago. We certainly want to look at every way that we can increase that. I will have some questions on that specifically. Investment in recreation is an investment in which we can get a high return.

The average age of a Forest Service facility is 39 years old, and one-third of the facilities are more than 50 years old. While it makes sense that you removed over 2300 of these facilities in 2014, I am pleased the budget calls for the significant investment of $33 million to address their deferred maintenance.

I am pleased to know, if I am reading your budget right, that about $1 million of that would be an investment specifically at Mount St. Helens National Monument.

I would also like to commend the President for a strong commitment to fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund in this budget. Six thousand acres of open space are lost each year to development. That is about four acres per minute. The Forest Service's Land and Water Conservation investment would permanently protect working forest lands and help maintain our rural jobs.

I just want to also mention that people in my state expect public access to their land, so I'm especially pleased to see your proposal for five Land and Water Conservation Fund initiatives focused on increasing public access.

I am pleased to note the President's budget proposal emphasizes forest restoration. This is most clearly highlighted by the $822-million investment in the Integrated Resource Restoration line item, or the IRR, which would improve 20 watersheds.

I also appreciate the way the Administration has viewed timber harvesting as a means of restoration. In this term alone, the President is bringing a 25 percent increase in timber harvesting by fo-

cusing on the timber harvesting that helps the forests. This proposal calls for national forests to produce 3.2 billion board feet of timber by 2016. This is 50 percent more timber than the 2.1 billion board feet of the Bush Administration. So, to me, this is how we can take care of the land and take care of people.

Lastly while I remain concerned about the sharp decline in the miles of streams the Forest Service would restore under this budget proposal, I am excited about the increase in road decommissioning. The budget increases the miles of decommissioning to 2,000 miles in 2016, a 25-percent increase.

I want to specifically thank Regional Forester Pena for working with me to secure a substantial increase in the Legacy Roads and Trails funding for the State of Washington and reducing our quantity of roads while allowing the Forest Service to concentrate its limited resources. It has been greatly appreciated.

I am sure we'll have a lot more to say, and our colleagues will, on subjects like the reauthorization of Secure Rural Schools. As I said earlier, there are many things my colleagues, who are here this morning, will have, I'm sure, for the Forest Service because each of us represent States that have an integral relationship with the Forest Service.

So, again, thank you and Mr. Dixon for being here this morning.

The Chairman: With that we will turn to you, Chief, and welcome to the Committee. Good morning.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS TIDWELL, CHIEF, U.S. FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. TIDWELL. Madam Chair Murkowski, Ranking Member Cantwell, Senators of the Committee, once again it's a privilege to be here to be able to talk to you about the President's budget request for the Forest Service for FY '16.

I appreciate your comments. You made many of my key points already for me during your opening remarks, but I just want to amplify a couple things.

This budget request, once again, will allow us to continue to move forward with our efforts to restore the nation's forests and grasslands. It will allow us to treat over 2.9 million acres to improve the health and reduce the threat. It will allow us to restore 3,200 miles of streams, restore 2,000 miles of roads and improve the ecological conditions on 20 different watersheds and also will produce 3.2 billion board feet.

We want to add to our collaborative forest landscape restoration project. This has proven to be a very successful program we've had where we can make the commitment to provide funding, multiyear funding, on a dedicated large landscape and through a collaborative effort. It's producing very favorable results, and this budget request will ask for an extension of that program.

I also want to build on this concept for this has worked out very well where we have hazardous fuel issues, but there are parts of the country where we have forest health issues that I'd like to propose doing a pilot approach and probably five or six projects across the country in areas outside of the hazardous fuel situations where we have a fire dependent ecosystem, where we can show we can produce the same type of results by making a multiyear investment

on larger landscapes to address forest health and to sustain our industry.

This budget will also allow us to continue to build our support addressing hazardous fuels. We'll be able to treat another 1.7 million acres in our Wildland Urban Interface. We deal with 58 million acres of Wildland Urban Interface.

And Senator Cantwell, her facts and figures about how many homes we have in the Wildland Urban Interface just stresses the point why it's so important for us to be able to move forward with that.

Once again, our budget request is asking for a shift in how we deal with fire suppression funding. It would allow us to budget for 70 percent of suppression costs within our budget and then 30 percent of those costs would come out of the Disaster Relief Fund. That equals one percent of our fires. We'll continue to suppress 99 percent of the fires within our budget, but that one percent which we really feel we should be looking at these types of catastrophic fires as really a natural disaster, and it should be funded out of the Disaster Relief Fund. For instance last year our ten largest fires, over $329 million. We dealt with over 5,200 fires just on the National Forest, but ten of those fires, $329 million. Those are the type of fires we feel should be considered a "natural disaster."

This approach will eliminate the disruptive practice of having to shut down operations and transfer funds come August and September. Provide a stable level of funding. Allow us to be able to continue to work through those months, so we can be more proactive to address these concerns.

The other parts of this budget is that, you mentioned with Land and Water Conservation funding, we again are proposing to move forward with those programs and really target properties where there is strong public support. In every case it reduces our management costs by acquiring these properties. It also assures public access will be able to be guaranteed in the future. It allows us to be able to improve the overall watershed, you know, conditions. With our Forest Legacy Program it allows us to help people to keep their private lands working, to keep their private forested lands working.

We also are requesting some additional funds to deal with the deferred maintenance in our recreation facilities, roads and also on trails.

We also want to continue our work to expand and build on wood markets. With the Secretary's proposal on green building initiatives to continue our work around biomass and we're also asking for additional funding for forest inventory and analysis. That is the data that every state uses, that industry uses, to be able to have the information to be able to back up the investments we need to make in our integrated wood products industry, and it gives us the information to really understand what we need to be doing on the landscape to address the overall forest health concerns.

Then yes, once again, we've included the funding for a framework around Secure Rural Schools. It's just essential we find a way to be able to extend this program. It's proven to be very successful in the past, not only the funding that goes to the counties and the boroughs for their schools and roads, but also in Title II. It provided a significant amount of funding where we worked with the

counties to be able to move forward with restoration projects and has been proven very successful to eliminate a lot of the controversy and in my way, some of our best collaborative work has come through the RAC Committees that are established under Secure Rural Schools.

Thank you again for the opportunity to be here, and I look forward to answering your questions this morning.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Tidwell follows:]

Statement of
Tom Tidwell, Chief of the USDA Forest Service
Before the
Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Concerning
President's Fiscal Year 2016 Proposed Budget for the USDA Forest Service
February 26, 2015

Madam Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for inviting me to testify on the President's Budget request for the Forest Service for fiscal year (FY) 2016. I appreciate the support this committee has shown for the Forest Service in the past. I look forward to continuing to work with members of the Committee to ensure that stewardship of our Nation's forests and grasslands serve the desires, expectations, and interests of the American people. I am confident that this budget, paired with the passage of a wildland fire suppression budget cap adjustment, will allow the Forest Service to meet the increasingly complex challenges of natural resource management while fostering efficiency and demonstrating cost-effective spending.

Budget Request and Focus Areas
The President's proposed overall budget for discretionary funding for the Forest Service in FY 2016 is $4.9 billion. That is $130 million less than the FY 2015 enacted level, but it reflects strategic investments to increase forest restoration and reduce wildfire threats to communities. This Budget focuses on five key areas: restoring resilient landscapes, building thriving communities, managing wildland fires, promoting safety, and building diversity and inclusiveness. It proposes a fiscally responsible funding strategy for wildland fire management, contributes to long-term economic growth, and continues our efforts to achieve the greatest benefits for the taxpayer with the most cost-effective approach. This budget will enable us to more effectively reduce fire risk, manage landscapes more holistically, and increase the resiliency of the Nation's forests and grasslands as well as the communities that border them.

Restoring Resilient Landscapes
The Forest Service responds to the many stressors affecting our landscapes and watersheds by working to restore healthy, resilient forests and grasslands. By restoration, we mean re-establishing the functions and processes characteristic of healthier, more threat-resistant, and more resilient ecosystems, even if they are not exactly the same ecosystems that existed before. These efforts reduce carbon emissions and make forests and grasslands more resilient in the face of climate change as well as climate-related disturbances, such as wildfires and insect outbreaks. Our goal is to protect and regain the ability of America's forests and grasslands to deliver all the social, economic, and ecological values and benefits that Americans want and need, both now and for generations to come.

In FY 2012, Congress authorized a pilot program where multiple budget line items were combined into a single line item, Integrated Resource Restoration, in three Forest Service regions. Combining funds from multiple budget line items allows us to better integrate and align watershed protection and restoration into all aspects of our management. Results from the pilot program consistently show that budget planning is simpler and managers have more flexibility to complete restoration work. When programs are better integrated, it is easier to establish goals and set priorities. Given the demonstrated success of this approach in the three pilot regions, we propose to fully implement Integrated Resource Restoration across the entire Forest Service in

FY 2016, with a budget of $822 million. This level of funding and the associated outputs below are dependent on the passage of a fire suppression cap adjustment and will help us implement restoration projects to address insect and disease outbreaks in areas designated under the 2014 Farm Bill and to work with the States under our new Good Neighbor Authority. If funded at the requested budget level, we will use the Integrated Resource Restoration line item to treat 2.9 million acres to improve watershed function and resilience, sell 3.2 billion board feet of timber, maintain over 52 percent of the watersheds across the National Forest System at a properly functioning condition, and improve the condition of up to an additional 20 watersheds.

Created in 2009, the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program encourages collaborative, science-based ecosystem restoration of priority landscapes. The program currently supports 23 large-scale projects for 10-year funding to implement priority restoration projects on National Forest System lands while engaging local communities and leveraging partner resources through collaboration, implementation, and monitoring. The projects support an array of restoration activities, including reducing hazardous fuels, restoring watershed function and resilience, increasing pollinator habitat, and improving forest vegetation and wildlife habitat. These collaborative projects help local economies by creating and maintaining jobs in rural communities, generating commercial timber and biomass for energy production, and restoring forest health while reducing the need for fire suppression in overgrown forests. The FY 2016 President's Budget for the Forest Service includes a proposal to eventually increase funding authority for the program from $40 million to $80 million, with funding in FY 2016 requested at $60 million. The funding increase will allow us to pursue up to ten additional projects. Accordingly, the budget proposes extending authority for the program through 2024 to allow for full completion of new projects.

The FY 2016 President's Budget for the Forest Service sets the stage for restorative actions, providing the necessary infrastructure as well as the needed scientific and organizational foundations for ecological restoration. Our researchers will provide managers with the knowledge they need to make sound risk-based decisions to take restorative actions, partly through the Regional Hubs for Risk Adaptation and Mitigation to Climate Change. The FY 2016 President's Budget funds Forest Service Research and Development at $292 million. That includes $83 million for Forest Inventory and Analysis, an increase of $13 million from the FY 2015 enacted level. This additional funding will allow us to inventory the vast, remote forests of interior Alaska for the first time using state-of-the-art remote sensing technology combined with field teams to verify our initial results.

It will also allow us to address five of the 11 provisions in the Forest Inventory and Analysis strategic plan, developed pursuant to direction in the 2014 Farm Bill. These provisions include improved forest carbon and biomass estimation, enhanced forest ownership study, improvements in land use and land cover research, annualized forest products monitoring, and inventorying the full base target of 15 percent of plots in the East and 10 percent of plots in the West annually.

Building Thriving Communities

The Forest Service works to build thriving communities across the Nation by providing communities with the many economic benefits that result from sustainable multiple-use management of the national forests and grasslands, helping urban communities reconnect with the outdoors, and expanding the benefits that both rural and urban residents get from outdoor

recreation. Rural communities rely on the landscapes around them for hunting, fishing, and various amenities.

Forest-dependent rural counties and communities have long benefited from Forest Service payments to support rural schools, including payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000. We propose reauthorizing the act through 2019. This will help timber-dependent rural communities transition to a more diverse, resilient economic model that is less reliant on Federal receipts.

Jobs and economic benefits stem from our administration of the National Forest System, including its multiple uses, as well as from investments in the activities, access, and infrastructure needed to deliver essential public services such as clean water, electrical power, and outdoor recreational experiences. The FY 2016 President's Budget for the Forest Service will focus on building thriving communities by providing jobs and benefits in two key areas: outdoor recreation and forest products. We will also continue to issue and renew grazing permits, execute timber sales, and permit other commercial uses of forests and grasslands nationwide.

Jobs and Benefits from Outdoor Recreation
Spending by visitors engaging in recreation activities, including skiing, hiking, hunting, and fishing, supports more jobs and economic output than any other activities on the National Forest System. In 2012, outdoor recreation on the National Forest System supported around 190,000 jobs and contributed about $13 billion to the Nation's gross domestic product.

We offer a range of recreational opportunities across the National Forest System to connect people with nature in an unmatched variety of settings and through a plethora of activities. We will expand programs that demonstrate success and explore new partnerships that will leverage resources to help get more kids outdoors, up close and personal with nature. We will also reconnect visitors with America's outdoor heritage and help them learn about the Great Outdoors, improving their quality of life as they become citizen-stewards of their public lands. The FY 2016 President's Budget would fund the Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness program at $263.9 million. Reauthorization of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act through FY 2017 would help us meet public demand for sustainably managed recreational facilities. Additionally, the FY 2016 President's Budget includes a $33 million investment in Deferred Maintenance and Infrastructure Improvement to address the backlog of maintenance and repair of Forest Service facilities. This will enable us to manage our infrastructure to ensure safety, protect water quality, provide recreational opportunities, and conserve wildlife habitat, especially for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species.

Jobs and Benefits from Timber, Grazing, and Other Uses
Through work on National Forest System lands, the timber and forest products industries, livestock producers, and minerals/energy production collectively support about 118,000 jobs. Each year, these industries contribute about $11.5 billion to America's gross domestic product. In rural areas in particular, these uses deliver sustained social and economic benefits to communities.

Our restoration work will create local jobs and help sustain communities, as will the sale of restoration byproducts. We will use traditional timber sales as well as our stewardship contracting authority to restore watersheds and healthy, resilient forested landscapes on National

Forest System lands while engaging communities in management of their public lands. Our FY 2016 target for timber volume sold is 3.2 billion board feet, up from 2.9 billion board feet in FY 2015. We will promote woody biomass utilization and biomass markets and facilities, providing jobs and other community benefits. Local communities will also benefit from fuelwood, special forest products, and safe drinking water supplies from the national forests.

However, the national forests account for only 20 percent of the Nation's forested lands. The remainder is under State, private, Tribal, municipal, or other Federal ownership. Private forests alone supply almost 30 percent of the Nation's surface drinking water, provide habitat for 60 percent of at-risk species, and furnish more than 90 percent of domestically produced timber. Accordingly, our responsibilities to support sustainable forest management go far beyond the National Forest System lands.

We will continue to support sustainable forest management on a landscape scale through a variety of educational and technical assistance programs for private forest landowners. Rural communities benefit from nearby forests, which provide local jobs, bolster rural economies and community infrastructure, and furnish opportunities for rural Americans to connect with the Great Outdoors. The FY 2016 President's Budget proposes maintaining our investment in forest landowner assistance through $23 million in funding for the Forest Stewardship program.

Land Acquisition and Improved Public Access

The President's FY 2016 Budget proposes to permanently authorize annual mandatory funding of the Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior Land and Water Conservation Fund programs beginning in FY 2017. In FY 2016, we are requesting $400 million in discretionary funding and $500 million in mandatory funding, with all $900 million coming from mandatory funding in FY 2017 to be shared by Agriculture and Interior. Full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund supports the President's agenda of improving public access. Accordingly, the Forest Service will work with partners to protect critical forested landscapes from conversion to developed uses through $61 million in discretionary funding for the Forest Legacy Program, $8 million more than the FY 2015 enacted level.

Our Land Acquisition Program will provide access for people, protect critical ecosystems, and prevent habitat fragmentation. Land acquisitions provide proven value for the taxpayer, making it easier and less expensive for people to access their public lands—and easier and less expensive for the Forest Service to manage and restore the lands entrusted to our care. An analysis by The Trust for Public Land showed that every $1 invested in Federal land acquisition returns $4 to the taxpayer. The FY 2016 President's Budget proposes $63 million in discretionary funding for our Federal Land Acquisition program, an increase of $15.5 million from the FY 2015 enacted level. Five million dollars of the discretionary funds will be used to acquire tracts to improve sportsman and recreational access to National Forest System lands.

In and around our cities, we will work with partners to sustain and restore urban forests. This not only helps ensure widespread access to green space, but provides other vital benefits such as energy savings, flood and pollution control, and climate change mitigation. The vast majority of Americans live in urban areas and urban and community forests cover about 130 million acres, an area larger than California. Tree-lined streets and open spaces improve quality of life for millions of Americans and we will work with urban communities to protect and expand these

amenities. The FY 2016 President's Budget funds Urban and Community Forestry at $23.7 million.

Managing Wildland Fires

Increasingly severe fire seasons are one of the greatest challenges facing the Nation's forests. The Forest Service will continue to collaborate with its Federal, State, local, and Tribal governments, partners, and stakeholders on the implementation of the National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy to safely and effectively extinguish fire when needed, use fire where allowable, manage our natural resources and, as a Nation, live with wildland fire.

The Forest Service has one of the most effective fire organizations in the world and continues to keep almost 98 percent of the wildfires we fight very small. However, the few fires that do escape initial response tend to grow much larger far more quickly than ever before. In addition, the cost of fire suppression has soared in the past 20 years.

We are again proposing a revised funding strategy for wildfire suppression. The FY 2016 President's Budget proposes discretionary funding for suppression at a level represented by 70 percent of the 10-year average of fire suppression costs. This level of funding provides for suppression of 99 percent of the fires we fight[1]. In addition, up to $855 million would be made available under a disaster funding cap adjustment to meet funding needs for fire suppression above the base appropriation. This strategy would provide increased certainty in addressing growing needs for fire suppression funding while better protecting non-suppression programs from funding transfers that diminish their effectiveness. Moreover, it would allow us to stabilize our investments in restoring forested landscapes, helping forests adapt to the growing effects of climate change, and preparing communities in the wildland/urban interface for future wildfires.

Restoring Fire-Adapted Ecosystems

Fire plays a beneficial role in maintaining the ecological stability of many landscapes, and the Forest Service is working with partners to restore healthy, resilient, fire-adapted ecosystems. Our goal, especially near homes and communities, is to prepare forests and grasslands to resist stresses such as drought and recover from disturbances, including wildfires. Our large-scale restoration projects are designed in part to restore fire-adapted forest types across large landscapes, including the reintroduction of periodic wildland fire where safe and effective.

Developing new markets for the low-value woody materials we remove during restoration and hazardous fuels treatments will help offset the costs of these activities while providing new revenue streams for private landowners. Therefore, this remains a top priority for the Forest Service. We will continue to provide grants and other forms of assistance for wood-to-energy initiatives, and to help projects compete for other sources of funding. We will also provide technical assistance to help facilities that convert wood to energy become or remain financially viable.

Building Fire-Adapted Human Communities

More than 46 million homes in the United States, or about 40 percent of our Nation's housing units, are located in fire-prone parts of the wildland/urban interface. We will continue providing

[1] A joint analysis between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior found that one percent of fires are responsible for 30 percent of suppression costs.

scientific and analytical support to help these communities become fire-adapted. This work includes completing hazardous fuels treatments, preparing community wildfire protection plans, becoming designated as Firewise Communities through the national Firewise program, and obtaining equipment to respond to and mitigate wildfire. Our goal is to encourage communities to adapt to wildland fire by establishing an effective emergency response plan and managing risk in a way that protects lives, property, and wildland resources. The FY 2016 President's Budget proposes funding the corresponding Research and Development program at nearly $20 million and the Joint Fire Science Program at nearly $7 million, both about equal to the FY 2015 enacted levels.

We will control fuels in the wildland/urban interface by removing buildups of dead vegetation and thinning overly dense forests. We will focus on treating high-priority areas, including municipal watersheds to protect water supplies. The FY 2016 President's Budget proposes $359 million for our Hazardous Fuels program, approximately the same as the FY 2015 enacted level.

Responding Appropriately to Wildfire
Where suppression is needed to protect homes and property, we will continue to deploy resources at appropriate places and times. Fire managers are using improved decision support tools to make risk-based assessments about when and where to suppress a fire—and when and where to use fire to achieve management goals for long-term ecosystem health and resilience. Our primary goal is always to protect life and property. Our collaborative interagency emergency response capacity, executed in cooperation with law enforcement, helps us accomplish this by focusing on preparedness for wildfire and other natural disasters and assuring an appropriate risk-based response.

We will continue to maintain an appropriate level of preparedness. Our Preparedness program has proven its worth. Fire Program Analysis, a strategic management tool, shows that every $1.00 subtracted from preparedness funding adds $1.70 to suppression costs because of small fires that escape to become large fires. Maintaining an adequate level of preparedness will reduce overall fire management costs. The FY 2016 President's Budget proposes $1.08 billion in Preparedness funding.

We will continue pursuing our Large Airtanker Modernization Strategy. Airtankers play a crucial role in keeping fires small. In FY 2016, the Forest Service expects to have up to 21 airtankers available. Fifteen will be next generation and six will be legacy. One of the 15 will be a Forest Service C-130H. Our strategy is to fund both the older aircraft still in operation (needed as we transition to newer aircraft) and the next-generation airtankers currently under contract.

We will also continue leveraging State and local firefighting resources by providing State and volunteer fire assistance. State and local fire departments are the first responders to almost 75 percent of the Nation's wildfires, so investing in their capacity is a high priority for the Forest Service. Federal grants are matched dollar for dollar, extending the value of our investments. We propose funding the State Fire Assistance Program at $78 million and the Volunteer Fire Assistance Program at $13 million, both nearly equal to the FY 2015 enacted levels.

Promoting Safety
Forest Service work can take us into high-risk environments. Ensuring human safety entails recognizing and managing these risks. For several years now, the Forest Service has been on a

learning journey to become a safer organization. Our efforts have resulted in a reduction of work-related annual fatalities from a 5-year running average of 7.4 per year in 2009 to a current rate of 1.8 per year. We have also seen a 28-percent drop in new workers' compensation claims (from nearly 3,700 annual claims to 2,700 annual claims) over the same period. Our goal is to become a zero-fatality organization by continuing to make safety an integral part of our organizational culture.

Building Diversity and Inclusiveness

At a time when the vast majority of Americans live in metropolitan areas, part of the Forest Service's job is to reach out to urban and underserved communities to give more people opportunities to get outdoors, participate in public land management, and engage in conservation work in their own communities. Building on USDA priorities, we will create and retain a more diverse workforce that reflects American society. Diversity of thought is key to allowing successful organizations to respond to changing circumstances, and it stems from hiring people from varied backgrounds. We will strive to become an employer of choice for all Americans by continuing to treat everyone fairly and respectfully and giving everyone in our workforce the opportunity to contribute and succeed.

We will expand access to the outdoors for underserved and minority communities and young people from urban areas by continuing to invest in programs designed to reach out to urban youth. We will also build on our work with partners to offer opportunities for youth in urban areas to engage in conservation work in their own communities and on National Forest System lands. We will continue to support the President's America's Great Outdoors initiative, with its target of 10,000 students serving on public lands. Forest Service Job Corps sites established eight Public Lands Corps projects, enabling 1,825 Job Corps students to participate in 21st Century Conservation Service Corps projects.

Cost Savings and Avoidance

The Forest Service is committed to achieving the greatest benefits for the taxpayer at the lowest cost. Mindful of the need for savings, we have taken steps to cut operating costs. Taking advantage of new technologies, the Forest Service has streamlined and centralized our financial, information technology, and human resources operations to gain efficiencies and reduce costs. We will maintain the $100 million reduction in overhead costs (cost pools) implemented in FY 2013-2014.

In 2012, we adopted a new planning rule designed to reduce the length of time it takes to revise management plans, thereby reducing costs. We are also reducing costs by making our environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act more cost-effective.

We have adopted new public-private partnership strategies for leveraging restoration funding. For example, over 10 years the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program is expected to generate $152 million in partner funding. In 2010, we also signed an agreement to use municipal funds to restore fire-damaged national forest land in the municipal watershed of Denver, Colorado. Over 5 years, Denver Water is matching the Forest Service's own $16.5 million investment in watershed restoration. We have signed similar agreements with other cities.

Future Outlook

For more than a century, the Forest Service has served the American people by ensuring that their forests and grasslands deliver a full range of values and benefits. Americans benefit tremendously from investments in Forest Service programs and activities.

We are now facing some of the greatest ecological challenges in our history. Invasive species, climate change effects, regional drought and watershed degradation, fuel buildups and severe wildfires, habitat fragmentation and loss of open space, and devastating outbreaks of insects and disease all threaten the ability of America's forests and grasslands to continue delivering the ecosystem services Americans want and need. In response, the Forest Service is increasing the pace and scale of ecological restoration. We are working to create healthy, resilient forest and grassland ecosystems capable of sustaining and delivering clean air and water, habitat for wildlife, opportunities for outdoor recreation, and many other benefits.

Our budget request focuses on our highest priorities: restoring resilient landscapes; building thriving communities; and managing wildland fire safely and effectively, all while continuing to cultivate a highly diverse and inclusive workforce. We will continue to integrate our programs and activities while advancing on our journey toward becoming a safer organization that is more diverse and inclusive. We will also continue to reduce our environmental footprint and improve our administrative operations for greater efficiency and effectiveness.

This concludes my testimony, Madam Chairman. I would be happy to answer any questions that you or the Committee members have for me.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Chief, and since we have so few members here we will probably have an opportunity for several rounds. Senator Cantwell had to excuse herself to go to another markup, but she will be back. So we will be going back and forth.

Chief, I was listening to your comments and appreciate what you are saying about forest health and what we need to be doing to address the fire borrowing. As I mentioned in my opening statement, I am clearly with you on that. What I did not hear was what we are going to do about timber harvest.

We are talking about everything else on our national forests. The national forests that are supposed to be used, be managed, for multiple use. Well, multiple use, last time I checked, included harvest. So I want to talk about that part of it in my first round here because I'm just concerned that, again, when we talk about this transition to second growth and this proposal that the Secretary has and that you are tasked with implementation it's not something that can actually bear fruit.

Until we passed the Sealaska Lands bill last year the CMAI requirement of the National Forest Management Act prohibited timber harvest on the Tongass until the timber had reached its so called rotation age, and the rotation age for the Tongass is 90 to 100 years depending on where you are. Since we really did not see significant timber harvest in the Tongass until the 1960s, the harvest of young growth ordinarily would not be allowed under the National Forest Management Act for another 30 to 40 years.

You have also got a situation where, in the 60s when we saw most of that timber harvest, it was along the beaches, it was along the streams. So harvest of any of the young growth timber is not going to be permitted in these areas because of the Tongass Timber Reform Act and the 2008 Forest plan restrictions. The oldest of the young growth isn't available for harvest, not withstanding this departure from CMAI.

So how do we get to what you are talking about here to really see any viable harvest of second growth that will be available in this time period when you are talking about this transition? It just does not add up. I can understand on paper what it is that you are looking for, but in the Tongass, given the nature of what we are dealing with, how do you make this work?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Madam Chair, first of all when I look at the progress we've been making over the last few years I feel good about the progress we're making. When I look back——

The CHAIRMAN. Describe to me the progress because—

Mr. TIDWELL. Well——

The CHAIRMAN. People in Southeast Alaska do not feel like there is a lot of progress. A lot of our small operators are looking and saying, I'm out of here. They cannot keep people on a payroll if they do not have logs in their yard. So where are we on progress with that?

Mr. TIDWELL. So with what we're proposing in our FY '16 budget nationally our level of harvest will have gone up 33 percent over the last, about, six years.

The CHAIRMAN. Are we talking the Tongass?

Mr. TIDWELL. No, we're talking nationally.

The CHAIRMAN. But we are not talking the Tongass. I want to talk the Tongass.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well——

The CHAIRMAN. Because this is my state's or used to be my state's economy, but now there is no economy down there anymore. You are talking about this transition to second growth and there is no way, at least in Southeast Alaska, at least in the Tongass, our nation's largest national forest, that we are seeing progress. I want you to define progress for me to the people of the Tongass.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well the progress, I think, as you look at what we've been able to accomplish, you know, the last couple years. We are putting up more. It's not adequate.

The bridge timber we talked about to be able to provide the bridge until we can move into the second growth. We were able to get the Big Thorne sale out last year. We're optimistic we'll be moving forward with it this year.

The CHAIRMAN. We have got a little bit of an ESA issue with Big Thorne. You and I both know that. So to say that we have got it out there——

Mr. TIDWELL. We're working——

The CHAIRMAN. And it is going to be this big bridge out there. The people on Prince of Wales are not so optimistic about this right now.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, I'm going to remain optimistic based on the work that we've done to be able to address the concerns with species. At the same time we're going to be moving forward with additional sales this year. We're going to be moving forward with Wrangell, with Saddle Lakes.

The CHAIRMAN. What will those sales yield us in terms of board feet?

Mr. TIDWELL. We're going to put another 70 million board feet up for sale this year, and then the same thing the next year and maybe a little bit more. The Kausko sale with the Sealaska bill—and I do want to thank you for getting that through because it does help us to address the CMAI issue. It will modify the Kausko sale, so we'll have to put a little more work into that before we can move forward with it.

But we're going to be moving forward with those. We are planning to do the bridge, what we call the bridge timber, until we can get to second growth, and there are areas in that—you know, we worked—we've actually been using some of the examples of Sealaska as put forward with some of their sales to be able to show that there is a market for the second growth.

It's one of the things that, not only the Forest Service wants to move into this, but you see that Sealaska also wants to move into developing the markets for second growth. We're going to continue to put up our bridge sells, and as we begin to start putting up second growth—we had a small second growth sale last year. We're going to have some more small sales this year. Next year we'll have a larger second growth sale. So that's the transition.

It's also essential that the Advisory Committee that, once again, I'm confident that that Advisory Committee is going to come up with some very good recommendations about what should be the land base as we move forward with second growth. What are some

of the guidelines that people can maybe agree to about how to move forward? What are the timeframes? I'm optimistic that that Advisory Committee will provide us with a recommendation that could be one of the alternatives that we'll look at as we amend the forest plan.

So that is our path forward, and I'm going to remain confident on the Big Thorne until otherwise. At the same time we are moving forward with additional sales this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Chief, I have let you go over two minutes because I wanted to actually hear if there would be anything in your statement that I could believe was going to provide hope that we're going to see something different out of the Forest Service for the people of the Tongass. Maybe two minutes wasn't adequate to let you explain it, but I don't think you were offering anything more than you have which is nothing, which is nothing to the people of the Tongass.

Now, I am going to have an opportunity for a second round here to talk about some of the retooling. I want to talk about Secure Rural Schools because right now I've got an industry that is not confident of their future. They've got to figure out how they're going to keep the people who want to live and raise their families in the Southeast, how they are going to find some other work.

I am not encouraged this morning, and I don't think the people in my state are encouraged this morning.

With that I'll go to my friend from New Mexico.

Senator HEINRICH. Thank you, Chairman.

First, Chief, I want to thank you for the work around the transition for the Valles Caldera National Preserve and all the effort that the Forest Service has put into that. As you know that CFLRP work there is the foundation on which we can then do the Santa Fe National Forest CFLRP work in the surrounding Jemez Mountains. It's incredibly important for the Jemez.

I really appreciate your staff's work, together with the Park Service, to resolve those transitional issues and to keep that local, tribal contractor in business so that we continue to have that capacity to then put them to work on the Santa Fe National Forest areas as they finish up their NEPA process. I think that's really important, and I want to say thank you for that work.

I also want to commend you for the increase in CFLRP. That funding and that program have been incredibly successful at reducing hazardous fuels, at restoring watersheds, at reducing the conflict that we've seen in our national forests. It is a big piece of how we get ahead of the fire curve.

Speaking of fire, your budget request includes reform of how we budget for the largest, most catastrophic and expensive fires in the National Forest system. That is a reform that has been driven on a bipartisan basis by a number of the people on this Committee. It's something I strongly support. In New Mexico we know we need to spend more resources restoring our forests to a healthy condition so that we can spend less time and effort and resources fighting the huge, catastrophic fires that result from unhealthy forests.

If the proposed fire budget reforms were passed, how would that impact funding for hazardous fuels reductions in both watershed

and watershed restoration in New Mexico and other Western states?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, if we're able to pass legislation to address the fire suppression issue it will, once again, eliminate the need to transfer funds in August and September to allow us to continue to be able to do that work. It also allows us in this budget to request the same level of Hatfield's funding that we received in the past. Last year was a significant increase of over $50 million, and we really appreciate the Committee's support on that.

It allows us to request additional funding to do more forest restoration. We have countless examples, many in your state, where by getting in there and thinning out the forests we not only can reduce the threat, but we reduce the severity of wildfire. It is what we need to do. We just need to find ways to be able to continue to expand on that work. The other thing it will help us is to be able to move forward with the new Farm bill authorities because, once again, we will not have to worry about having to stop and shut down operations.

Senator HEINRICH. Well, I appreciate your focus on it. I couldn't agree more. And we've seen around the state in the Cibola in Western New Mexico. It's a great example, but in many places around the state, we simply don't have the big old 36–40 inch, DBH trees anymore in New Mexico. Being able to retool and then focus on these thinning projects has been key to sustaining what industry we have and making those fires much more manageable and much more like what they were historically when they served such an important ecosystem function within our Ponderosa Pine forests.

Shifting gears just a little bit. I have heard from constituents who have faced some pretty severe obstacles in applying for recreational special use permits on national forest. I know firsthand how challenging that is having run an organization that relied on those special use permits to get kids into the back country for educational purposes. We also are seeing a large number of veterans, a large interest in getting veterans, into our national forests for therapeutic reasons.

One of my constituents, who is a veteran himself and runs a business that provides those sort of therapeutic outings for veterans recovering from PTSD has been told by the Cibola National Forest that they won't even begin to consider his application for his permit until 2016 because they lack the staff. How does this budget address the backlog in recreational permit review and is the backlog a matter of funding or are there other obstacles that we can help with to get to more timely decisions on those?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well this budget request does ask for some additional money in recreation that will help address that backlog, but we also need to look at our permitting process to find some ways to put more efficiency into that, especially around, not only with outfitter and guides, but also with folks who want to take out youth.

Senator HEINRICH. Right.

Mr. TIDWELL. And to find, maybe, a different mechanism to be able to deal with that in a way so that there's certain areas where we need the skills of outfitters and guides. There's other areas that

people can take youth out to experience the outdoors for the conservation education, and it can be, maybe, a different experience.

So we want to work to come up with an approach that will allow us to be able to address that a little bit faster, be more effective. When I hear not until next year we can even address it, I hate that. I understand why our folks would say that because of the reduction of our staffing, but it's another example of what's happened to our agency staffing with the cost of fire suppression.

Since 2003 cost of fire suppression, the ten year average, has gone up $740 million. It's—the result of that. We reduced our staffing and our national forest system staffing by 35 percent. Foresters, 49 percent. When I think about the work our folks are getting done every year, I'll tell you it's just so impressive, but at the same time we just have to find a fix.

Senator HEINRICH. Yeah.

Mr. TIDWELL. Because the cost of fires, even though doing everything we can are going to continue to increase, especially in the Wildland Urban Interface. We've got to find a way to fix that so that we don't continue to have to look at moving funds from other programs in a constrained budget.

Those are the things we're looking at to improve our recreation services immediately, but this fire suppression fix is a long term.

Senator HEINRICH. I apologize, Madam Chair, for going over. I look forward to working with you on that issue. We are working on legislation.

I know firsthand the old system really treats the Boy Scouts the same way they treat a hunting outfitter guide, and I think we need some more nuance. We need some more efficiency.

And in a state where 68,000 people work in the outdoor recreation industry, we can't afford to be telling a veteran-owned business like that wait until next year. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Heinrich. Senator Daines.

Senator DAINES. Alright. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chief Tidwell, thank you for being here today.

Montana used to boast a robust timber economy. However since the late 80s harvests on our national forests are down 82 percent, and we've lost now nearly 30 mills. In fact, of the 11 surviving mills many workers there today are facing layoffs and reduced hours. As we look at strong demand in the lumber industry we can't get enough logs.

Meanwhile our national forests are suffering from insect infestation, overgrowth and, as you described, the risk to catastrophic wildfire. The deteriorating health of Montana's national forests jeopardize our public safety, our watersheds, undermines recreational hunting and frankly, is harmful to habitat.

Chief Tidwell, I hope we can work together to find some workable solutions trying to crack this nut that significantly increases responsible timber harvest and improve the forest health across Montana.

In fact, just last week I met with a variety of stakeholders regarding National Forest policy. It was a recess week in Washington, and I was back home in Montana. We had conservation. We had sportsmen. We had mill workers. We had members from the wood products industry. One strong message I heard from these

folks, from a variety of directions, is the impact of objections and lawsuits in obstructing these much needed timber sales and these collaborative projects. In fact, to hear that our mills today, the surviving mills, are receiving logs from Oregon, from Washington, from Canada, from Wyoming, when we're surrounded by millions of acres of national forests and much of it dying and still harvestable, to me, is a tragedy.

When I was growing up in Montana in Bozeman, my home high school was a double A high school, the largest classification in sports. The Libby Loggers up in Northwest Montana, they were a double A school when I was going to high school. Today the Libby Loggers, they've dropped to A and just going into this year now they're a Class B high school. There's a reason they call them the Libby Loggers. This is where the heart of our logging industry is in Montana. There's not a single mill in Lincoln County today as a result of what's going on in our timber industry. In fact, somebody said last week perhaps we should rename the Libby Loggers and call them the Libby Lawyers because that's what's going on now. The timber industry has been stopped by this habitual litigation.

So my question is how are these objections and litigation affecting the Forest Service's ability to complete timber projects in Montana in a reasonable time period?

Mr. TIDWELL. Senator, since we've moved from the old appeals process to the objection process that actually is a better way to move forward. We're able to address the concerns before we make the decision, and it's proving to be an effective approach. However, it does take some time. The litigation definitely does impact. It's not just the litigation when we get a temporary restraining order where we have to stop and wait. Every time we get a lawsuit the same staff that would be preparing for the next project have to prepare to go to court. We pull the information together for our attorneys to go to court. For me, that's probably the biggest impact to litigation because we don't have a separate staff just to be able to put together the information so the attorneys can go to court over it. It's the same folks that would be working on the next project. We're very successful. We win the majority of our cases, and I think up in your part of the country, the last I heard, something like 17 and 19, the last cases we won. Even when we win, it still has that impact because it slows down the development of the next project because we only have one set of staff to be able to deal with it.

Now we are making good progress with the collaborative efforts in your state, and we're seeing that. I do understand the frustration where you have that strong collaborative and people reach agreement about the project going forward.

I can use the Colt Summit a couple years ago where we had really tremendous support across the board from the conservation community, the environmental community and of course, the county and the state. Then we got sued, and we went through the process. Yes and we finally implemented the project, but it took another year or so to do it. So I understand that frustration. The solution I do believe, is to——

Senator DAINES. Go ahead. The solution is?

Mr. TIDWELL. The solution, I think, is to continue to find ways to support these collaborative efforts so that we can move forward in a way to actually implement the projects.

I understand from time to time we're going to be sued. and if we ever do anything that's wrong, I'll understand that. I understand that's part of the process.

Senator DAINES. Quickly to this insect infestation issue.

Our governor designated five million acres in the Montana National Forest Service that's eligible to be managed under the streamline processes established in the 2014 Farm bill. Based on feedback from Montanans I heard, I heard all about it last week. I'm concerned the Forest Service is not moving fast enough to implement this policy. I think it's good policy that came out of the Farm bill. This is exactly the kind of solutions we need to start moving on harvesting dead trees. That's what we're asking for right now.

I anticipate Congress funding Fiscal Year '16 to help implement this program, but can we expect some meaningful results on the ground now between today and October when the new fiscal year begins?

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes, Senator. In fact the first project that we used under the Farm bill authority for a CE. We actually put the decision out last December in your state. I know in that region they planned another five to six projects this year. They're moving forward with both the CEs and also using the expedited procedures for EAs and EISs. So we are moving out, and I want to thank the governor for his approach to be willing to put some state funding to work with us on that to be able to help us get more work done.

We're also looking forward to using the Good Neighbor Authority where we can work closely with the states to be able to use some of the state resources to help us to be able to get more work done. So we are moving forward on that. And FY '16, I think, is when you'll really see probably the big increase in the number of projects where we'll be using those new authorities.

Senator DAINES. Okay. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Warren.

Senator WARREN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

According to Forest Service's assessments, more than half our nation's fresh water comes from forest ecosystems. Agricultural Secretary Vilsack has noted that clean, healthy, forests are vital to our efforts to protect America's fresh water supply.

Chief Tidwell, can you just explain a little bit about why that's so?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, to provide clean water you need healthy forests because it protects the soil. It has the over story plus the under story so that when we do have disturbance events like big rains or floods, wind storms, etcetera, having that healthy forest maintains the ecosystem so that the system can filter the runoff and produce that clean water.

It's one of the reasons that you'll see—especially when we're working with EPA about how to continue to make sure we're providing clean water. There is a general understanding we have to start with healthy forests. You know that as well as anyone from your state.

Senator WARREN. Yes, thank you, sir. Let me then follow up on that by asking I know you're concerned about how climate change threatens our forests and threatens the many benefits that they provide to Americans including clean water. You've testified before this Committee and I think I've got your quote here that, "climate change is already altering our nation's forests in significant ways and those alterations are likely to accelerate in the future." What I'd like to ask is how does climate change affect the clean water benefits that our forests provide to our communities?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, if we lose our forested ecosystems from any disturbance event, but especially what we're seeing with the shift in climate, we're going to lose that filtering process to be able to provide the clean water. That's why we've continued to invest in our research and development part of the agency so that we understand the effects of a changing climate on vegetation and what we need to do differently to be able to address whether it's a threat of wildfire, whether it's the threat of insect and disease, whether it's the threat of more invasives.

It seems like every invasive that comes into our ports, especially here in the East, that a warmer climate seems to provide a more favorable environment for those species.

Senator WARREN. Yes, we evidently are very hospitable to these——

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes, the Emerald Ash Borer is a perfect example. It came into the country over 30 years ago and it pretty well just stayed in the mid part of the Atlantic Coast. As we've seen the weather change, the climates change, the Emerald Ash Borer has now made it to Canada because of the lack of having, really, any long, cold winters.

Senator WARREN. Can you talk just a little bit about what the Forest Service is doing right now in response to climate change?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, what we've done is we've looked at each one of our national forests and we've done an assessment to first of all, make sure we understand the current conditions, and then to make sure that our staff understands the things they need to be looking at into the future.

When we talk about restoring the forests it's not to restore it to something in the past. We need to be restoring the forest to the future. And in some situations to really look at if there's going to be a different species composition of the forest as we're looking out 20, 30, 40 years in front.

So that's where we rely on our scientists to provide the science and then for our land managers to use that in designing the projects as we go forward.

Senator WARREN. Well, thank you very much, Chief. You know, our forests face a number of threats and climate change is a very big one. Protecting our forests from threats has so many benefits, soil erosion, protect habitats for wildlife, take in atmospheric carbon, not to mention providing the recreational opportunities and contributing to regional economies, as others here have talked about.

As we've heard, healthy forests are vital to protecting our fresh water supply. It makes sense to make forward looking investments to address the real threats that our forests face today so that our

forests can continue to contribute in providing important health benefits for all of us and building a strong future.

Thank you very much, Chief, and thank you for your work.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Capito.

Senator CAPITO. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Chief, for being here with us today.

I'd like to talk about one aspect of your area of responsibility that is impacting our state right now. I'm from West Virginia, and the construction and maintenance of adequate pipeline capacity is critical to our nation and our state. We have a shale gas boom in the Marcellus shale in West Virginia and that's providing us with amazing opportunities, but we can't do this without pipelines.

In West Virginia at least four natural gas pipelines are being discussed. One such pipeline, I hope you're familiar with this, is the Atlantic Coast pipeline which is going through the Mon Forest in West Virginia, a 17.1 segment will go through Pocahontas and Randolph counties.

I think they're having, as part of the review process, community meetings and review. But the Forest Service has to make a separate determination as to whether to issue a right of way permit to conduct, operate and maintain a natural gas transmission project.

I would like to know if you are working with FERC and DOE to examine the importance of proposed pipelines and what this process is, in terms of your role in the Forest Service?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, we do work with FERC on projects and also Department of Energy. We have many, many, thousands of miles of pipeline that cross the national forests, so this is something that we deal with on a routine basis.

As part of the analysis, we'll look at the location. Where's the best location to minimize impacts. That's a thing that we look at. We also look, if possible, to minimize the amount of road construction that needs to be done because often with a pipeline they can just use the construction zone as their access point.

Those are the things that we look at to minimize the impact but then also to ensure that everything is being considered so that pipelines are located in a place where they'll have less of a potential problem in the future. It's one of the things we work very closely with the proponent, but then also with the public, to be able to get the public's concerns and be able to address that. That's the path we'll move forward with this pipeline, like we do it for all.

Senator CAPITO. Right. I think that's the process you're in right now, and I appreciate that.

I'd like to talk about the Secure Rural Schools. I've been a supporter of that. I have, obviously, some rural counties in West Virginia. Pocahontas County, for instance, has gone from $581,000 a year to $95,000; Randolph County, $383,000 to $62,000; Webster has lost $176,000; Pendleton County, $171,000; Tucker County, $170,000. I know this doesn't sound like large figures but when you're trying to——

Mr. TIDWELL. Right.

Senator CAPITO. In a rural area afford your schools it really impacts the schools. There are long bus rides, and it's an expensive system to maintain in a rural area like this.

I would like to work with you to try to address this issue, so what suggestions would you make at this point for us besides reauthorizing, so we can make sure that these school systems which are really struggling and the county systems are able to rely on us for reliable funding?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, first of all, Senator, there's tremendous urgency around this.

Senator CAPITO. Right.

Mr. TIDWELL. As you point out that the impact of this. We've proposed a framework in our budget request which provides funding. We really want to work with the Committee on the path forward, but I think the past with the titles of the past Secure Rural School authorizations worked very well. There's a lot of benefits for all three of those titles, but it's just essential that we find a way to move forward and get this reauthorized just as quickly as we can.

I don't care what county, I mean, for some counties there's larger levels of funding. But when I look at the impact and how severe it was from one year to the next.

Senator CAPITO. Yeah.

Mr. TIDWELL. Without any time for any planning, etcetera, it's essential that we just find a way to get this reauthorized as soon as we can, and we want to do everything we can to work with the Committee to find a path forward.

Senator CAPITO. I'm sure the Chair intends to work diligently on this, because I think there's a lot of bipartisan agreement that this needs to move forward.

I'll just make a quick comment and then I'll thank you again.

You've mentioned a lot about the cost of fire suppression. I think while we haven't been, on the East Coast or at least in West Virginia, the victim of large and broad wildfires, we have been the victim of the shifting of the funds. So I would encourage and work together to try and meet that challenge. Thank you very much.

Mr. TIDWELL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Capito, and know that this is a priority, certainly, to figure out how we deal with Secure Rural Schools. I know that Senator Wyden is very keyed in on this, and I look forward to working with him and with you as well. Senator Wyden.

Senator WYDEN. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. I appreciate that. And Senator Capito, we're very pleased to hear your comments. I know you joined as a co-sponsor of our legislation this week, the bill that I introduced with Senator Crapo. We wrote that bill in this room in 2000.

Chief, thank you for your continued support and persistence in speaking up for it. I'll just very quickly mention I do hope that we can make mandatory the PILT program as part of it because that helps give us a broader base for it. Senator Capito made, I think, essentially that same point.

We're looking for ways to grow our coalition for Secure Rural Schools, and making PILT mandatory will help us do that. As you know in the one year reauthorization for PILT we basically came up with a process that short changed that formula so now we've got frustrated communities about two areas of Secure Rural Schools and about PILT. So we look forward to working with you on that.

Let me talk to you about water for a moment. As you know my constituents are really on the cusp of coming up with a fresh approach for dealing with these contentious water battles, and we're having them all over the West. Again, this Committee played a leading role because essentially out of our work in the last Congress we came up in the Klamath Basin with something that really hadn't been done before and that was a task force that cut the cost of the program, eliminated some of the political battles between folks in different parts of the Basin. We felt we were really right on the cusp of being able to enact it into law.

Most recently we have bumped up against a serious problem involving the ownership of the Mazama Forest. As you and I have talked about here in the last couple of days, the Klamath tribe has, as I've indicated, continually worked in good faith. They have concerns about what's happened. We're going to have to find ways to deal with it, and make sure the tribes are treated fairly. I would just like to have, because I know people at home are listening to this, your thoughts on this and the commitment you gave to me, that you'll work with us to make sure the tribes are treated fairly because this will be key to actually getting this passed into law. I introduced it in the last session of Congress. Senator Merkley with the California Senators, we want to get it done this time. So having your commitment and having you on record today would be very helpful.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, we are committed to work with you and Senator Merkley to be able to find a solution, and I look at the benefits here providing a solution for the tribe and at the same time to deal with the water issues that are essential for the farmers and the ranchers. Once again, we're going to be faced with another very, very dry year.

Then at the same time to be able to factor in opportunities for us to increase the level of forest management here. I think there's some opportunities here for a very creative approach, and it's something that we could look at finding not only to address the solutions here but maybe in other parts of the country too.

So we're more than committed to being able to work with you to be able to find a solution to this because it's one of those issues that you can't change the past, can't change the history, but it's an opportunity to, kind of, move forward in a way that we can address this in a way that everybody benefits. The tribes benefit. The water users benefit. Industry can benefit from it. The public, in general, benefits from it. That's what I'm looking forward to, and I'll tell you that I talked to my staff. They're already rolling up their sleeves ready to go to work on this to look at some creative solutions.

Senator WYDEN. Well, thank you, Chief, and this will help Oregon. This will help people who live in the Basin. But I do think it has the potential to be a model for dealing with water issues around the country.

Let me ask you about one other question before my time runs out, and that's the question of fighting wildfires. As you know we have a bipartisan bill in the Senate. We have a bipartisan bill in the House because the system is essentially broken.

What we have is a situation where you all don't get enough resources in order to deal with prevention, then you have a situation where it gets hotter and drier and you have a lightning strike and all of a sudden you have an inferno on your hands. In effect the Prevention Fund is asked to put up money to help put the fire out and the problem gets worse because you have shorted prevention.

We're trying to change that. We have the Administration's support so these big fires, these infernos, would get handled from the Natural Disaster Fund.

Tell me what it means to you as we wrap up to have that kind of flexibility as the bipartisan bill in the Senate and House seeks to do.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, the benefits of having this legislation pass is one, it resolves the issue. It provides stable funding for suppression, and we no longer have to start off and sometimes in July, but definitely in August, contacting all of our units to see what funds are available then start to pull that money back to be able to transfer it.

Even in the very few years that we end up not having to transfer, we still have to go through all that work. It shuts down operations, it puts people out of work, and most times Congress then, sometime in the future, pays the money back.

So this is your proposal, it was scored neutral by the Congressional Budget Office. It's just a better business model, a better approach. At the same time, 99 percent of the fires will still be covered out of our budget. It's just this one percent.

You had one fire in your state last year. Senator Cantwell had one. We had quite a few in Oregon. But just last year the top ten fires, $329 million, and that's out of 52,000 fires just on the national forest. So we're going to continue to suppress 98 percent of our fires where we take initial attack. It's just this one percent that really does need to be considered a natural disaster.

Senator WYDEN. Thank you, Madam Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Gardner.

Senator GARDNER. Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you, Chief Tidwell, for your time and testimony today.

Following up on the theme that Senator Wyden was talking about, one of the things that we have to work on together, I think, is this issue of how disaster designations work when it comes to forest fires. The immediate aftermath of the hydrophobic soil conditions as it results in flooding and some of the damage that can occur to transportation systems, drinking water systems and others and making sure that our disaster declarations and designations reflect the nature of Western catastrophies like a wildfire verses an Eastern disaster like a hurricane or something else. I mean, that's, kind of, what we have to work on in some of our disaster designations and would enjoy the opportunity to work with you on that.

I wanted to also talk a little bit about fire suppression issues. As you know the various insect infestations in Colorado continue to grow, and the spruce beetle last year alone, we had a 22 percent expansion of the spruce beetle infestation, which of course, results in greater fire dangers.

It appears as if the request for fire management within the budget for research and development request for fire management remains stagnant. Can you talk a little bit about that?

Mr. TIDWELL. On the research and development part?

Senator GARDNER. Yes, for fire management, yes.

Mr. TIDWELL. Yeah, our budget request just reflects the constrained budget scenario we work under and where we've tried to target some very specific areas of our program to ask for additional funding around, for instance, wanting to move forward with forest, increasing forest management, but we're asking for a continued level with research.

We're also contining to expand our partnership with universities. In fact, some work that's potentially going to occur in your state about how to expand and leverage the funding we have to be able to work with others to be able to continue to do that essential research.

There's no question, we could always use more, broadening every program and every research area, but we feel that this is an adequate level to continue the research that's ongoing to be able to understand and address the problems that we're going to be facing.

Senator GARDNER. If we have time we'll get into a little of that work of whether it's the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute, the Southwest Ecological Restoration Institutes, I would love to continue our conversation on that.

In line with the wildfire issues though, I know we're talking about various changes to the funding of wildfire efforts and activities. In Fiscal Year 2016 the FLAME account is not included in the budget request, I believe. At $303 million in that account from last year what happens to that money going forward, that $303 million that was in the FLAME account?

Mr. TIDWELL. You'll see in our budget request that we're maintaining the increase in hazardous fuels funding that we received last year which is a little over $50 million. We're asking for another $20 million in our CFLR projects which helps us to address hazardous fuels and restore forests. We're also asking for another $27 million in our integrated resource restoration that allows us to be able to restore our forests, reduce the threat.

And then also, the ten year average, once again, it's gone up $115 million, so just 70 percent of that is about $80 million. You add those numbers up, plus you look at our overall budget request is actually $130 million less than last year. That basically is that $300 million difference.

That's our approach so we can be more proactive and at the same time understand the budget issues in this country and have, I think, somewhat of a constrained budget. But there's where we're looking for that flexibility so we can be more proactive.

Senator GARDNER. And two additional questions on the Ski Area Water Rights issues and the Ground Water Management Directive. Where do we stand right now with the Ski Area Water Rights Directive?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, we've had good meetings and a lot of good public comments so that we're in a place to solve this issue in that we're not going to be—we're going to address it by just working with the permitees to provide—it will be up to the ski areas to pro-

vide the adequate water that's needed to operate their facilities, and then when that permit transfers it will be up to the new operator. If they want a permit, they're going to have to be able to show they have water.

I feel that we've basically resolved this. We've got a couple small issues we have to work out on how, just the mechanics of it, but I think we're real close to having a final solution on this that will work for everyone.

Senator GARDNER. Under the original proposal, I believe, it's a violation of both Colorado Water Law and the federal Takings Law, Constitutional law. Do you think the proposal violates the Fifth Amendment?

Mr. TIDWELL. What we've been operating under since 2004 which was an agreement we worked out with the ski areas at the time, everyone was happy, and we actually thought that it would work.

Senator GARDNER. Everyone was happy after that agreement?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, yes, in 2004 the NSAA worked with us to be able to put that together, but then we found as we were implementing it that there was conflicts with state law and that was the reason we had to go back and take another approach.

It's taken some time, a lot of discussion, a lot of dialogue, but we're now finally in a place that, I think, it will resolve this once and for all. It's my understanding that we made good progress, and NSAA is in agreement that this is a good approach.

Senator GARDNER. Well, I look forward to talking with you because I believe it's also a violation of Takings, language in the Constitution, the Fifth Amendment.

Last year the Forest Service released a proposed directive on ground water resource management. The Forest Service Ground Water Directive obviously created a great deal of concern for states like Colorado, including organizations like the Western Governors Association, the National Water Resources Association, talking about concerns both the substance of the rule and the lack of stakeholder outreach that went into its development.

I'm very concerned about what this means and how this directive was put together, and I hope you would commit right here to improving your outreach to stakeholders and to working with the states and water users to address their concerns.

The second part of this question is I'd like to learn more about how this water directive, how this ground water management directive would work in areas like national grasslands where you have checkerboard ownership, issues like the South Platte water basin, the alluvial aquifer and the connections between the two. I think that's opening up an entire area that has a lot of people concerned.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well the proposed directive is something we've been working on for many years to have a consistent approach on how to evaluate the impacts of our decisions on ground water to prevent contaminating ground water from our decisions or impacting other people's water, their water rights, with our decisions. So we've never had a consistent approach, and there's been times when we've been inadequate level of analysis and we've gone to court. There's been times when our actions have contaminated ground water, and we've been sued. I want to—we need to have a

systematic approach so that we minimize any chance of contaminating ground water. When our decisions will have an impact on water rights, someone else's water, we need to disclose that.

Sometimes we don't have any choice. We can mitigate as much as we can, but there's sometimes we may, for instance, with the mine proposal. We make a decision, a decision we have to make, need to make, and it may impact water. So we want to be able to work with the states.

So where we are today is that we've stopped. We're going to go back. We're going to sit down primarily with the states, state water engineers, and to really sit down with them and get their ideas about how we can do this and ideally how we can do it together. There's some opportunities where some states are well positioned to provide this for us, to be able to do the analysis that we can use. That's where we're at right now. We're going to stop. We're going to continue to work with the states until we figure out the right way to go forward with this.

In the meanwhile I expect in some forests we're going to probably do more analysis than we need to. Hopefully in some places we won't do less and end up in court again, but that's our approach right now. It's something we've been working on for years.

Senator GARDNER. What about stakeholder outreach? Will you commit to increasing more?

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator's time has run out.

Senator GARDNER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cantwell.

Senator CANTWELL. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chief Tidwell, I apologize for having to run out to another committee markup. I very much appreciate you being here today.

My colleague, Senator Wyden, had a chance to talk to you, in more detail about his fire budgeting proposal, S. 235. Obviously, we want to get it enacted. If we don't, we'll be out of funds again this year.

You and I had a chance to talk about the devastation that happened from the Carlton Complex Fire. Again, thank you for your discussions yesterday and today about that. I am very interested in what we're going to do, the Forest Service and USDA, on moving ahead on flood control with the Burned Area Emergency Response teams. I definitely want your help and support in those communities in preventing the movement of the large amounts of ash that are there, which could caused flooding in the area.

What are you thinking about pilots? Are you thinking about using community wildfire protection plans to help us alleviate these kinds of predicaments in the future? When communities find themselves overrun by all of this, are you thinking about a way to help bring order into communities after these events, like the Carlton Complex Fire?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, first of all we are going to continue our restoration work on the Carlton Fire. We did the work last year. We'll continue to do more work here to stabilize some key areas to reforest, replant some areas and also continue to do some additional road work to stabilize that.

I guess that we were somewhat fortunate we have a pretty shallow snow pack this year and so we may not be subject to as much

flooding as we could have been. I say that there's some benefits and not with that because it sets us up for another potential dry year.

But your point about—in our community wildfire protection plans they're all focused on the work that we need to put into place to prevent the catastrophic loss of homes and impact on communities. You bring up a good point about what we also need to be thinking about when we do have fire because no matter what we do we're going to continue to have large fires, and we can make steps so that we can definitely reduce the number of homes that are lost, reduce the severity of wildfires. But we're going to have large fires.

So there's probably another component of this about what else do we need to have in place so that, not only before the fire, the actions we need to take, but also during the fire, the actions that we need to take. But also how can we make sure that we have thought out what we need to do following that fire. And we worked quick with our Burned Area Emergency Teams. They come in and quickly analyze the area and put some emergency steps into place.

Often the restoration then takes several years to follow that. It's an opportunity for us to really think about after the fire, which is also something we need to focus on. It's something to really look at with our partners and our cooperators, the private landowners and the communities.

So as much as I wish I could say yeah, if we can restore our forests, reduce the hazardous fuels, we're not going to have these scenarios. We're still going to have large fires in this country from everything that we're seeing, but we can reduce the threat to communities. We can definitely reduce the numbers, the thousands of homes that are lost to wildfires every year, but we're still going to need recovery efforts.

Senator CANTWELL. Well, I think the entire Okanogan, which is what we refer to as the region there, would gladly participate in ways to increase the work in the community wildfire protection plans and what we need to do moving forward, but I certainly want your help on the emergency response teams now for flood control and the community response in the area. So we definitely want to work with you on that.

I think the one thing that we've talked about but maybe it's really not been stated so specifically is we're not really talking about what we're getting ready for and what we don't have resources for and whether they're emergency disasters or not. I think the thing here that we saw, at least with the Carlton Complex, is this was a weather event. That really high winds caused this acceleration. So the question of weather and taking into consideration weather patterns as it relates to our fire season, I think, is something we're going to have to pay a lot more attention to.

I wanted to ask you about recreation permits. My colleague had a chance to ask you about that. Can you just discuss quickly about getting nonprofit youth serving groups like the YMCA into our national forests and what we need to do to get that permit process going so that they can also have access? It just seems to me if somebody from the YMCA or YWCA only wants to take ten people

into the forest service and educate them one Saturday morning that they should be able to do that.

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes, Senator. As I described earlier we have our outfitter and guide special use process that works very well for the outfitter and guides that want to take people more into the back country and have quite unique experiences. What you're describing, especially with our youth, is really a different experience. We need to look at being able to provide access so that it's easy for folks to take school kids, YMCA, YWCA, up onto the national forest and the grasslands to be able to experience that.

It's one of the things that this coming year, actually for the next ten years, working with the Department of Interior we're going to try to get every fourth grader out to a park, out to a forest for the next ten years to expose them to the outdoors, provide an activity for them. At the same time we need to find a way to make it easier for school groups, community groups, nonprofits to be able to get our youth out.

Senator CANTWELL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. And just for my colleague's information the Chief is very familiar with the situation that we had in a very small community in Southeastern Alaska where a day care provider took her young charges out to have a picnic in a shelter. It's not even a closed in shelter, just a picnic, and she was fined because she didn't have a permit. Now this is not how we welcome people to our public lands. So know that we want to work with you on that.

Senator Risch.

Senator RISCH. Were they singing, this land is your land, this land is my land, at the time? [Laughter.]

Chief Tidwell, thanks so much for your service. We really appreciate it. On behalf of Idahoans I can tell you that you've just been a pleasure to work with, and I find you to be reasonable and hopefully continue with that relationship over the next 694 days as we move along. I do want to put a couple of things on your radar screen.

First of all I know you were a big proponent of the forestry section in the 2014 Farm bill, and we had high hopes for the categorical exclusion from the NEPA process in there.

Well, the first one we tried is the Jasper Mountain project. I don't know if you're familiar with it or not. You might mark that down. It's about 3,000 acres. They tried to use the designation by prescription and a designation by description processes to move the thing forward. As fate would have it they're high centered with all four wheels spinning now because they say they couldn't use those in this particular situation, so I'd appreciate it if you'd have a look at that. This is something you and I were both excited about, and now here we've got the first one and the wheels have come off. So if you could take a look at that I would appreciate it.

The second thing that I think my staff has talked to yours and told you that I was going to ask you about this, but in 1980 the Central Idaho Wilderness Act was passed. You may have been living in Idaho in 1980 at the time. In any event, as you recall, it was very controversial, but we were patted on the head and told that everything was going to be alright. And one of the provisions in

there was the people who fly into the back country. As you know in Idaho, that's a big deal, and there's a number of back country airports that have used for decades back there. Section 7(a)(1) of the Central Idaho Wilderness Act states, "the landing of aircraft where this has use has become established prior to the date of enactment of this act shall be permitted to continue."

I'm told the Payette National Forest supervisor has proposed closing four of those air strips, so you might send a little memo when you get back to your desk about that and maybe send him a copy of the section because I'm just a poor country lawyer, but it seems to me, shall means shall. I know the Forest Service hates getting sued, but this looks like one that's set up to be a lawsuit if they proceed with that. I understand they may not want to do it anymore, but the 1980 Act is pretty clear about that. So I would appreciate it if you'd have a look at that. Again, thanks for your service. Thank you, Madam Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Flake.

Senator FLAKE. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Chief. Thanks for all you do for Arizona.

We've talked before about this topic. We have the Eastern Forest, the White Mountains, where I grew up, that we've had the White Mountain Stewardship Contract. It's revitalized the private industry in that area and has done some good work. We've seen about $130 million in private investment flow in.

Senator Heinrich and I toured, last April, some of the facilities and the mills and what not that are there because of the stewardship contract, and steps have been taken to give some kind of certainty moving ahead before 4FRI really kicks in.

Mr. TIDWELL. Right.

Senator FLAKE. There's that gap that we know was there, but we're still hearing from private industry, a couple of them in particular, that they just don't have the certainty moving ahead that they're going to be able to get their product out of the forest.

What is the Forest Service doing to give them the assurance that they'll be able to continue? As you know if we lose private industry this time, we'll never get it back. We'll just never get the investment there, and that's the only way that we can get these forests thinned and managed the way they should be.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, with the 4FRI area we're—I think they have just under the 4FRI contract, they have, I think, close to 19,000 acres that we've issued task orders on that. So there's plenty of work for them to do.

We're also getting close to be able to address the objections that we received on the EIS that cover about a million acres of your state and will allow us to be able to go forward and do the level of restoration on that type of landscape for many years in the future.

In addition to that to address the concern, there's also about 25,000 acres that's outside of the 4FRI and we're going to put up another 6,000 acres this year. I know it was really tight, especially last year, to be able to provide at the same time removing the 4FRI to be able to support the industry had come in. With this additional work that we're putting forward this year it should put us in a much better place.

Then as we move forward and once again, the additional hazardous fuels funding that we received in FY '15 will allow us to be able to put up more sales and not just for 4FRI but for also the other parts of your state that we need to move forward with. So that level of funding is going to be very—well, the timing was excellent on it and we're requesting that same level again so we can be able to have, kind of, a stable program across the country.

So we're going to be in a better position this coming year than we were in the past and to be able to continue to provide the work that needs to be done and to keep people employed.

Senator FLAKE. With regard to 4FRI since FY '13 there have been notices to proceed of about 21,000 acres, but only just north of 3,000 acres have actually been treated. What's the next milestone for the task orders with and what criteria are we using to judge these contractors? They just don't seem to be moving.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, each task order, I mean, it has a certain amount of time to be able to start the work and be able to implement it. At the same time the 4FRI contractor, I think, they too, were waiting to see if we were able to get this EIS done, this large EIS, to give them the confidence that they can make the additional investments.

If they're not able to get the work done we'll be able to offer these contracts to others who will be able to get the work done. You have to give an adequate amount of time, but if they're not able to perform on that or if they're not able to keep up with the level of work that we're putting out, we'll be able to contact with others.

So we want to be able to not only get the—make 4FRI successful, but at the same time to be able to have enough work on the landscape and also to use more of these stewardship, these long-term contracts, that have proven to be a success. I mean, your state was probably our early model about the difference that we can make. You personally have seen the difference on the ground, but also the investments that are in place were because of that.

We have to be able to maintain that, so we're going to do whatever it takes to, not only keep 4FRI going forward, but at the same time to be able to get more work available so that we can maintain that infrastructure that came in initially with our first stewardship contract there.

Senator FLAKE. Just one quick question in terms of overall priorities and budget.

In 2014 there was an A&E story about USFS that you had abandoned a $10 million initiative to hire an outside firm with a five year strategic organizational transformation or branding management contract, and I'm glad to see that that was abandoned. I would hope that we don't see that kind of money. That's big figures, a $10 million contract.

I know there are other contracts, smaller ones, for rebranding of the Department. I would think the best rebranding is for the Department to do as you have been in many areas, move forward and be able to treat these forests. That's a lot better than a $10 million project paid to an outside public relations firm to rebrand the Forest Service.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, it was never about rebranding. The purpose of the contract which was guaranteed for one year was to

help us find ways to strengthen our connection with communities because we found, as you've seen in some of your communities, where we've been able to come together. We can resolve a lot of the issues, bring people together in a way to be able to move forward with the work.

We don't have that everyplace across the country, so part of this was to strengthen our connection and to help people understand all of the multiple use that comes with their national forests. There are times that I meet with a lot of people and they're really interested in promoting their use, but at times it gets a little lonely when it comes to multiple use because that's our challenge.

So part of it is to be able to strengthen our connection with communities, but also to let people understand all the benefits that come from their national forests and to also understand this concept of multiple use and the benefits that they receive from our forests.

So I appreciate your comments on that. We're not moving forward with that contract. We're going to take a different approach on how to strengthen our connection with communities.

Senator FLAKE. Alright. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I just might add that if you're looking to strengthen the connection to communities you should be listening to some of these comments from colleagues here about the ways that the Forest Service puts a hand out and says, no, don't come in here unless you have the appropriate permit. Whether it's a day care provider in Wrangel or whether it's the kayaker in Seattle or in New Mexico.

If we're trying to get young people onto our lands it's one thing if you take the fourth graders in and you give them a great field trip, but if they can't come back with their families without having the right kind of a permit, I don't think we need to have a campaign to do that. I think it's simple common sense.

Let's go to Senator Manchin, and then we'll go to a second round.

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

As you might know, West Virginia is proud to be the third most forested state in the nation, close to 80 percent of the entire state is forested. We have 12 million acres of beautiful mixed hardwoods and softwoods. Timber production from these forests are critical to our state's economy, but they are equally important for providing the clean water, outdoor recreation, hunting, fishing and all the other uses that we enjoy.

Importantly 87 percent of our forest land is privately owned while only 13 percent is publicly owned. So east of the Mississippi we don't understand the BLM and all the things that go with it and all the challenges our friends out West may have. The largest expanse of public land is Monongahela National Forest, the fourth largest national forest in the Northeast and one of the most ecologically diverse forests in the entire National Forest system. We're also proud of our beautiful forests and the forest management practices that we have enjoyed working with you, so I appreciate that very much.

My question to you, sir, is that Governor Tomblin, from the State of West Virginia, requested a designation of Monongahela National Forest as an insect and disease epidemic area citing a number of

insects and diseases impacting that area. I think you're well aware of that. In May of last year you designated that requested area. Could you provide an update to me on the efforts to address these issues and how the agency is using its expedited authorities to get more done on the ground? If you could give me a brief on that, I'd appreciate that.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, you're referring to the designation of areas where we need to use the insect—what we call the insect and disease authority from the Farm bill. So the first thing was that to get to work with the governors to get their recommendations which we were able to do that. And then last year we designated, I think, close to 40—over 45 million acres across the country. It gives us the opportunity to use these expedited procedures when it comes to doing EAs and EISs where we only will have to look at like one action alternative and then a no action alternative.

And where we—so many places we have these strong collaborative groups come together. Folks understand what type of work needs to be on the landscape. And so, by just having to deal with maybe one, at most, two action alternatives, it will save time in the analysis. It will allow us to be able to move forward faster.

Then the other key part of this is also to have the categorical exclusion where we can look at up to 3,000 acres at a time and be able to use the CE to be able to cover that decision. Last year when the bill was passed, which I cannot thank you enough for that, we had our program of work in place for '14. And it had, often, a lot of our planning started for '15. But as we now move forward to start to do the planning for projects that we'll be implementing later this year and early next year, we'll be able to talk about specific examples to how using these new authorities. It's one of the things that I look at what's going to really help us to be more effective, look at larger landscapes. Once again to be able to reduce the amount of analysis and the amount of time that we have to spend to be able to implement which in most cases is what people want to see done on the ground.

Senator MANCHIN. Here's a follow up question. Chief Tidwell, your budget proposes a small reduction to total funding for R and D, research and development. But due to a $13 million proposed increase in the forest inventory and analyst program, the budget would ultimately reduce funding for other R and D programs by $17 million from your FY2015. Can you tell me what kind of impact this reduction will have on R and D programs and how it may affect my great State of West Virginia?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, working under a constrained budget we have to make some tough decisions.

Senator MANCHIN. Sure.

Mr. TIDWELL. And be able to move forward with the FIA that's absolutely essential. There had to be some tradeoffs, so what we'll be looking at in FY '16 is that some of our research we can slow down, things that are more long term, that whether we continue at this pace or we could actually slow down.

There's also some of the work that is getting close to being completed on certain projects that we can identify. We'll stop that. But it will have a reduction in the level of research.

Senator MANCHIN. What type of research and development would affect, let's say states in the Northeast, West Virginia, maybe out West too?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well it could, for instance, if we had a new species or a new invasive——

Senator MANCHIN. I just asked you about the species. What we're getting, is that going to affect what I just—the first question I asked you about, the species we know is invading Monongahela, the National Forest?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, the ongoing work that we're dealing with we'll want to continue to do that. But what could happen is if we had another invasive come that just showed up tomorrow or if something like Thousand Canker started to expand, we're not probably going to be able to get into additional research onto that.

So there is going to be some consequences. It's one of the things we'll look at what we can do by working with area universities and others to be able to see how we can, kind of, minimize that impact and see if we can't create some different partnerships on that. But it's just one of the consequences that we will have to slow down some of our research in certain areas, but we'll do everything we can to minimize the impact.

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Manchin.

Chief, I want to bring up the issue of Secure Rural Schools again because in your response to the Senator from West Virginia, Senator Capito, I did not really hear what the proposal was.

Earlier in the hearing we had some folks from Petersburg here. They were in my office yesterday. This is their biggest issue. Seven percent of their community's budget comes from Secure Rural Schools funding. Last year they got $1.2 million under Secure Rural Schools, but this year under the 25 percent proposal they're going to be down to $41,000. Clearly it's rattled a small community like that.

What funding source is the Administration looking to to use to pay for the Secure Rural Schools extension? Then what I would like to understand is how much timber would have to be cut and sold on our national forests to fund the Administration's own Secure Rural Schools program?

Mr. TIDWELL. So our proposal is just part of the overall President's budget to provide that——

The CHAIRMAN. So there's no pay for them for that. It's just included as part of the budget. What I'm trying to get at, we've got great interest, I think, from members of this Committee to find a way to fund Secure Rural Schools. Do you have any proposals for us in terms of how we can fund it? And if it's not from timber receipts, how are we going to do it and what would those timber receipts be?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, all the receipts, the timber receipts, are going to be part of the two hundred—in our proposal there's $275 million that's provided for the first year. I just want to stress it's a framework, and we really want to work with the Committee about how to put a reauthorization together on that. The timber receipts will be part of that, but the challenge is——

The CHAIRMAN. How much a part of that?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, you see with under the 1908 Act the $50 million that's spread across. That's about the level of funding that you see available. You know, the other part—and so it takes—we're going to continue to provide, you know, the receipts as part of Secure Rural Schools funding. So, those——

The CHAIRMAN. But we don't know how much those receipts are or is it the $50 million?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, $50 million, what was available under the 25 percent of the receipts.

The CHAIRMAN. Right.

Mr. TIDWELL. You know, there's about $125 million total that could be potentially made available, but there will have to be additional funding just like there has been for like the last what, 15 years, under Secure Rural Schools.

The CHAIRMAN. So, okay, there's $125 million potentially that is available to fund Secure Rural Schools. But we're only going to use $50 million of it?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, under the 1908 Act——

The CHAIRMAN. Okay.

Mr. TIDWELL. With 25 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Right.

Mr. TIDWELL. That's what it equates to.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask about the recreation activities and how much they actually generate in terms of receipts. Which recreation activities are shared under the 25 percent payments? And if you don't know that—what I'm trying to understand is what receipts from activities from our national forests are coming in and just an understanding as to how much is coming in and where it's coming in from?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, we can provide you a breakdown of each activity that generates receipts and how much that—we expect that to be, you know, in FY '16.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay.

Mr. TIDWELL. And the majority of it will come from, you know, from timber harvest. But the point that——

The CHAIRMAN. If you could get us a breakdown that lays this out, I think that that would be helpful. I've got a whole bunch of other questions, and I know that Senator Heinrich wanted to go another round here.

The 2008 amended Forest Plan for the Tongass does not contain a renewable energy plan. As you and I discussed as we were flying over the Tongass, in order to deal with the high cost of energy in Southeast, hydro is the cheapest, most available and renewable resource. But it's frustrated. It's complicated because of the roadless rule down there. I believe, pretty strongly, that we need to have a renewable energy plan in the amendment to the Tongass plan the Forest Service is now considering.

I received a letter yesterday directed to Forrest Cole, your forest supervisor in the Tongass, that outlines why this is an imperative. I want to make sure that is available to you. This is something, as important as it is to help with our struggling industry there in Southeast, our communities can't survive if we don't have affordable energy and the blessing in that part of the country is that the

affordable energy is a renewable energy. If our own policies are limiting or blocking our ability to either build that hydro facility or build transmission lines, we can't achieve that.

I'm going to make sure that you've got a copy of this letter and hope that you all are working aggressively to make sure that we've got a renewable energy plan within the amended Forest plan. Okay?

I'll turn to Senator Heinrich.

Senator HEINRICH. I want to thank you both for letting me go next.

I want to ask you, Chief, about funding for recreational facilities. I've heard from communities like Pecos, New Mexico, who really their businesses depend on hikers and fishermen and picnickers driving through their town as their primary customer base, particularly in the summer months. In the last few years we've seen a campground, a trail head, and several picnic and fishing areas in the Santa Fe National Forest all closed due to a lack of operations and maintenance funds. The small businesses in the nearby communities have really been hit hard by that.

Does your budget include increased resources for recreational facilities and what else can we do to make sure that these facilities stay open so that the public lands stay public?

Mr. TIDWELL. Our budget request asked for an additional $33 million to deal with some deferred maintenance around recreational facilities and also with our trails which will be a start on really what we need to address.

Once again, we've got to find a way that we can continue to respond to the public's needs to provide the level of service. Our full—proposal, that is something else we need to discuss about the reauthorizing that. It does help us out of the 14,000 rec sites that we have across the country.

There's about 4,000 of those where we collect fees that we retain and are able to use on site. We keep 95 percent of that on site, so that's one of the tools. The other thing, we need to continue to look for ways to work with businesses, with our concessionaires to find ways to be able to offset the costs of operating. We've also had some success with communities, especially when a facility is close to the community, the community can take it on as just part of being able to maintain that and keep it safe and operating.

So we're going to have to use all of those tools, but there's just no question this is an area that the public expects a higher level of service. They want to see these facilities.

And I'll tell you it's really difficult when we have to look at closing a facility when we can no longer afford to keep it open and safe.

Senator HEINRICH. Yeah, I would agree. Chief, this sounds like a joke, but it's really not. Do you know why the fish crossed the road? It's usually because the Forest Service put in a culvert or some other aquatic species crossing device, but the number of those has gone down precipitously in recent budget years. Particularly with the changes we're seeing in climate, the ability for our fisheries, particularly in cold weather fisheries in states like New Mexico, to be able to move up and down through the watershed in response to those changes is really limited by that infrastructure. We've seen that drop from, I think it was close to 600 crossings

funded in 2010 down to 275 in 2012, 168 in FY2014. This is troubling. I wanted you to address it.

Mr. TIDWELL. Once again it just reflects the consequence of going from 14 percent to over 40 percent of our budget into dealing with the cost of fires. We are asking for some additional funding in our Integrated Resource Restoration that will allow us to do work on about 3,200 miles of streams which is often to address these culverts, but it's a tremendous backlog.

The thing that adds to it is that 20 years, 30 years ago the culverts that we were putting in place were of a certain size. Today, with the change in the weather, the change in the climate we're seeing that often these culverts are undersized. And so whether we get a rain on snow event or in your country, in the, you know, the late summer.

Senator HEINRICH. Monsoons.

Mr. TIDWELL. When we get the monsoons that we're getting the duration is in a case where we're getting more of these culverts blowing out. So it's just another thing we're dealing with with the changing climate, and it's going to be something we're going to have to address to be able to find ways to not only be able to address this for fish, but also to maintain the access.

Senator HEINRICH. Right.

Mr. TIDWELL. Because when we lose the culvert.

Senator HEINRICH. We lose the road.

Mr. TIDWELL. Not only do the fish lose, but then so does the public.

Senator HEINRICH. You bet. Last thing. Congress provided the Forest Service $65 million in FY2015 to begin modernizing the large aircraft tanker fleet. What's the status there of the action plan and business case analysis for the large tanker program and when do you think you'll be able to provide Congress with the action plan to spend that appropriation?

Mr. TIDWELL. With that specific appropriation we've actually contracted with a company to do the business case to expedite that process. I'm hoping to have that completed in May, and we'll submit that into clearance. Then hopefully by later this year we'll be able to have that discussion about what's the best way to move forward with acquiring additional aircraft.

In addition with what we're doing with the next generation, we expect to have, probably, around 24 large air tankers operating this year plus our MAFFS units from the air force and air reserves. So we're going to be in a good position this year. We'll also be starting to bring on the C–130Hs that we'll begin to transfer. We're hoping to have the first one that we can start to use late this year, and then it will probably be in 2017 when they come on. But this potential new aircraft would help, basically replace one of those C–130Hs that have a very limited life span for us.

Senator HEINRICH. Great. Thank you, Madam Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cantwell.

Senator CANTWELL. Thank you.

Chief Tidwell, I learned recently that the Forest Service entered into a MOU, a memorandum of understanding, with the Biomass Power Association to expand wood energy use in the U.S. This is something that's very interesting to me. Obviously there are com-

munities in our country that use wood pellets and they can come from smaller trees and debris and things of that nature. Obviously collection is an issue and getting them to market.

Older, non-EPA certified wood stoves are considerable polluters, but new EPA-certified wood stoves don't even produce smoke. So this is a big opportunity to move forward. Separately I know EPA is revising how it will count emissions from woody biomass in its framework, and this framework can determine how biomass can be used to comply with the Clean Air Act regulations. Could you tell me about your participation in that and also about the MOU and what you hope to accomplish from that?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well a couple things will come out of the MOU. First of all, there's active competition between folks that make wood stoves to actually produce the most efficient stoves, but also to minimize any emissions. The advances that have been made in that technology is tremendous over the years from what it used to be. So that's one of the things we expect will come out of this is basically a product that will not only meet any air standards but also be even more efficient.

The second part of that is that we're going to continue our work to provide loans and grants to help folks design facilities. Senator Murkowski, in your state we're working with some of your communities to provide that upfront money to be able to do the design to be able to put facilities into place so that we can use this renewable energy. So it's not just for wood stoves but our program also wants to look at more of the commercial facilities, our schools, potentially hospitals and also look at our buildings so that we could be able to model this.

Another key part of this is with the Farm bill we have the authority to be able to subsidize the transportation of biomass. That's still the economic problem of biomass is getting it to where it could be used either to a facility to convert it into pellets or to haul it to a CoGen plant, etcetera. So we do have that authority. We'll continue to use it. We used it last year in California on the rim fire project.

So those are the variety of tools that we're using to really expand the use of wood. It's not the solution, but it's renewable. It's green energy.

But it's just another thing that we need to look at, because this biomass needs to be removed from our forests. The saw logs, that's the easy part. But there's a lot of other smaller diameter material and some of it we can put it into some of the advanced wood products that are available on the market today but there's also a need to use this residual material.

We have a project actually in Southern Colorado where we provided some initial funding for this project to get it started, and we expect now that it's probably going to save us $1 million a year because it provides a use of this material verses having to pay somebody to pile it and burn it to remove it. And so those are the things we want to continue to build on but having efficient, emission free, wood stoves is one of the things we hope to get out of this agreement.

Senator CANTWELL. Well I think the fact that those wood stoves are a game changer, and there are new products on emissions. I

think we should look more deeply at this. When I look at the Northeast and so many homes are still on home heating oil and paying exorbitant prices or visiting Alaska with my colleague here and seeing the exorbitant prices, I just keep thinking there's got to be a better solution.

Wood pellets, as you said, it is a green source of energy and certainly would be cheaper. And I know that in some non-attainment areas in parts of the United States communities have worked harder to transfer out these inefficient wood stoves and put in new ones. Those are the kinds of programs I think we should look at.

I have a related question. My colleague from New Mexico made me realize when we had the Carlton Complex Fire we had this question. There was a long delay on getting access to drones as a way to help us with that fire. What do we need to do to get the Department of Homeland Security to give the Forest Service the access and the authority to share drones to help us in fire fighting awareness on our forests?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, we're working with Homeland Security, also the FAA, to look into being able to use drones.

We've had a couple situations where working with the state, with the Air National Guard, we've actually been able to use drones on fires. We did in California a couple years ago, and it provided excellent intelligence. It actually identified a place in the fire where it crossed the line, but because of the heavy smoke cover we were not able to see it. But the drone was able to pick that up.

It was just a perfect example of—it's a tool that we're going to be moving forward to be able to use, but it's something that needs to be done in a way so that it can be done safely with conjunction of all the other air activity on fires. And at the same time to address the public's concerns about the use of these drones on fires.

So it's going probably take us a little while before we're able to have everything in place. But when we have the opportunity, especially working with the states to be able to use the military aircraft from time to time, it's one of the things we'll probably continue to do in the near term.

Senator CANTWELL. I hope that you will get an agreement with them because, to me, this is good information to have. When you think about some of these fires that do blow up and the challenges that we've had in the past, having that kind of data would be very, very helpful.

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes.

Senator CANTWELL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, the issue of drones is a really interesting one. I believe it was the Funny River fire in Alaska where——

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It was very, very helpful in terms of being able to target the drops. I have got a couple questions about young growth and then one on filming on public lands.

With this transition to young growth that the Administration continues to speak about, you have stated that it's going to be necessary to export the young growth logs outside of the United States to other countries instead of processing them at the mills in Alaska and that export is going to have to be part of the transition to young growth timber in order for it to be economic. Tell me how

exporting the young growth trees would help our struggling saw mills? How does this actually make the transition to young growth work? We are trying to figure out how you transition to young growth so that the Industry in Southeast Alaska stays alive. But if you're sending all the product overseas you're not going to be able to sustain these communities. So I don't see how it works.

Again, I have been very skeptical during this hearing, and I think you can sense my frustration, but this is yet another example of where I am not seeing the contribution to the local community here.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, I wish we didn't have to export any logs out of Southeast Alaska. It's my understanding to make, whether it's the old growth sales or second growth sales, economically viable that we have to allow for some export to occur. And it will be done based on the market, etcetera. Ideally if we could actually keep all that wood in Southeast Alaska and have it the facilities——

The CHAIRMAN. This isn't your idea that this is a good thing to export? You appreciate that part of what we are trying to do here is figure out how we can keep these smaller operators going and that you do that through ensuring available product is available in these communities.

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Not necessarily sending it out of the country.

Let me ask about the issue of retooling. Back in July of '13 the Secretary of Agriculture issued this memorandum that outlined the goal to transition from the old growth to the second growth. In his memo he says "we're going to pursue opportunities to facilitate investments in retooling and to develop by December 31 of 2013, in collaboration with rural development and other stakeholders, a plan for providing financial assistance to retool timber processing equipment in Southeast Alaska to assist the industry to handle youth growth timber."

That plan was due December 31 of '13. The question to you is where is the plan that the Secretary asked for and what, if anything, can you point to within this budget on retooling financial assistance to help the small industry in Southeastern Alaska make the transition?

First, where is the plan and second where do we see the retooling efforts in the budget?

Mr. TIDWELL. So it's my understanding with the plan that it has been different generations of that to address different issues working with rural development.

I'm also aware of another issue that's come up that we weren't aware of. I think it's the Credit Reform Act. I do not understand all of it, but it's my understanding that we may need to come to you and ask for a reprogramming request to be able to provide the funding that we want to be able to use on that retooling.

So I'm going to need to get back to you on this that we may need your help on a reprogramming request to be able to work with rural development to be able to do this.

To retool that mill is essential, and I think the sooner we can be able to move forward with that and work with the owners there to be able to do it, it will help us to be prepared to be able to not only

start using some second growth but to be prepared with the transition that will occur sometime in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay, we need to talk about this, Chief, because again, this was a directive that is now a year and a half stale. There has been no plan developed, and now you are saying we need to talk about reprogramming so that we can start doing some retooling. These are promises that were made, I think, in good faith, fairly, that just simply have not been delivered on. In the meantime every time I go back home to Ketchikan or any of the communities in the region they are saying, okay, we haven't been able to do anything to keep our operators alive. On the other, the Administration has promised us retooling. We don't see either, so this is a real tough spot for us. I think you know that. So you are either going to have to help me figure out how we allow for an industry, even a small industry, or what you are going to do to keep the promise on the retooling because it is just not there. I will look forward to visiting with you on this. But this is something. Promises made, promises not kept. So we've got to do better, Chief.

Let's go to Senator Franken.

Senator FRANKEN. Chief Tidwell, you and I have discussed the devastating impact of climate change on wildfires previously. Fighting wildfires costing a lot of money, about half your budget and all that spending means that preventive measures such as hazardous fuels treatment is receiving less funding, right?

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes.

Senator FRANKEN. So I'm very interested in exploring how we can find new markets for forest waste in order to help pay for the removal of hazardous fuels and simultaneously bring economic benefit to plants that can burn the waste. For example, in my State of Minnesota the District Energy of St. Paul was recently recognized for its leadership in using wood waste to generate heat and electricity for downtown St. Paul while providing its customers with stable and competitive energy prices and at the same time reducing CO_2 emissions. It seems to me the District Energy projects and combined heat and power plants are an ideal market for hazardous fuels, particularly ones that are located near our forests.

Chief Tidwell, can you describe what your energy is doing on such bio-based energy efforts and can you also tell us what needs to be done to encourage more facilities to get involved in that arena?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, we're continuing to make investments in the technology itself with our research scientists to be able to look at how to increase the efficiency, especially in pellets, to make them not only more durable, but actually increase the BTUs. But by doing that it expands the use. It also makes it more efficient.

The other part of it is to find ways to be able to defer the transportation costs because that's usually the limiting factor. If we have the biomass material at the facility, economically it makes good sense to use it. But it's to be able to find a way to deal with the transportation. So looking at the benefits of chipping a material in the woods and then hauling it out that way is some of the things we're using. We're also—continuing to make loan money and in some cases grant money available, especially through all the USDA

programs to help provide the funding to do the designs. So it helps communities if they want to put a facility in place then here's some funding to help pay for the design, do the feasibility study, so that they can see if they make the investment that, over time, they're actually going to break even on it through the use of wood.

The other key part of it is to provide the source. In your case there's a lot of wood available off of private lands and county lands, but also in certain parts of your state the wood that comes off the national forest is also essential. So it's a combination of continuing to improve the technology, providing a reliable source of material and then looking at ways to be able to address the transportation costs.

It may mean looking at multiple facilities and maybe less large facilities that—and you have to factor in the economics of that. But those are the things we're going to continue to work on because we need to make use of this material. Not only is it a green energy source, but also we need to remove the biomass one way or another.

Senator FRANKEN. Yeah.

Mr. TIDWELL. And so we've got to find a way to use this material instead of piling it up, burning it in cases which just costs more money. It makes more sense to be able to haul it to a facility and to use it.

We just had a discussion about wood stoves and the competition that's occurring to create the most fuel efficient, the most emission free wood stove to create, you know. And there's a market for that. But that's another thing that's going on.

Granted that's just in homes, but every little piece will help. So it's not just what we can do in homes, but also in businesses. And we have numerous examples across the country where we put these facilities in and in many cases, the business has been able to pay off their investment in a matter of years because of their energy cost savings.

Senator FRANKEN. Well, thank you. I see my time is about to expire, so I'll submit a question for the record. Thank you, Madam Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Hoeven.

Senator HOEVEN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Chief Tidwell, good to see you. Thanks for your previous visits to North Dakota.

I guess my first question is before you finalize the EA for the update to the management plan for our lotees on the grasslands in North Dakota are you going to be back in North Dakota? We'd certainly like to see you again. Any chance you'll be back?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, I'll look at my schedule. I appreciate the times that I've been able to be up there with you and also the time I worked up there in the past. Those meetings, I've felt, have always been helpful to not only for me to understand, continue to understand the issues, but also the challenges you're facing up there.

Senator HOEVEN. You've been good about coming. I think there's some concerns on the part of our ranchers and grazers as far as your draft EA. And so both in terms of their input, some of the specific recommendations they have and input from North Dakota

State University Range Science, I need to understand how you're going to take those comments and concerns into consideration in going from the draft to a final EA. And I think it would be good if you're back to talk about that before you finalize the EA.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, we look at the comments from the university along with the comments from everyone else plus the other science that's available, and it's all factored into those decisions. I understand we've made some progress, you know, in resolving some of the issues, but there still is this concern about the biological capable areas.

Senator HOEVEN. Right.

Mr. TIDWELL. As to which areas the grass can actually grow tall enough to have the stubble height that we'd like to see for some of the upland game species. So that's the thing.

It's going to continue to look at the science that the universities provide and the science that we have from our scientists, the work that's been done with NRCS and the comments from the ranchers. I'm going to remain optimistic that we can find a way through on this because there's definitely areas where folks agree that it's biologically capable, but there's also some areas where we have this disagreement and a lot of that is something we don't have to continue to look on and work on.

I also think there's some flexibility here to be able to look at these areas and to be able to go out there and just monitor it too because there's may be some that it's right on the edge. Depending on years it may work, it may not. But I'm going to remain optimistic that if we can just understand areas we're in agreement and then areas where there's disagreement and then go and take a look at those areas and just see what it will take for us to be able to reach agreement on that and to be able, then, to monitor it because we're in this for the long term.

Senator HOEVEN. Can we look at getting you out to have that discussion with our grazers and the NDSU Range Scientists and your folks before you issue the final EA? Because I think that would be a good discussion so that our people can get a sense of where you're going and what that flexibility is before you finalize that EA?

Mr. TIDWELL. I'll check to see what the schedule is on completing that EA and my schedule, and if there's any way I can get up there I'll do it.

Senator HOEVEN. Okay. Let's see if we can make that happen. It'd be great. I think it'd be helpful.

The other question is on controlled burns. What measures are you taking to make sure that you're taking proper precautions to coordinate with people on the ground who live, work, ranch, graze, farm, in the area before you're doing any controlled burns on forest lands?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well it's essential that we, before we even plan to do a prescribed burn that we, not only go through our public comment process, but we're also taking the time to meet with our cooperators, meet with the community, so that folks understand what we're trying to get done here, factor in their concerns, you know, make sure we're using all the information that we need to have to ensure that when we are in prescription to be able to carry out the

burn under the conditions where it can be controlled, that we have all the information that's needed.

In your case that we need additional weather information. And if we're relying on it from one state or one area we may have to recognize we need additional information. And if that means putting up some portable weather stations ahead of time that's the sort of thing we need to do to make sure that we can continue to use the tool. But at the same time to do everything we can to make sure that we do not have the situation where we have a fire, a burn, a prescribed burn, that it gets out of prescription and impacts private land, destroys facilities. It's the last thing we want to do.

Senator HOEVEN. Yeah, and again, I'd really urge you to emphasize to your people that are out on the ground, that local coordination, working with those folks. I understand there may be different considerations when you're actually working in forests, but we are grasslands. That is different, and so anything and everything you can do to coordinate with the locals I think is very important. Thanks, Chief.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cantwell, do you have any additional questions?

Senator CANTWELL. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Chief, if I may, just ask one final question? I have hinted at this throughout this morning's conversation, and this is relating to filming on public lands.

I have been at a couple of different venues, one inside the state, one outside the state, and I thought that I would be asked questions about hunting and fishing and sportsmen's issues but what it came back to was just this hue and cry over filming on public lands. It ties in with what we have heard from Senator Heinrich and Senator Cantwell here in terms of public access and just understanding what the rules are on our public lands.

It would seem to me that the law on commercial filming that we passed in Congress in 2000 is being grossly misconstrued and applied in a way that really limits or restricts or sometimes outright denies access to our public lands. The folks that I am talking to, these are not big movie producers. These are a couple people, three people, film crews. They have cameras. They have hand held video equipment. They are not disturbing the landscape. They are basically going in and taking these beautiful pictures that allow people who would otherwise not be able to access these amazing lands an opportunity to see it. The frustration, I think, is that in some places they are being allowed access and others they are not.

Now I understand that you are planning on issuing a new directive on commercial filming in wilderness areas. I don't know if it's this month or how soon it's coming up, but can you give me a heads up in terms of what this directive will actually allow, particularly as it relates to individuals and small film operations? We are working together on a proposal in the context of the sportsmen's bill that would exempt a diminimus number of people who would be engaging in filming on our Forest Service lands. What do you think about something like this?

I need to understand a little bit more from your perspective where the Forest Service is going on filming.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, we're going to move forward with taking the comments and all the meetings we've had across the country to put forward a proposal on how and when, for commercial filming, in wilderness. Because of the Wilderness Act that restricts or limits commercial activities we need to have a system in place so it's consistent across the board for when it comes to commercial filming in wilderness.

And really, what is commercial filming? You know, in the past, it's the movies, the Hollywood movies, definitely it is a commercial film. But there's a lot of other things—today people go out and take pictures. You never had to have a permit for that before. Don't have to have a permit for it now. So this is all about commercial filming in wilderness. But what did come out of the discussions we had across the country was a lot of questions around this. And that we've never charged for somebody to take a picture.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope we are not planning on it.

Mr. TIDWELL. No, we're not.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay.

Mr. TIDWELL. We never have nor would we. This is about commercial filming, and really the permit is to address the requirements under the Wilderness Act to be able to put in place; these are the opportunities we have for commercial filming in wilderness. There's a lot of other places you can go film, but certain things.

We have situations where people want to film in wilderness and they want to carry the story about wilderness, whether it's wilderness ethic or the importance of wilderness. We feel that that fits in fine.

If it's a Hollywood production that could be filmed someplace else verses being in a wilderness we'll probably say, hey, here's another landscape. Go film over here.

The CHAIRMAN. What about this diminimus idea? So you have a few guys. Let's just say for discussion you have three folks and they are carrying all their gear on their back and they are hiking in?

Mr. TIDWELL. If it's for a commercial filming and this is one of the things we're working on. We're actually working with the industry to come up with some clear definitions of just what commercial filming is. It's something we're going to have to address to be able to find what is the right approach to be able to do that, because you're right, today from when we put these procedures in place in, what was it? 2000? When the bill was? Well today the equipment most of the time, it's something like this.

The CHAIRMAN. Yeah, this, on a stick, maybe.

Mr. TIDWELL. Yeah, exactly. And so it really changes the concern about impact on the ground because you're not looking at large film crews in a lot of cases when somebody wants to do a commercial film when they can use the equipment that's either on their hand or on their shoulder at the most. So that's the thing that we're trying to work through this.

The CHAIRMAN. So——

Mr. TIDWELL. This is just about wilderness and wilderness only.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay. So when do you anticipate that this directive is going to be out?

Mr. TIDWELL. I'll get back to you on that date.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean, like, soon or a month?

Mr. TIDWELL. It's going to be this year.

The CHAIRMAN. This year? Okay.

The CHAIRMAN. So again, I hope the direction you are taking recognizes that it is not necessarily big Hollywood crews, that there is a distinction when you go out with this small equipment. I would think that we would have an allowance within our public lands and a recognition that this is not the type of activity that we want to preclude. I appreciate what you are saying about the differences between wilderness areas and non-wilderness areas, but again, there has to be some level of consistency out here. What I am hearing from folks is there is none right now. It is more than confusing, and it makes folks really angry.

I think we have to get this right. And I'm thinking that if you've got small operators using this small equipment and you're, I don't know, you mentioned drones, Senator Cantwell. There is some really great video footage of the Tongass that was taken by these little drones you can get at Best Buy and put your camera on it with your GoPro—you get some pretty amazing shots.

I am sure hoping that we are not going to be telling people that we can't do that without a permit.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, we've had this interim directive out, I think, for four or five years. And we did have two or three situations where it was applied inconsistently which makes the case for why we need to have very clear direction to all of our offices about how to approach this.

And also what is commercial? And that's where we've had some, I think, some very productive meetings with the industry where they've really helped provide some additional insight about how to do this in a way that will make sense to them. And so that's where a lot of the comments that we've received have come directly from those and a lot of public comments too. But because of that work and the meetings we've held across the country with industry on this that I feel we'll be able to move forward in a way with something that works, that it's clear and people won't have to worry about when they need a permit or not. It will be very clear for those that do need it around this concept of commercial and wilderness.

That's the thing we're moving forward to. And I'm optimistic, based on the comments in the meetings that I have had with some of the folks, that we'll be in a much better place than the interim directive we've been following in the past. This will be improved. It will be easier, and it will be better.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I hope so because I do not think it does the Forest Service any good——

Mr. TIDWELL. Yeah.

The CHAIRMAN. To see top of the fold headlines in the Juneau Empire about the Forest Service banning the use of photographs or photographers in the Tongass. That is not good for you. It creates confusion.

Mr. TIDWELL. It's never happened. It never will.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay, with that I appreciate the time that you have given the Committee this morning. I think you got a whole host of issues placed in front of you.

I would like to talk to you a little bit more about some of the things we discussed here this morning, but I think you can hear the continuing concern and frustration from the people of the Tongass as we try to live in an area where we are a hundred percent surrounded by our nation's largest national forest.

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And not much room to move around. So thank you and I thank my Ranking Member this morning.

[Whereupon, at 12:12 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIX MATERIAL SUBMITTED

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Responses from Chief Tidwell to Questions for the Record
Submitted by Chairman Lisa Murkowski

Question 1: The budget proposal includes an extension and 4 year phase-out of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program (pg. 345 of the budget justification). Based on this proposal, please answer the following questions:

a. How much would be paid to States in each fiscal year under this proposal and how is that money allocated among the three titles?

Answer: The FY 2016 President's Budget proposes a mandatory reauthorization and a four-year phase-out through 2019 of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) Act starting in FY 2015 with an estimated $275 million of total payments to communities. The table below shows the Payments to Communities proposal from the FY 2016 President's Budget.

Payments to Communities Proposal - Funding Source					
(dollars in thousands)					
Funding Source	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
Mandatory	275,000	247,000	154,000	118,000	97,000

We have not made any preliminary decisions on the proposed payments under the various Titles and we look forward to working with Congress in the reauthorization process for Secure Rural Schools.

b. What dedicated funding source is the Administration proposing to use in order to pay for this SRS extension?

Answer: Annual funding under this Proposal would be funded in part by receipts derived from National Forest System lands and deposited into the National Forest Fund during a fiscal year, as with prior SRS authorizations. For FYs 2015-2018 there would also be a supplemental Payment to States (Treasury warrant), which would decrease each year until it is eliminated in FY 2019.

Question 2: More and more of the contracts let for timber harvesting on the national forests are stewardship contracts. According to the Forest Service's cut and sold reports for FY2014, stewardship contracts provided 30 percent of the timber volume sold in 2014, up from 27.5 percent last year, and up from less than 5 percent in 2004.

a. Does this Administration support sharing stewardship contracting receipts under the Twenty-Five Percent Fund Act of 1908? Why or why not?

Answer: The Administration has not taken a position on this. The receipts generated through Stewardship Contracts support local jobs in restoration work on the national forest where the receipts were generated. While we understand the concern that Stewardship Contracting doesn't pay into the 25% payments under the 1908 Act, there are tradeoffs involved in changing the use of the

receipts. The level of receipts generated through Stewardship Contracting is much lower than the Secure Rural Schools proposal in the FY 2016 President's Budget.

b. Please provide a table showing the receipts collected from stewardship contracts by region since 2004.

Answer:

Stewardship Contracting Timber Collections by Fiscal Year and Region 2004-2014 *All Values in Thousands of Dollars*											
Region	**FY14**	**FY13**	**FY12**	**FY11**	**FY10**	**FY09**	**FY08**	**FY07**	**FY06**	**FY05**	**FY04**
1	1,841	1,158	309	621	815	1,191	221	253	21	75	0
2	85	20	29	30	141	4	52	0	48	0	0
3	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	19	0	147	31	8	17	1	0	0	25	32
5	126	1,059	166	103	292	1,308	440	-2	14	0	0
6	4,754	7,466	6,299	4,779	4,507	2,379	2,097	531	520	781	356
8	1,836	1,795	1,830	1,920	1,417	480	180	381	773	6	39
9	2,826	868	622	511	518	280	53	111	329	302	226
10	165	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**11,663**	**12,367**	**9,417**	**7,996**	**7,699**	**5,660**	**3,043**	**1,275**	**1,705**	**1,189**	**653**

Question 3: What, if anything, is the Forest Service doing to create new economic opportunities to generate revenue from the national forests that can be shared with communities?

Answer: The Forest Service is developing multiple new economic opportunities that will provide support to communities surrounding national forests and grasslands. In FY 2015 and FY 2016, we will continue our focus on rural economies through our efforts related to forest products, biomass, grazing, energy and mineral production, recreation opportunities, and the ongoing restoration of landscapes, sustainable forest management, and the development of markets for ecosystem services.

Recreational opportunities on national forests will remain a strong driver of local economies. Outdoor recreation is by far the single greatest use of National Forest System lands, supporting approximately 194,000 jobs and contributing up to $13 billion to the communities surrounding national forests and grasslands. We anticipate that the continued implementation of year-round recreation activities at ski areas will reap significant benefits for select communities. Proposed budget increases for both Trails and Deferred Maintenance line items will support new economic opportunities for gateway communities. The Forest Service regularly uses local business contractors to perform capital improvement and maintenance projects, which provide direct job opportunities to communities.

Forest Service investments in research and development and public private partnerships hold the potential to accelerate job creation in the 21st Century. Renewable wood energy and wood

products markets are a growing source of jobs, particularly in rural America, that contribute to a sustainable future based on a locally grown renewable resource. New markets for low value wood and non-timber products, such as food products and medicinals, provide the financial incentive for private landowners to maintain their lands in forests. The Forest Service's Public-Private Partnership for Advanced Woody Biomaterials and Nanotechnology will help diversify the economy, create new family-supporting jobs, provide materials for a future bioeconomy, and contribute to critical forest restoration needs across all ownerships.

Question 4: Under the 1908 Act, requiring 25 percent payments to States, the Forest Service will pay $50 million to States based on the 7 year rolling average of gross receipts. This Committee needs to understand what receipts are coming in from the activities on our national forests. Please provide the committee with a table by receipt type and Forest Service region for the last 14 years of the gross receipts collected. Please identify whether the receipts are currently subject to the 1908 Act.

Answer: Gross receipts available as a source for 1908 Act payments to States, and other payments to States, can be found in the individual fiscal year ASR-04 Receipt Summary reports below.

The 1908 Act payment is based on a 7-year rolling average of National Forest Fund receipts plus the sum of five other funds (KV, Purchaser road credits, Timber salvage sales, Specified road costs, and Timber pipeline revenue). The total contribution of this latter set of funds is listed in the tables at the above website.

Receipts credited to the National Forests Fund, used to make 1908 Act payments to States and other payments to States, are identified by resource classes as indicated in the ASR-04 Receipt Summary reports. Resource class descriptions are listed below for reference.

- Class 1; Timber: This class includes amounts collected for all timber sales and other forest products into the timber sale deposit fund. It does not include interest, fines, penalties, or amounts in excess of contract stumpage rates collected in timber trespass, timber property, or other timber settlement activities.

- Class 2; Grazing (except 16 Western States): This class includes all grazing trespass settlements for resource value and grazing fees, regardless of class of livestock, received for forage consumed on other than the sixteen western States (class 08).

- Class 3; Land Uses: This class includes all collections from land uses including the resource value of trespass settlements and entire amounts of pasture permit fees. This class does not include fees from land uses related to power, minerals, or recreation uses covered in other classes.

- Class 4; Recreation (except class 7): This class includes receipts for all types of recreation use except user fees collected under Land and Water Conservation Fund (class

7), including recreation use trespass settlements. This class does not include interest, fines, penalties, transfer fees, or late payment fees. This class also does not include collections under authority of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act.

- Class 5; Power: This class includes all receipts from uses authorized by Forest Service permits or easements for all types of power generating projects and power transmission line rights-of-way.

- Class 6; Minerals: This class includes all collections from the sale of minerals and permit fees. This includes mineral lease and permit fees collected by the United States Department of the Interior on acquired lands having National Forest status but does not include any mineral revenue derived from National Forest land which was established from the public domain. This class does not include interest, late payment fees, transfer fees, fines, or penalties to the National Forest Fund.

- Class 7; Land &Water Conservation Fund Recreation User Fees: This class includes collections from admission and user fees at designated Land and Water Conservation Fund areas. This does not include collections received from the sale of Golden Eagle permits, fines, penalties, or other settlements to this account.

- Class 8; Grazing, 16 Western States: This class includes grazing fees received from the National Forests in the sixteen western States.

- Class 9; Quartz: This class includes moneys received from the disposal of quartz mineral from lands reserved from the public domain on the Ouachita National Forest.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Statement of Receipts - Actual ASR-04						
Fiscal Year:2001		National:Yes		Run Date : 12/04/2001		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	3,351,789.35	3,611,643.76	1,843,323.66	916,881.78	8,704,701.09	603,775.56
Class 2 - Grazing East	561,771.86	1,115,537.42	1,479,553.91	1,599,366.93	347,343.35	475,491.63
Class 3 - Land Use	391,539.80	946,438.63	1,616,496.07	1,089,561.74	3,177,624.38	722,586.94
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	1,803,785.16	12,021,510.50	2,013,809.63	3,433,145.11	13,178,372.54	4,336,892.33
Class 5 - Power	71,465.69	142,965.72	441,371.56	145,366.26	525,508.44	66,036.02
Class 6 - Minerals	87,561.48	583,829.85	635,918.48	70,544.41	479,985.73	59,646.69
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	89,980.43	958,338.31	441,859.51	1,276,329.23	317,822.44	343,455.94
Class 8 - Grazing West						
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals						
Total NFF Receipts	6,357,893.77	19,380,264.19	8,472,332.82	8,531,195.46	26,731,357.97	6,607,885.11
KV Revenue	4,550,583.79	3,183,546.34	432,913.63	2,061,795.13	5,476,916.41	7,258,501.55
Purchaser Road Credit	798,842.93	985,623.61		134,701.57	582,634.76	1,254,877.80
Specified Road Costs	1,819,899.08	423,026.71		210,419.25	1,997,652.55	1,552,773.26
Timber Salvage Sale	16,538,705.66	2,119,226.80	540,093.65	6,483,673.34	8,149,271.18	24,221,484.02
TPTP Revenue						
Grand Total	30,065,925.23	26,091,687.65	9,445,340.10	17,421,784.75	42,937,832.87	40,895,521.74
Prior Year Total	50,368,288.61	34,689,993.79	9,850,870.07	21,722,609.59	55,751,697.29	65,601,888.19
Difference	(20,302,363.38)	(8,598,306.14)	(405,529.97)	(4,300,824.84)	(12,813,864.42)	(24,706,366.45)
% Change	(40.3)	(24.8)	(4.1)	(19.8)	(23.0)	(37.7)

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Fiscal Year 2001 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	23,015,459.40	31,921,735.48	466,781.02	74,436,091.10	138,977,749.07	(64,541,657.97)	(46.4)
Class 2 - Grazing East	71,564.89	28,068.06		5,678,698.05	5,786,197.19	(107,499.14)	(1.9)
Class 3 - Land Use	1,273,677.11	1,106,283.71	319,381.26	10,643,589.64	9,605,626.20	1,037,963.44	10.8
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	591,623.26	1,842,402.42	144,904.83	39,366,445.78	36,689,738.63	2,676,707.15	7.3
Class 5 - Power	234,509.75	84,928.04	35,183.08	1,747,334.56	1,741,421.35	5,913.21	0.3
Class 6 - Minerals	94,915.52	463,335.63	6,785.86	2,482,523.65	2,067,704.87	414,818.78	20.1
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	42,247.80	199,146.86	606,512.25	4,275,692.77	3,871,859.41	403,833.36	10.4
Class 8 - Grazing West							
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals							
Total NFF Receipts	25,323,997.73	35,645,900.20	1,579,548.30	138,630,375.55	198,740,296.72	(60,109,921.17)	(30.2)
KV Revenue	13,201,556.34	10,579,543.45	300,633.44	47,045,990.08	91,216,703.93	(44,170,713.85)	(48.4)
Purchaser Road Credit	890,178.63	263,223.57	1,698,717.52	6,608,800.39	18,256,848.76	(11,648,048.37)	(63.8)
Specified Road Costs	1,359,866.80	456,685.62	334,598.60	8,154,921.87	4,161,086.63	3,993,835.24	96.0
Timber Salvage Sale	4,274,469.98	7,512,763.07	1,041,807.63	70,881,495.33	71,637,017.64	(755,522.31)	(1.1)
TPTP Revenue							
Grand Total	45,050,069.48	54,458,115.91	4,955,305.49	271,321,583.22	384,011,953.68	(112,690,370.46)	(29.3)
Prior Year Total	82,403,884.09	54,407,867.66	9,214,854.39	384,011,953.68			
Difference	(37,353,814.61)	50,248.25	(4,259,548.90)	(112,690,370.46)			
% Change	(45.3)	0.1	(46.2)	(29.3)			

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Statement of Receipts - Actual ASR-04						
Fiscal Year:2002		National:Yes		Run Date : 12/02/2002		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	1,659,619.12	5,263,224.58	1,204,174.80	1,139,321.78	3,486,170.78	2,324,460.16
Class 2 - Grazing East	577,481.78	1,079,737.68	1,320,683.83	1,622,091.26	345,039.41	483,421.50
Class 3 - Land Use	371,568.92	1,259,431.28	1,635,851.47	1,109,075.98	4,197,272.22	767,309.83
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	1,828,961.02	11,734,498.43	1,980,338.99	3,579,250.21	12,413,739.66	5,473,793.66
Class 5 - Power	81,220.56	135,998.13	427,905.55	148,146.17	560,531.28	68,051.72
Class 6 - Minerals	101,383.17	(383,708.72)	567,918.22	68,833.48	221,929.86	34,398.57
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	85,011.36	1,109,488.50	553,576.37	1,124,868.33	225,464.27	395,256.36
Class 8 - Grazing West						
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals						
Total NFF Receipts	4,705,245.93	20,198,669.88	7,690,449.23	8,791,587.21	21,450,147.48	9,546,691.80
KV Revenue	2,092,269.24	5,824,484.31	261,227.70	2,121,252.84	4,472,056.86	7,379,032.57
Purchaser Road Credit	721,119.14	516,062.89		317,647.52	184,945.41	1,226,391.02
Specified Road Costs	3,094,274.76	859,842.61	11,321.08	416,145.55	883,709.08	1,278,404.78
Timber Salvage Sale	16,779,263.29	2,061,585.77	720,867.13	5,310,729.31	7,382,479.11	16,741,147.51
TPTP Revenue						
Grand Total	27,392,172.36	29,460,645.46	8,683,865.14	16,957,362.43	34,373,337.94	36,171,667.68
Prior Year Total	10,065,925.23	26,091,687.65	9,445,340.10	17,421,784.75	42,937,832.87	40,895,521.74
Difference	17,326,247.13	3,368,957.81	(761,474.96)	(464,422.32)	(8,564,494.93)	(4,723,854.06)
% Change	172.1	12.9	(8.1)	(2.7)	(19.9)	(11.6)

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Fiscal Year 2002 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	20,131,010.13	21,075,388.71	980,184.89	57,263,554.95	74,436,091.10	(17,172,536.15)	(23.1)
Class 2 - Grazing East	54,270.16	46,548.41		5,529,274.03	5,678,698.05	(149,424.02)	(2.6)
Class 3 - Land Use	1,175,562.64	1,084,678.28	257,440.60	11,858,191.22	10,643,589.64	1,214,601.58	11.4
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	567,837.72	1,604,222.23	154,876.50	39,337,518.42	39,366,445.78	(28,927.36)	(0.1)
Class 5 - Power	236,675.19	92,748.70	54,856.05	1,806,133.35	1,747,334.56	58,798.79	3.4
Class 6 - Minerals	92,034.18	267,063.14	18,908.85	988,760.75	2,482,523.65	(1,493,762.90)	(60.2)
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	26,478.47	297,713.82	717,588.70	4,535,446.18	4,275,692.77	259,753.41	6.1
Class 8 - Grazing West							
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals							
Total NFF Receipts	22,283,868.49	24,468,363.29	2,183,855.59	121,318,878.90	138,630,375.55	(17,311,496.65)	(12.5)
KV Revenue	(11,685,536.67)	7,394,752.41	(56,831.66)	17,802,707.60	47,045,990.08	(29,243,282.48)	(62.2)
Purchaser Road Credit	498,024.22	70,246.95	987,503.31	4,521,940.46	6,608,800.39	(2,086,859.93)	(31.6)
Specified Road Costs	1,676,781.04	677,289.03	9,355.45	8,907,123.38	8,154,921.87	752,201.51	9.2
Timber Salvage Sale	4,526,216.23	7,195,338.99	375,253.85	61,092,881.19	70,881,495.33	(9,788,614.14)	(13.8)
TPTP Revenue							
Grand Total	17,299,353.31	39,805,990.67	3,499,136.54	213,643,531.53	271,321,583.22	(57,678,051.69)	(21.3)
Prior Year Total	45,050,069.48	54,458,115.91	4,955,305.49	251,321,583.22			
Difference	(27,750,716.17)	(14,652,125.24)	(1,456,168.95)	(37,678,051.69)			
% Change	(61.6)	(26.9)	(29.4)	(15.0)			

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Statement of Receipts - Actual ASR-04						
Fiscal Year:2003		National:Yes		Run Date : 11/18/2003		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	2,263,843.44	3,292,457.98	567,870.97	560,651.90	2,081,752.83	4,673,181.63
Class 2 - Grazing East	495,045.28	796,607.45	833,332.27	1,385,366.19	315,391.23	439,515.25
Class 3 - Land Use	406,480.93	897,818.75	1,611,314.64	1,015,811.44	5,028,481.60	736,677.36
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	1,799,704.70	12,060,516.18	1,822,016.63	3,981,284.27	12,898,931.30	4,557,252.55
Class 5 - Power	68,366.28	160,260.31	434,593.77	178,784.03	593,430.78	78,469.49
Class 6 - Minerals	651,306.91	43,082.67	428,778.18	66,941.21	111,832.65	61,946.26
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	57,007.75	1,294,308.51	629,807.27	1,177,673.73	316,516.17	372,022.43
Class 8 - Grazing West						
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals						
Total NFF Receipts	5,741,755.29	18,545,051.85	6,327,713.73	8,366,512.77	21,346,336.56	10,919,064.97
KV Revenue	11,417,736.75	2,527,046.63	653,235.87	1,060,984.53	5,224,753.78	7,661,878.34
Purchaser Road Credit	439,757.43	400,850.03		197,016.80	167,857.25	1,278,036.82
Specified Road Costs	1,978,049.13	949,129.93	16,967.28	516,696.62	1,562,173.37	1,609,117.48
Timber Salvage Sale	15,472,858.14	2,803,050.77	423,774.76	2,463,911.22	8,878,608.04	12,608,443.56
TPTP Revenue						
Grand Total	35,050,156.74	25,225,129.21	7,421,691.64	12,605,121.94	37,179,729.00	34,076,541.17
Prior Year Total	27,392,172.36	29,460,645.46	8,683,865.14	16,957,362.43	34,373,337.94	36,171,667.68
Difference	7,657,984.38	(4,235,516.25)	(1,262,173.50)	(4,352,240.49)	2,806,391.06	(2,095,126.51)
% Change	28.0	(14.4)	(14.5)	(25.7)	8.2	(5.8)

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Fiscal Year 2003 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	19,071,736.05	24,581,917.33	1,454,337.27	58,547,749.40	57,263,554.95	1,284,194.45	2.2
Class 2 - Grazing East	62,784.26	23,399.97		4,351,441.90	5,529,274.03	(1,177,832.13)	(21.3)
Class 3 - Land Use	1,254,250.71	885,175.80	236,282.95	12,072,294.18	11,858,191.22	214,102.96	1.8
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	565,013.28	1,603,551.45	139,033.68	39,427,304.04	39,337,518.42	89,785.62	0.2
Class 5 - Power	213,203.17	101,175.65	100,590.86	1,928,874.34	1,806,133.35	122,740.99	6.8
Class 6 - Minerals	102,966.42	284,880.62	34,705.54	1,786,440.46	988,760.75	797,679.71	80.7
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	62,902.38	279,659.19	764,023.93	4,953,921.36	4,535,446.18	418,475.18	9.2
Class 8 - Grazing West							
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals							
Total NFF Receipts	21,332,856.27	27,759,760.01	2,728,974.23	123,068,025.68	121,318,878.90	1,749,146.78	1.4
KV Revenue	13,274,856.56	7,843,865.22	(5,354.12)	49,659,003.56	17,802,707.60	31,856,295.96	178.9
Purchaser Road Credit	191,347.26	135,015.80	875,884.04	3,685,765.43	4,521,940.46	(836,175.03)	(18.5)
Specified Road Costs	2,456,702.90	1,464,562.78	1,854,731.37	12,408,130.86	8,907,123.38	3,501,007.48	39.3
Timber Salvage Sale	3,134,246.77	9,685,942.67	532,376.89	56,003,212.82	61,092,881.19	(5,089,668.37)	(8.3)
TPTP Revenue							
Grand Total	40,390,009.76	46,889,146.48	5,986,612.41	244,824,138.35	213,643,531.53	31,180,606.82	14.6
Prior Year Total	17,299,353.31	39,805,990.67	3,499,136.54	213,643,531.53			
Difference	23,090,656.45	7,083,155.81	2,487,475.87	31,180,606.82			
% Change	133.5	17.8	71.1	14.6			

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Final Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2004		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	2,649,680.55	5,250,002.21	512,420.96	1,107,844.53	513,766.39	19,577,719.11
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	399,993.20	976,155.03	1,457,827.63	1,002,430.55	4,168,620.92	969,797.60
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	1,988,182.83	12,914,585.52	1,959,131.23	3,671,821.09	12,971,512.21	4,851,786.17
Class 5 - Power	68,063.82	205,359.96	430,002.52	176,833.55	625,845.97	67,996.81
Class 6 - Minerals	78,261.95	91,847.11	617,742.04	57,042.80	1,079,092.11	41,600.95
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	8,358.70	1,336,773.81	578,035.62	1,409,959.71	293,090.16	390,905.45
Class 8 - Grazing West	557,201.79	1,024,333.94	994,668.54	1,545,273.62	355,638.85	466,505.68
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	25,342.18	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	5,749,742.84	21,799,057.58	6,549,828.54	8,996,548.03	20,007,566.61	26,366,311.77
KV Revenue	5,863,704.96	7,663,801.02	275,281.49	1,052,394.27	4,781,420.48	14,412,479.96
Purchaser Road Credit	561,278.30	222,198.79	0.00	15,251.46	101,373.51	2,470,043.23
Specified Road Costs	1,955,778.40	1,083,530.28	0.00	165,224.40	662,024.07	2,624,432.72
Timber Salvage Sale	18,490,842.83	3,171,961.65	399,433.73	3,079,733.07	8,778,138.74	24,067,388.87
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	32,621,347.33	33,940,549.32	7,224,543.76	13,309,151.23	34,330,523.41	69,940,656.55
Prior Year Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	32,621,347.33	33,940,549.32	7,224,543.76	13,309,151.23	34,330,523.41	69,940,656.55
% Change	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Fiscal Year 2004 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	19,410,275.69	23,868,343.40	118,373.81	73,008,426.65	0.00	73,008,426.65	0.00
Class 2 - Grazing East	46,400.59	27,717.72	0.00	74,118.31	0.00	74,118.31	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	1,450,745.34	892,769.51	303,807.63	11,622,147.41	0.00	11,622,147.41	0.00
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	580,646.99	1,606,077.72	145,188.75	40,688,932.51	0.00	40,688,932.51	0.00
Class 5 - Power	218,879.27	115,858.72	83,158.89	1,991,999.51	0.00	1,991,999.51	0.00
Class 6 - Minerals	59,406.85	341,925.05	32,380.85	2,399,299.71	0.00	2,399,299.71	0.00
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	129,865.43	259,039.25	775,435.68	5,181,463.81	0.00	5,181,463.81	0.00
Class 8 - Grazing West	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,943,622.42	0.00	4,943,622.42	0.00
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	16,064.50	0.00	0.00	41,406.68	0.00	41,406.68	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	21,912,284.66	27,111,731.37	1,458,345.61	139,951,417.01	0.00	139,951,417.01	0.00
KV Revenue	17,574,614.83	3,592,871.26	(4,862,144.22)	50,354,424.05	0.00	50,354,424.05	0.00
Purchaser Road Credit	341,668.71	23,406.42	340,684.59	4,075,905.01	0.00	4,075,905.01	0.00
Specified Road Costs	4,032,737.04	1,001,296.61	974,670.93	12,499,694.45	0.00	12,499,694.45	0.00
Timber Salvage Sale	1,382,599.19	14,419,123.46	438,934.75	74,228,156.29	0.00	74,228,156.29	0.00
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	45,243,904.43	46,148,429.12	(1,649,508.34)	281,109,596.81	0.00	281,109,596.81	0.00
Prior Year Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	45,243,904.43	46,148,429.12	(1,649,508.34)	281,109,596.81	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Final Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2005		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	4,425,585.26	6,701,323.80	518,030.09	845,655.87	(668,280.90)	17,383,778.92
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	371,045.03	962,431.00	1,580,516.03	1,063,444.34	4,675,863.36	754,909.78
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	1,892,398.07	14,393,306.87	1,968,658.46	3,722,764.47	14,167,376.92	4,004,727.98
Class 5 - Power	126,769.70	236,266.08	464,248.30	175,337.66	738,026.59	80,521.42
Class 6 - Minerals	79,170.69	84,215.44	1,560,181.58	134,596.97	678,698.05	71,865.47
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	4,793.55	855,669.04	134,565.27	366,207.97	172,970.90	151,584.10
Class 8 - Grazing West	668,955.28	1,310,786.62	1,373,939.84	1,989,430.64	411,957.00	598,740.10
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	7,568,717.58	24,543,998.85	7,600,139.57	8,297,437.92	20,176,611.92	23,046,127.77
KV Revenue	7,470,897.72	7,954,266.51	267,550.21	801,528.12	5,069,379.63	24,432,138.39
Purchaser Road Credit	589,767.62	56,728.11	0.00	0.00	138,289.15	1,627,417.85
Specified Road Costs	1,588,983.67	1,468,097.99	0.00	497,080.95	274,931.36	2,683,943.37
Timber Salvage Sale	17,260,307.40	2,257,879.75	469,211.81	2,255,844.35	11,260,582.75	16,075,064.38
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	34,478,673.99	36,280,971.21	8,336,901.59	11,851,891.34	36,919,794.81	67,864,691.76
Prior Year Total	32,621,347.33	33,940,549.32	7,224,543.76	13,309,151.23	34,330,523.41	69,940,656.55
Difference	1,857,326.66	2,340,421.89	1,112,357.83	(1,457,259.89)	2,589,271.40	(2,075,964.79)
% Change	5.69	6.90	15.40	(10.95)	7.54	(2.97)

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Fiscal Year 2005 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	13,145,917.25	34,780,354.84	(23,971.90)	77,108,393.23	73,008,426.65	4,099,966.58	5.62
Class 2 - Grazing East	38,860.78	17,246.12	0.00	56,106.90	74,118.31	(18,011.41)	(24.30)
Class 3 - Land Use	1,655,126.19	784,800.06	304,835.51	12,152,971.30	11,622,147.41	530,823.89	4.57
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	670,373.53	1,649,056.32	143,590.75	42,612,253.37	40,688,932.51	1,923,320.86	4.73
Class 5 - Power	239,726.69	143,109.63	73,603.37	2,277,609.44	1,991,999.51	285,609.93	14.34
Class 6 - Minerals	43,831.90	194,656.27	33,531.74	2,880,748.11	2,399,299.71	481,448.40	20.07
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	78,164.45	99,524.21	156,268.91	2,019,748.40	5,181,463.81	(3,161,715.41)	(61.02)
Class 8 - Grazing West	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,353,809.48	4,943,622.42	1,410,187.06	28.53
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	15,662.00	0.00	0.00	15,662.00	41,406.68	(25,744.68)	(62.18)
Total NFF Receipts	15,887,662.79	37,668,747.45	687,858.38	145,477,302.23	139,951,417.01	5,525,885.22	3.95
KV Revenue	23,626,621.50	9,760,557.76	179,919.78	79,562,859.62	50,354,424.05	29,208,435.57	58.01
Purchaser Road Credit	133,990.36	174,161.68	89,703.58	2,810,058.35	4,075,905.01	(1,265,846.66)	(31.06)
Specified Road Costs	6,215,419.75	2,270,734.21	1,542,363.86	16,541,555.16	12,499,694.45	4,041,860.71	32.34
Timber Salvage Sale	2,379,366.30	11,821,296.57	237,939.61	64,017,492.92	74,228,156.29	(10,210,663.37)	(13.76)
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	48,243,060.70	61,695,497.67	2,737,785.21	308,409,268.28	281,109,596.81	27,299,671.47	9.71
Prior Year Total	45,243,904.43	46,148,429.12	(1,649,508.34)	281,109,596.81	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	2,999,156.27	15,547,068.55	4,387,293.55	27,299,671.47	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	6.63	33.69	(265.98)	9.71	0.00	0.00	0.00

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Final Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2006		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	9,066,651.40	4,307,640.16	649,779.11	1,264,074.46	7,872,208.02	15,643,362.45
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	364,911.98	1,038,384.03	1,592,216.77	1,036,972.54	4,131,600.28	862,779.15
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	2,024,407.07	16,489,378.24	1,406,252.29	3,971,769.49	16,915,457.79	5,581,326.06
Class 5 - Power	81,469.32	229,567.51	520,319.50	187,483.43	742,090.36	118,886.40
Class 6 - Minerals	50,684.70	98,437.71	1,318,274.34	56,783.92	852,184.83	96,758.45
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	2,100.00	16,095.88	25,976.90	6,502.88	10,770.51	(2,014.47)
Class 8 - Grazing West	633,435.73	1,141,878.49	1,348,320.93	1,816,313.17	388,718.88	509,652.69
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	12,223,660.20	23,321,382.02	6,861,139.84	8,339,899.89	30,913,030.67	22,810,750.73
KV Revenue	4,935,692.56	7,049,336.95	501,783.29	1,096,709.77	8,634,875.13	15,425,513.97
Purchaser Road Credit	55,401.35	282,085.62	0.00	26,337.80	127,263.04	586,739.23
Specified Road Costs	3,246,707.15	512,270.13	0.00	544,384.25	2,304,340.56	3,822,717.20
Timber Salvage Sale	9,048,003.36	3,187,324.58	771,667.56	2,919,726.48	7,585,351.00	14,811,416.49
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	29,509,464.62	34,352,399.30	8,134,590.69	12,927,058.19	49,564,860.40	57,457,137.62
Prior Year Total	34,478,673.99	36,280,971.21	8,336,901.59	11,851,891.34	36,919,794.81	67,864,691.76
Difference	(4,969,209.37)	(1,928,571.91)	(202,310.90)	1,075,166.85	12,645,065.59	(10,407,554.14)
% Change	(14.41)	(5.32)	(2.43)	9.07	34.25	(15.34)

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Fiscal Year 2006 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	19,750,338.45	25,521,248.92	353,041.25	84,428,344.22	77,108,393.23	7,319,950.99	9.49
Class 2 - Grazing East	42,710.97	19,321.74	0.00	62,032.71	56,106.90	5,925.81	10.56
Class 3 - Land Use	1,305,398.84	933,712.47	286,341.10	11,552,317.16	12,152,971.30	(600,654.14)	(4.94)
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	570,737.25	1,639,521.63	137,375.62	48,736,225.44	42,612,253.37	6,123,972.07	14.37
Class 5 - Power	256,780.02	170,283.25	92,897.19	2,399,776.98	2,277,609.44	122,167.54	5.36
Class 6 - Minerals	52,528.86	276,174.18	64,320.54	2,866,147.53	2,880,748.11	(14,600.58)	(0.51)
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	(1,205.23)	951.67	0.00	59,178.14	2,019,748.40	(1,960,570.26)	(97.07)
Class 8 - Grazing West	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,838,319.89	6,353,809.48	(515,489.59)	(8.11)
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	17,312.42	0.00	0.00	17,312.42	15,662.00	1,650.42	10.54
Total NFF Receipts	21,994,601.58	28,561,213.86	933,975.70	155,959,654.49	145,477,302.23	10,482,352.26	7.21
KV Revenue	21,923,951.68	11,382,847.60	89,008.70	71,039,719.65	79,562,859.62	(8,523,139.97)	(10.71)
Purchaser Road Credit	8,940.72	0.00	0.00	1,086,767.76	2,810,058.35	(1,723,290.59)	(61.33)
Specified Road Costs	6,886,067.93	1,599,117.48	445,918.37	19,361,523.07	16,541,555.16	2,819,967.91	17.05
Timber Salvage Sale	14,728,662.41	13,613,236.22	345,656.40	67,011,044.50	64,017,492.92	2,993,551.58	4.68
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	65,542,224.32	55,156,415.16	1,814,559.17	314,458,709.47	308,409,268.28	6,049,441.19	1.96
Prior Year Total	48,243,060.70	61,695,497.67	2,737,785.21	308,409,268.28	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	17,299,163.62	(6,539,082.51)	(923,226.04)	6,049,441.19	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	35.86	(10.60)	(33.72)	1.96	0.00	0.00	0.00

Final Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2007		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	2,611,959.07	1,312,207.83	657,185.27	581,733.20	2,730,310.60	6,967,135.95
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	409,894.38	1,240,021.34	1,786,017.20	1,176,023.76	4,304,890.98	848,457.39
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	2,091,950.50	17,624,741.67	1,795,180.85	4,199,487.11	15,040,854.09	5,625,452.10
Class 5 - Power	68,172.50	170,665.49	459,378.91	191,939.77	864,096.00	93,373.74
Class 6 - Minerals	68,307.90	215,417.24	937,570.25	37,153.13	695,783.70	69,224.72
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	2,800.00	3,824.59	0.00	0.00	2,003.43	0.00
Class 8 - Grazing West	543,515.61	1,009,093.78	1,234,727.12	1,565,562.59	355,997.10	481,348.25
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	5,796,599.96	21,575,971.94	6,870,059.60	7,751,899.56	23,993,935.90	14,084,992.15
KV Revenue	3,037,289.32	3,761,974.21	282,936.35	1,217,601.97	6,574,400.44	8,100,943.98
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	9,303.73	0.00	0.00	17,625.45	217,487.73
Specified Road Costs	1,570,244.34	633,747.43	65,638.23	1,147,612.01	1,687,704.86	3,183,166.03
Timber Salvage Sale	6,653,982.98	2,000,467.40	430,947.47	3,129,683.94	4,563,888.87	14,316,819.45
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	17,058,116.60	27,981,464.71	7,649,581.65	13,246,797.48	36,837,555.52	39,903,409.34
Prior Year Total	29,509,464.62	34,352,399.30	8,134,590.69	12,927,058.19	49,564,860.40	57,457,137.62
Difference	(12,451,348.02)	(6,370,934.59)	(485,009.04)	319,739.29	(12,727,304.88)	(17,553,728.28)
% Change	(42.19)	(18.55)	(5.96)	2.47	(25.68)	(30.55)

Fiscal Year 2007 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	13,272,241.88	22,361,184.89	120,176.62	50,614,135.31	84,428,344.22	(33,814,208.91)	(40.05)
Class 2 - Grazing East	35,142.82	22,243.34	0.00	57,386.16	62,032.71	(4,646.55)	(7.49)
Class 3 - Land Use	1,280,041.80	1,254,677.29	318,715.37	12,618,739.51	11,552,317.16	1,066,422.35	9.23
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	465,597.05	1,567,637.79	155,821.98	48,566,723.14	48,736,225.44	(169,502.30)	(0.35)
Class 5 - Power	309,770.62	176,049.17	93,372.12	2,426,818.32	2,399,776.98	27,041.34	1.13
Class 6 - Minerals	71,320.78	261,541.42	82,593.80	2,438,912.94	2,866,147.53	(427,234.59)	(14.91)
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	0.00	0.00	200.33	8,828.35	59,178.14	(50,349.79)	(85.08)
Class 8 - Grazing West	2,600.36	0.00	0.00	5,192,844.81	5,838,319.89	(645,475.08)	(11.06)
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	1,075.00	0.00	0.00	1,075.00	17,312.42	(16,237.42)	(93.79)
Total NFF Receipts	15,437,790.31	25,643,333.90	770,880.22	121,925,463.54	155,959,654.49	(34,034,190.95)	(21.82)
KV Revenue	24,164,209.69	14,763,551.44	60,059.39	61,962,966.79	71,039,719.65	(9,076,752.86)	(12.78)
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	244,416.91	1,086,767.76	(842,350.85)	(77.51)
Specified Road Costs	5,389,017.70	1,768,030.20	267,207.04	15,712,367.84	19,361,523.07	(3,649,155.23)	(18.85)
Timber Salvage Sale	1,221,321.36	10,607,957.60	112,212.17	43,037,281.24	67,011,044.50	(23,973,763.26)	(35.78)
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	46,212,339.06	52,782,873.14	1,210,358.82	242,882,496.32	314,458,709.47	(71,576,213.15)	(22.76)
Prior Year Total	65,542,224.32	55,156,415.16	1,814,559.17	314,458,709.47	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	(19,329,885.26)	(2,373,542.02)	(604,200.35)	(71,576,213.15)	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	(29.49)	(4.30)	(33.30)	(22.76)	0.00	0.00	0.00

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Final Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2008		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	1,111,968.27	1,390,399.53	446,999.31	420,018.46	1,902,562.95	2,434,182.30
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	455,331.34	1,721,083.56	1,998,552.92	1,328,448.53	3,758,408.08	877,769.88
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	2,240,646.43	18,367,653.46	1,774,692.28	4,211,485.94	16,935,183.95	5,691,023.20
Class 5 - Power	97,233.90	183,969.35	508,260.88	190,812.06	765,801.68	102,317.92
Class 6 - Minerals	97,885.49	207,109.97	852,528.75	33,221.75	319,347.72	55,002.19
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	1,837.50	5,000.00	0.00	0.00	(333.55)	0.00
Class 8 - Grazing West	540,404.17	1,016,200.24	1,312,383.48	1,525,797.92	324,433.55	443,724.36
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	4,545,307.10	22,891,416.11	6,893,417.62	7,709,784.66	24,005,404.38	9,604,019.85
KV Revenue	2,401,355.61	5,564,303.42	295,813.21	658,921.38	3,332,727.38	10,188,099.80
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	880.94	85,481.40	71,153.91
Specified Road Costs	2,395,744.54	1,228,822.45	0.00	999,152.04	1,084,544.01	3,576,414.05
Timber Salvage Sale	4,288,580.38	914,096.07	635,180.23	2,579,153.66	4,104,437.42	9,308,744.75
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	13,630,987.63	30,598,638.05	7,824,411.06	11,947,892.68	32,612,594.59	32,748,432.36
Prior Year Total	17,058,116.60	27,981,464.71	7,649,581.65	13,246,797.48	36,837,555.52	39,903,409.34
Difference	(3,427,128.97)	2,617,173.34	174,829.41	(1,298,904.80)	(4,224,960.93)	(7,154,976.98)
% Change	(20.09)	9.35	2.29	(9.81)	(11.47)	(17.93)

Fiscal Year 2008 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	15,583,025.68	15,057,436.97	95,876.32	38,442,469.79	50,614,135.31	(12,171,665.52)	(24.05)
Class 2 - Grazing East	40,786.20	33,574.09	0.00	74,360.29	57,386.16	16,974.13	29.58
Class 3 - Land Use	1,396,608.39	1,555,914.47	336,891.53	13,429,008.70	12,618,739.51	810,269.19	6.42
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	537,412.81	1,785,921.20	159,321.65	51,703,340.92	48,566,723.14	3,136,617.78	6.46
Class 5 - Power	265,079.28	174,984.48	91,995.58	2,380,455.13	2,426,818.32	(46,363.19)	(1.91)
Class 6 - Minerals	55,212.24	283,808.92	383,353.72	2,287,470.75	2,438,912.94	(151,442.19)	(6.21)
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,503.95	8,828.35	(2,324.40)	(26.33)
Class 8 - Grazing West	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,162,943.72	5,192,844.81	(29,901.09)	(0.58)
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	16,264.50	0.00	0.00	16,264.50	1,075.00	15,189.50	1,412.98
Total NFF Receipts	17,894,389.10	18,891,640.13	1,067,438.80	113,502,817.75	121,925,463.54	(8,422,645.79)	(6.91)
KV Revenue	24,347,247.76	13,302,354.28	48,923.14	60,139,745.98	61,962,966.79	(1,823,220.81)	(2.94)
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	157,516.25	244,416.91	(86,900.66)	(35.55)
Specified Road Costs	6,241,732.68	2,598,471.61	110,633.20	18,235,514.58	15,712,367.84	2,523,146.74	16.06
Timber Salvage Sale	3,025,904.96	9,703,692.09	255,979.18	34,815,768.74	43,037,281.24	(8,221,512.50)	(19.10)
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	51,509,274.50	44,496,158.11	1,482,974.32	226,851,363.30	242,882,496.32	(16,031,133.02)	(6.60)
Prior Year Total	46,212,339.06	52,782,873.14	1,210,358.82	242,882,496.32	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	5,296,935.44	(8,286,715.03)	272,615.50	(16,031,133.02)	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	11.46	(15.70)	22.52	(6.60)	0.00	0.00	0.00

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Final Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2009		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	419,785.71	311,322.21	374,462.37	500,891.64	400,103.36	(487,546.90)
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	507,471.13	1,685,006.43	1,968,100.25	1,370,704.44	5,282,518.76	1,056,140.95
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	2,263,439.53	16,420,580.88	2,114,086.91	5,014,813.30	15,216,366.81	6,258,473.84
Class 5 - Power	137,742.56	222,048.59	378,458.03	363,624.75	3,345,425.18	139,843.33
Class 6 - Minerals	41,091.06	61,664.67	466,295.51	15,029.30	193,112.19	186,026.76
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	2,275.00	5,600.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 8 - Grazing West	542,652.51	1,026,796.35	1,342,771.64	1,498,269.08	318,484.13	450,432.37
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	3,914,457.50	19,733,019.13	6,644,174.71	8,763,332.51	24,756,010.43	7,603,370.35
KV Revenue	2,579,634.00	4,078,645.14	214,886.39	728,814.34	548,784.79	6,804,960.98
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(27,187.73)	0.00
Specified Road Costs	1,396,417.08	915,374.91	0.00	671,335.64	100,035.88	3,738,906.43
Timber Salvage Sale	3,713,145.14	873,172.83	650,689.92	1,642,399.38	1,442,972.83	5,982,539.61
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	11,603,653.72	25,600,212.01	7,509,751.02	11,805,881.87	26,820,616.20	24,129,777.37
Prior Year Total	13,630,987.63	30,598,638.05	7,824,411.06	11,947,892.68	32,612,594.59	32,748,432.36
Difference	(2,027,333.91)	(4,998,426.04)	(314,660.04)	(142,010.81)	(5,791,978.39)	(8,618,654.99)
% Change	(14.87)	(16.34)	(4.02)	(1.19)	(17.76)	(26.32)

Fiscal Year 2009 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	10,597,877.13	3,586,736.49	156,507.39	15,860,139.40	38,442,469.79	(22,582,330.39)	(58.74)
Class 2 - Grazing East	39,185.68	34,238.90	0.00	73,424.58	74,360.29	(935.71)	(1.26)
Class 3 - Land Use	1,752,398.93	833,724.24	305,714.06	14,761,779.19	13,429,008.70	1,332,770.49	9.92
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	613,197.04	2,112,849.96	157,498.06	50,171,306.33	51,703,340.92	(1,532,034.59)	(2.96)
Class 5 - Power	359,221.95	226,001.37	121,154.90	5,293,520.66	2,380,455.13	2,913,065.53	122.37
Class 6 - Minerals	51,051.71	242,612.30	153,441.81	1,410,325.31	2,287,470.75	(877,145.44)	(38.35)
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,875.00	6,503.95	1,371.05	21.08
Class 8 - Grazing West	1,295.10	0.00	0.00	5,180,701.18	5,162,943.72	17,757.46	0.34
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	13,787.92	0.00	0.00	13,787.92	16,264.50	(2,476.58)	(15.23)
Total NFF Receipts	13,428,015.46	7,036,163.26	894,316.22	92,772,859.57	113,502,817.75	(20,729,958.18)	(18.26)
KV Revenue	20,746,040.78	9,850,513.12	147,839.20	45,700,118.74	60,139,745.98	(14,439,627.24)	(24.01)
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	(27,187.73)	157,516.25	(184,703.98)	(117.26)
Specified Road Costs	5,676,497.09	1,275,235.90	2,198.16	13,776,001.09	18,235,514.58	(4,459,513.49)	(24.46)
Timber Salvage Sale	2,317,716.10	5,942,107.08	329,228.31	22,893,971.20	34,815,768.74	(11,921,797.54)	(34.24)
TPTP Revenue	2,299,592.57	4,852,353.71	0.00	7,151,946.28	0.00	7,151,946.28	0.00
Grand Total	44,467,862.00	28,956,373.07	1,373,581.89	182,267,709.15	226,851,363.30	(44,583,654.15)	(19.65)
Prior Year Total	51,509,274.50	44,496,158.11	1,482,974.32	226,851,363.30	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	(7,041,412.50)	(15,539,785.04)	(109,392.43)	(44,583,654.15)	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	(13.67)	(34.92)	(7.38)	(19.65)	0.00	0.00	0.00

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Final Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2010		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	452,577.21	495,403.22	293,024.41	330,149.17	841,821.78	1,352,973.59
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	529,491.72	1,868,152.35	2,098,572.33	1,406,649.82	5,061,405.92	1,203,555.98
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	2,665,113.00	16,747,301.44	2,149,416.47	4,345,426.33	17,346,244.41	6,726,070.52
Class 5 - Power	184,960.19	1,511,656.79	418,474.74	444,733.82	4,379,996.77	378,430.98
Class 6 - Minerals	8,778.90	60,710.31	411,064.58	10,498.29	3,571.00	49,995.31
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	1,925.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 8 - Grazing West	540,411.56	1,013,488.95	1,281,697.51	1,521,778.87	312,113.23	442,800.36
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	4,383,257.58	21,696,713.06	6,652,250.04	8,059,236.30	27,945,153.11	10,153,826.74
KV Revenue	1,831,316.53	4,220,220.09	265,167.50	312,643.22	1,298,347.92	7,872,213.30
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,301.73	(3,333.62)
Specified Road Costs	2,553,717.12	787,458.23	0.00	72,025.06	148,465.66	2,758,608.72
Timber Salvage Sale	2,603,363.61	850,257.61	735,680.52	1,460,125.16	1,876,418.43	5,115,210.24
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	14,936.35	0.00	43,927.44
Grand Total	11,371,654.84	27,554,648.99	7,653,098.06	9,918,966.09	31,280,686.85	25,940,452.82
Prior Year Total	11,603,653.72	25,600,212.01	7,509,751.02	11,805,881.87	26,820,616.20	24,129,777.37
Difference	(231,998.88)	1,954,436.98	143,347.04	(1,886,915.78)	4,460,070.65	1,810,675.45
% Change	(2.00)	7.63	1.91	(15.98)	16.63	7.50

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Fiscal Year 2010 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	8,719,590.30	3,693,799.11	1,048,929.91	17,228,268.70	15,860,139.40	1,368,129.30	8.63
Class 2 - Grazing East	32,609.35	33,731.58	0.00	66,340.93	73,424.58	(7,083.65)	(9.65)
Class 3 - Land Use	2,255,653.52	1,601,910.08	268,058.15	16,293,449.87	14,761,779.19	1,531,670.68	10.38
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	820,108.98	2,368,405.76	150,791.54	53,318,878.45	50,171,306.33	3,147,572.12	6.27
Class 5 - Power	565,977.50	304,495.94	120,433.31	8,309,160.04	5,293,520.66	3,015,639.38	56.97
Class 6 - Minerals	29,683.16	251,312.33	65,308.87	890,922.75	1,410,325.31	(519,402.56)	(36.83)
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,925.00	7,875.00	(5,950.00)	(75.56)
Class 8 - Grazing West	1,109.70	0.00	0.00	5,113,400.18	5,180,701.18	(67,301.00)	(1.30)
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	14,937.93	0.00	0.00	14,937.93	13,787.92	1,150.01	8.34
Total NFF Receipts	12,439,670.44	8,253,654.80	1,653,521.78	101,237,283.85	92,772,859.57	8,464,424.28	9.12
KV Revenue	17,749,106.20	10,490,962.78	80,257.79	44,120,235.33	45,700,118.74	(1,579,883.41)	(3.46)
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,968.11	(27,187.73)	36,155.84	(132.99)
Specified Road Costs	5,658,454.88	1,027,149.16	97,743.55	13,103,622.38	13,776,001.09	(672,378.71)	(4.88)
Timber Salvage Sale	749,774.27	7,929,264.11	783,211.84	22,103,305.79	22,893,971.20	(790,665.41)	(3.45)
TPTP Revenue	774,844.61	5,016,347.07	0.00	5,850,055.47	7,151,946.28	(1,301,890.81)	(18.20)
Grand Total	37,371,850.40	32,717,377.92	2,614,734.96	186,423,470.93	182,267,709.15	4,155,761.78	2.28
Prior Year Total	44,467,862.00	28,956,373.07	1,373,581.89	182,267,709.15	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	(7,096,011.60)	3,761,004.85	1,241,153.07	4,155,761.78	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	(15.96)	12.99	90.36	2.28	0.00	0.00	0.00

Final Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2011		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	638,302.35	555,163.90	300,292.55	316,555.00	1,495,664.91	4,371,004.26
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	707,575.72	1,886,453.40	2,198,030.04	1,570,454.20	6,318,073.97	1,501,850.86
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	2,631,988.24	18,458,517.04	2,149,556.21	5,470,405.51	17,666,236.42	6,902,218.18
Class 5 - Power	329,107.03	212,316.42	800,978.68	649,606.64	20,511,811.40	427,916.20
Class 6 - Minerals	24,782.37	66,059.54	428,462.69	12,037.97	(136,281.53)	27,227.88
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	2,100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	570.03
Class 8 - Grazing West	526,900.58	987,194.72	1,358,887.15	1,522,895.82	311,300.33	437,687.23
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	4,860,756.29	22,165,705.02	7,236,207.32	9,541,955.14	46,166,805.50	13,668,474.64
KV Revenue	2,004,319.54	3,948,089.26	300,971.00	279,427.22	3,876,511.67	7,042,866.62
Purchaser Road Credit	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,028.16
Specified Road Costs	1,336,795.94	609,524.68	0.00	377,615.81	1,543,852.56	2,574,739.45
Timber Salvage Sale	3,675,998.09	772,877.69	643,840.83	1,210,429.87	2,691,478.02	7,423,036.87
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	19,331.24	177,215.02	64,075.54
Grand Total	11,877,870.30	27,496,196.65	8,181,019.15	11,428,759.28	54,455,862.77	30,774,221.28
Prior Year Total	11,371,654.84	27,554,648.99	7,653,098.06	9,918,966.09	31,280,686.85	25,940,452.82
Difference	506,215.46	(58,452.34)	527,921.09	1,509,793.19	23,175,175.92	4,833,768.46
% Change	4.45	(0.21)	6.90	15.22	74.09	18.63

Fiscal Year 2011 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	13,593,251.91	5,026,410.28	914,486.03	27,211,131.19	17,228,268.70	9,982,862.49	57.94
Class 2 - Grazing East	19,613.01	36,462.26	0.00	56,075.27	66,340.93	(10,265.66)	(15.47)
Class 3 - Land Use	2,372,994.66	1,854,041.34	406,053.51	18,815,527.70	16,293,449.87	2,522,077.83	15.48
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	897,454.81	2,493,758.45	146,888.88	56,817,023.74	53,318,878.45	3,498,145.29	6.56
Class 5 - Power	661,290.09	416,372.07	158,099.58	24,167,498.11	8,309,160.04	15,858,338.07	190.85
Class 6 - Minerals	29,105.58	209,055.60	(4,265.87)	656,184.23	890,922.75	(234,738.52)	(26.35)
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,670.03	1,925.00	745.03	38.70
Class 8 - Grazing West	946.35	0.00	0.00	5,145,812.18	5,113,400.18	32,412.00	0.63
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	13,212.93	0.00	0.00	13,212.93	14,937.93	(1,725.00)	(11.55)
Total NFF Receipts	17,587,869.34	10,036,100.00	1,621,262.13	132,885,135.38	101,237,283.85	31,647,851.53	31.26
KV Revenue	24,059,277.67	9,934,766.10	1,038,251.04	52,484,480.12	44,120,235.33	8,364,244.79	18.96
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,028.60	8,968.11	(7,939.51)	(88.53)
Specified Road Costs	8,585,525.76	2,746,273.29	581,847.47	18,356,174.96	13,103,622.38	5,252,552.58	40.08
Timber Salvage Sale	1,046,752.61	7,170,171.44	1,359,382.36	25,993,967.78	22,103,305.79	3,890,661.99	17.60
TPTP Revenue	1,659,782.12	4,547,581.02	0.00	6,467,984.94	5,850,055.47	617,929.47	10.56
Grand Total	52,939,207.50	34,434,891.85	4,600,743.00	236,188,771.78	186,423,470.93	49,765,300.85	26.69
Prior Year Total	37,371,850.40	32,717,377.92	2,614,734.96	186,423,470.93	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	15,567,357.10	1,717,513.93	1,986,008.04	49,765,300.85	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	41.66	5.25	75.95	26.69	0.00	0.00	0.00

Final Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2012		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	544,880.93	321,734.18	300,150.66	262,217.87	1,502,936.05	6,102,251.84
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	700,931.63	1,976,753.12	2,761,578.95	1,755,471.68	6,470,958.04	1,550,755.67
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	2,551,698.02	18,393,022.57	1,909,193.91	4,922,027.87	16,466,525.82	7,562,505.20
Class 5 - Power	301,218.71	228,905.54	5,104,340.24	1,431,278.98	4,434,407.91	409,029.72
Class 6 - Minerals	23,991.21	469,662.39	326,770.38	9,726.87	479,029.34	19,044.42
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	1,822.44	440.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	189.33
Class 8 - Grazing West	504,740.69	988,708.31	1,244,478.21	1,514,299.56	319,946.83	446,238.55
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	4,629,283.63	22,379,226.11	11,646,512.35	9,895,022.83	29,673,803.99	16,090,014.73
KV Revenue	3,095,736.96	2,698,482.45	291,135.65	514,348.38	5,938,258.13	9,722,017.94
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	31,998.03
Specified Road Costs	784,778.84	585,589.82	0.00	316,748.34	1,116,482.97	3,094,325.81
Timber Salvage Sale	4,008,810.29	1,128,908.41	744,130.31	1,342,420.41	1,799,032.31	5,494,739.22
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	56,678.62	190,302.19	57,069.80
Grand Total	12,518,609.72	26,792,206.79	12,681,778.31	12,125,218.58	38,717,879.59	34,490,165.53
Prior Year Total	11,877,870.30	27,496,196.65	8,181,019.15	11,428,759.28	54,455,862.77	30,774,221.28
Difference	640,739.42	(703,989.86)	4,500,759.16	696,459.30	(15,737,983.18)	3,715,944.25
% Change	5.39	(2.56)	55.01	6.09	(28.90)	12.07

Fiscal Year 2012 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	9,721,177.39	6,408,283.60	918,375.33	26,082,007.85	27,211,131.19	(1,129,123.34)	(4.15)
Class 2 - Grazing East	20,594.69	22,036.59	0.00	42,631.28	56,075.27	(13,443.99)	(23.97)
Class 3 - Land Use	2,554,242.94	2,761,209.97	391,960.12	20,923,862.12	18,815,527.70	2,108,334.42	11.21
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	787,373.57	2,390,470.89	144,881.42	55,127,699.27	56,817,023.74	(1,689,324.47)	(2.97)
Class 5 - Power	786,246.90	450,157.57	150,044.27	13,295,629.84	24,167,498.11	(10,871,868.27)	(44.99)
Class 6 - Minerals	37,899.43	228,396.12	408,000.41	2,002,520.57	656,184.23	1,346,336.34	205.18
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,451.77	2,670.03	(218.26)	(8.17)
Class 8 - Grazing West	946.35	0.00	0.00	5,019,358.50	5,145,812.18	(126,453.68)	(2.46)
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	13,212.93	0.00	0.00	13,212.93	13,212.93	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	13,921,694.20	12,260,554.74	2,013,261.55	122,509,374.13	132,885,135.38	(10,375,761.25)	(7.81)
KV Revenue	21,770,202.24	10,023,330.55	715,739.91	54,769,252.21	52,484,480.12	2,284,772.09	4.35
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	31,998.03	1,028.60	30,969.43	3,010.83
Specified Road Costs	8,248,488.10	3,187,190.98	2,433.83	17,336,038.69	18,356,174.96	(1,020,136.27)	(5.56)
Timber Salvage Sale	1,799,950.38	7,553,566.54	239,068.41	24,110,626.28	25,993,967.78	(1,883,341.50)	(7.25)
TPTP Revenue	795,897.06	4,539,608.14	0.00	5,639,555.81	6,467,984.94	(828,429.13)	(12.81)
Grand Total	46,536,231.98	37,564,250.95	2,970,503.70	224,396,845.15	236,188,771.78	(11,791,926.63)	(4.99)
Prior Year Total	52,939,207.50	34,434,891.85	4,600,743.00	236,188,771.78	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	(6,402,975.52)	3,129,359.10	(1,630,239.30)	(11,791,926.63)	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	(12.09)	9.09	(35.43)	(4.99)	0.00	0.00	0.00

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Final Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2013		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	331,501.68	1,062,048.84	246,287.39	229,225.48	2,098,801.88	10,903,346.72
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	540,368.79	1,830,423.82	1,807,071.08	1,365,411.56	6,995,525.12	1,168,438.38
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	3,452,155.54	20,230,625.46	2,271,873.33	5,507,987.26	16,813,318.88	8,991,879.43
Class 5 - Power	386,652.95	210,802.89	446,702.34	566,811.33	4,765,064.43	412,854.55
Class 6 - Minerals	4,909.75	1,046,474.68	298,893.70	6,485.04	(258,684.60)	12,892.20
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	0.00	75.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 8 - Grazing West	452,394.12	878,526.66	1,284,652.26	1,429,245.69	315,195.32	458,654.45
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	5,167,982.83	25,258,977.35	6,355,480.10	9,105,166.36	30,729,221.03	21,948,065.73
KV Revenue	2,661,393.19	3,437,607.52	267,517.46	309,333.26	2,516,941.29	11,334,840.84
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	213,845.14
Specified Road Costs	963,697.18	635,490.26	55,598.05	111,105.05	749,799.68	3,243,477.34
Timber Salvage Sale	4,679,750.55	1,413,716.40	667,662.50	1,065,999.79	3,345,752.44	8,423,436.85
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	77,346.47	103,209.79	132,753.10
Grand Total	13,472,823.75	30,745,791.53	7,346,258.11	10,668,950.93	37,444,924.23	45,296,419.00
Prior Year Total	12,518,609.72	26,792,206.79	12,681,778.31	12,125,218.58	38,717,879.59	34,490,165.53
Difference	954,214.03	3,953,584.74	(5,335,520.20)	(1,456,267.65)	(1,272,955.36)	10,806,253.47
% Change	7.62	14.76	(42.07)	(12.01)	(3.29)	31.33

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Fiscal Year 2013 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	9,521,099.89	7,228,978.39	362,598.05	31,983,888.32	26,082,007.85	5,901,880.47	22.63
Class 2 - Grazing East	17,664.17	2,012.01	0.00	19,676.18	42,631.28	(22,955.10)	(53.85)
Class 3 - Land Use	2,185,377.32	1,712,237.56	358,471.06	17,963,324.69	20,923,862.12	(2,960,537.43)	(14.15)
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	861,486.63	3,133,370.92	146,259.12	61,408,956.57	55,127,699.27	6,281,257.30	11.39
Class 5 - Power	712,018.16	396,803.27	133,690.94	8,031,400.86	13,295,629.84	(5,264,228.98)	(39.59)
Class 6 - Minerals	26,737.32	326,024.02	380,961.26	1,844,693.37	2,002,520.57	(157,827.20)	(7.88)
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.00	2,451.77	(2,376.77)	(96.94)
Class 8 - Grazing West	946.35	0.00	0.00	4,819,614.85	5,019,358.50	(199,743.65)	(3.98)
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	12,637.93	0.00	0.00	12,637.93	13,212.93	(575.00)	(4.35)
Total NFF Receipts	13,337,967.77	12,799,426.17	1,381,980.43	126,084,267.77	122,509,374.13	3,574,893.64	2.92
KV Revenue	18,896,315.50	9,900,926.02	26,864.56	49,351,739.64	54,769,252.21	(5,417,512.57)	(9.89)
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	213,845.14	31,998.03	181,847.11	568.31
Specified Road Costs	5,179,662.63	1,913,240.87	0.00	12,852,071.06	17,336,038.69	(4,483,967.63)	(25.87)
Timber Salvage Sale	1,403,328.94	7,398,791.85	181,246.09	28,579,685.41	24,110,626.28	4,469,059.13	18.54
TPTP Revenue	1,029,537.01	5,145,055.73	0.00	6,487,902.10	5,639,555.81	848,346.29	15.04
Grand Total	39,846,811.85	37,157,440.64	1,590,091.08	223,569,511.12	224,396,845.15	(827,334.03)	(0.37)
Prior Year Total	46,536,231.98	37,564,250.95	2,970,503.70	224,396,845.15	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	(6,689,420.13)	(406,810.31)	(1,380,412.62)	(827,334.03)	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	(14.37)	(1.08)	(46.47)	(0.37)	0.00	0.00	0.00

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Draft Receipts Summary Report PNF (ASR-04)						
Fiscal Year:2014		National:Yes		Run Date : 03/04/2015		
Region:NA		Admin Unit :NA		PNF:NA		
State :NA		County :NA		Cong. District :NA		
Class Name	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6
Class 1 - Timber	329,101.06	752,454.53	267,962.11	176,698.52	927,781.76	12,477,927.05
Class 2 - Grazing East	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Class 3 - Land Use	743,548.59	2,648,327.37	2,960,744.48	1,888,190.74	7,339,612.66	2,108,259.50
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	4,183,925.14	23,242,792.58	3,069,092.58	7,854,774.43	19,042,875.63	9,394,920.40
Class 5 - Power	371,301.58	266,160.94	514,609.21	595,158.35	5,202,380.26	424,182.40
Class 6 - Minerals	63,695.93	1,233,115.01	389,400.54	12,565.46	12,845.02	34,539.49
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,446.14
Class 8 - Grazing West	521,871.31	961,514.55	1,355,177.97	1,518,788.27	258,303.84	457,470.09
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total NFF Receipts	6,213,443.61	29,104,364.98	8,556,986.89	12,046,175.77	32,783,799.17	24,907,745.07
KV Revenue	3,630,496.25	3,854,890.48	187,408.43	328,572.20	4,591,923.48	13,510,560.54
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(143.30)
Specified Road Costs	985,695.48	537,668.60	12,354.30	96,435.10	818,776.84	3,471,351.16
Timber Salvage Sale	6,157,952.14	1,272,228.03	600,420.41	1,040,025.83	4,964,819.28	11,439,218.83
TPTP Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00	26,355.99	0.00	36,293.44
Grand Total	16,987,587.48	34,769,152.09	9,357,170.03	13,537,564.89	43,159,318.77	53,365,025.74
Prior Year Total	13,472,823.75	30,745,791.53	7,346,258.11	10,668,950.93	37,444,924.23	45,296,419.00
Difference	3,514,763.73	4,023,360.56	2,010,911.92	2,868,613.96	5,714,394.54	8,068,606.74
% Change	26.09	13.09	27.37	26.89	15.26	17.81

Fiscal Year 2014 (continued)

Class Name	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Current Year	Previous Year	Difference	% Change
Class 1 - Timber	7,691,039.12	6,972,020.08	445,017.82	30,040,002.05	31,983,888.32	(1,943,886.27)	(6.08)
Class 2 - Grazing East	28,794.75	30,773.95	0.00	59,568.70	19,676.18	39,892.52	202.75
Class 3 - Land Use	2,747,755.27	2,152,339.12	431,002.75	23,019,780.48	17,963,324.69	5,056,455.79	28.15
Class 4 - Recreation Spec. Uses	1,272,109.07	3,800,381.52	146,439.60	72,007,310.95	61,408,956.57	10,598,354.38	17.26
Class 5 - Power	898,665.27	563,193.34	179,449.87	9,015,101.22	8,031,400.86	983,700.36	12.25
Class 6 - Minerals	17,442.65	308,803.09	106,231.35	2,178,638.54	1,844,693.37	333,945.17	18.10
Class 7 - Recreation User Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,446.14	75.00	10,371.14	13,828.19
Class 8 - Grazing West	946.35	0.00	0.00	5,074,072.38	4,819,614.85	254,457.53	5.28
Class 9 - Quartz_Crystals	13,212.93	0.00	0.00	13,212.93	12,637.93	575.00	4.55
Total NFF Receipts	12,669,965.41	13,827,511.10	1,308,141.39	141,418,133.39	126,084,267.77	15,333,865.62	12.16
KV Revenue	14,678,036.00	9,965,305.63	54,693.62	50,801,886.63	49,351,739.64	1,450,146.99	2.94
Purchaser Road Credit	0.00	0.00	0.00	(143.30)	213,845.14	(213,988.44)	(100.07)
Specified Road Costs	2,229,213.14	1,388,738.34	57,426.19	9,597,659.15	12,852,071.06	(3,254,411.91)	(25.32)
Timber Salvage Sale	887,906.43	8,663,402.57	111,817.20	35,137,790.72	28,579,685.41	6,558,105.31	22.95
TPTP Revenue	951,520.24	4,232,404.07	0.00	5,246,573.74	6,487,902.10	(1,241,328.36)	(19.13)
Grand Total	31,416,641.22	38,077,361.71	1,532,078.40	242,201,900.33	223,569,511.12	18,632,389.21	8.33
Prior Year Total	39,846,811.85	37,157,440.64	1,590,091.08	223,569,511.12	0.00	0.00	0.00
Difference	(8,430,170.63)	919,921.07	(58,012.68)	18,632,389.21	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Change	(21.16)	2.48	(3.65)	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Question 5: In July 2013, the Secretary of Agriculture issued a memorandum outlining the goal to transition away from old-growth timber harvesting and towards second-growth timber harvesting. In that memorandum, the Secretary made a specific request for action by the Forest Service:

> The Secretary asks the Forest Service to - Intensify work with Rural Development to pursue opportunities to facilitate investments in re-tooling. **Develop by December 31, 2013, in collaboration with Rural Development and other stakeholders, a plan for providing financial assistance to re-tool timber processing equipment** in Southeast Alaska to assist the industry to efficiently handle young growth timber.

Please provide me with a copy of the plan the Secretary asked for.

Answer: The Tongass National Forest has worked with industry and other interested parties on a variety of reports related to timber production in Southeast Alaska over the past few years. As the forest moves forward with the transition to 2nd growth we are aware that industry will have re-tooling needs to adjust to processing different products. The Forest Service believes that we have a role in helping with this transition and we are exploring opportunities to use our current State and Private authorities and work with USDA Rural Development to support industry re-tooling in Southeast Alaska.

Question 6: What is the Forest Service doing to develop markets for young growth in Alaska and elsewhere in the United States?

Answer: The Forest Service role has consistently focused on supplying raw materials. Significant research into wood technologies, strength characteristics, and potential uses has come from the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, WI, and to a lesser degree from some of the other Forest Service research stations. The information is then made available to interested parties for use for the development of commercially viable markets.

Question 7: Regarding the wildfire cap adjustment, you and others from the Administration have stated that the wildfire cap adjustment is reserved for the 1 percent of wildfires that are truly catastrophic, emergency fires—"disasters." Your budget goes on to outline specifically the kinds of conditions such fires would have to meet in order to be considered "disasters" and taken off budget. Those conditions are as follows:

- a fire required an emergency Federal response based on significant complexity, severity, or threat posed to human life, property or resource;
- the fire covered 1,000 acres or more;
- a fire was within 10 miles of a major urban area (defined as 50,000 inhabitants or more); or
- the cumulative costs of annual wildland fire suppression operations will exceed all of the amounts previously appropriated within 30 days.

It seems that *any* wildfire would fit one or more of these conditions.

a. How many of the conditions would a fire have to meet to qualify to be taken off the budget?

Answer: A declaration by the Secretary that a fire meets one or more of these conditions would be required.

b. How can these conditions be adequate to prevent abuses of the cap adjustment to fund fires off budget?

Answer: The Administration believes that having a required designation from the Secretary of Agriculture will minimize the use of the fire cap adjustment and such a decision would require multiple levels of review and scrutiny within the Forest Service and the Department. In addition, these criteria do not apply to all fires. For example, only about 2% of fires are of "significant complexity", which is generally defined as requiring assignment of a Type I or Type II Incident Management Team. Also, only about 2% of the fires we fight are over 300 acres (and even less are over 1,000 acres) because 98% of them are put out during initial attack. In addition, on average, only about 0.4% of fires are near urban areas with 50,000 inhabitants or more. These criteria are intended to apply to those extraordinary, very costly fires. We anticipate using primarily the last criteria, the need to access cap adjustment funds when we will run out of appropriated suppression funds.

Question 8: The Fire Suppression Program provides the primary source of wildfire response operations. Your budget states that the Forest Service allocates funds from the suppression account only for active incident response. Yet if I am reading your suppression request right, you are requesting over $6 million for pay and health benefits for seasonal hires.

a. Why are pay and health benefits for seasonal hires being paid from suppression?

Answer: The Fire Suppression Program funds active incident response. A significant part of that response is provided by on-the-ground firefighters. Approximately 40% of these firefighters are seasonal employees who will be charging primarily to the Suppression program because they are hired for active incident management. Therefore, the funding increase is requested in the Suppression budget line item.

b. Are you proposing that we pay for pay and health benefits with funds made available under the budget cap adjustment? Please explain.

Answer: We would request the necessary funding to pay for this normal firefighting expense within the Wildland Fire Suppression Budget Line Item funded within the agency's discretionary budget.

Question 9: In your testimony, you highlight the importance of maintaining a strong preparedness program to keep wildfire suppression costs down. You have cited a statistic from your Fire Program Analysis Management Tool that for every dollar subtracted from preparedness funding, $1.70 is added to suppression costs. So, keeping this statistic in mind, it appears that your proposed budget would cut preparedness by 6 percent (-$63 million) which, per your Management Tool, would translate into an increase of about $1.7 million in suppression costs. I have a hard time understanding why the Forest Service would propose that Congress change the

entire budget framework for wildfire suppression funding yet budget in a way that would ultimately guarantee certain increases in wildfire suppression spending. What is going on here? Please explain.

Answer: The FY 2016 Preparedness budget request is a $1.8 million increase from the FY 2015 request because we know we must continue to invest appropriately in Preparedness or suppression costs will increase. The decrease of $63 million from 2015 enacted is net of this increase and a decrease for the $65 million appropriated to the Forest Service in FY 2015 to obtain next generation airtanker capability. While we appreciate Congress providing that additional funding over our FY 2015 request, we did not request that again in FY 2016 because we would have to substantially decrease other key mission-critical programs to do so.

Question 10: The Administration has once again proposed doubling the amount of funding for the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLR) programs. This is in spite of the fact that the agency either met or exceeded goals on only 2 of the 12 performance measures; notably attaining only 41% of the forest acres vegetation improved and only 39% of the renewable biomass goal. Please explain:

a) How has the CFLR program reduced unit costs, either for acres treated or per unit of wood produced?

Answer: The cost per acre varies substantially among ecosystems, treatment types, and economies. One example of a project finding efficiency through collaboration and large landscape restoration is the Four Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI) in Arizona. 4FRI has issued 19 task orders to date, with an average per acre payment to the government of $41.15 per acre on 18 of those task orders. Ultimately, these contracts will have a positive impact on watershed function and resilience and hazardous fuels reduction while creating economic activity in local communities.

b) How have CFLR projects reduced litigation or expedited project completion?

Answer: Several projects have seen large landscape decisions approved without appeals or objections, and as a member of the Uncompahgre Partnership in Colorado stated, "there is no way a 17,000 acre decision would not have been appealed without collaboration." By supporting project collaboratives, the CFLR program enables groups to address larger landscapes. The Deschutes Skyline project is a part of a 25,000 acre NEPA decision, bolstered by the success of a thinning project that was the first on the district to not be litigated in 13 years. Former litigants are still at the table, often acting as educators for the treatments proposed and carried out by the Forest Service. One representative from a group that has previously litigated forest decisions stated that through his participation in the collaborative, "I've gone from horrified to pretty darn optimistic about the future of this forest."

c) Why should we expect better results in 2016?

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Answer: While we expect that a given accomplishment measure might be higher in one year than another -- projects need to prioritize work each year with the capacity and funding available – overall, CFLR accomplishments are trending upwards over time. Timber volume sold, high priority acres treated for hazardous fuels within the wildland-urban interface, and acres of vegetation improved, for instance, have all had strong, consistent increases in outputs over time. We expect for these trends to continue into FY 2016.

Many CFLRs are working through the "NEPA-ready" acres that were available at the start of CFLR implementation. Due in large part to their investments in establishing strong community relationships, many projects are finding that they have collaborative support for the larger-scale projects they are in the process of bringing online. For example, in the fall of 2014, the Weiser-Little Salmon project in Idaho signed a final Record of Decision on an 80,000 project to restore Ponderosa pine and improve wildlife habitat on the Payette National Forest. This project implementation phase of a 50,000 acre project that did not result in any lawsuits or major appeals, due to collaborative efforts. As implementation begins on these new project areas, we expect to see additional results.

Question 11: The Administration's budget justification provides no quantitative analysis of the performance of individual CFLR projects. Please provide the committee with:

a. A table showing the number of acres actually treated on each CFLR project area since 2010, with an explanation of whether that number of acres represents an increase or decrease based on the NFS unit's prior performance.

Answer: The table below provides estimates of select accomplishment measures for CFLR implementation on the landscape from 2010-2014. Projects have varying restoration needs and ecological contexts, and particular activity types may be more of a priority for some projects than others. This accomplishment data does not exist in this format for years prior to CFLR implementation, and is therefore not comparable.

	Acres of forest vegetation established	Acres of forest vegetation established or improved	High priority acres treated for noxious weeds and invasive plants	Terrestrial and stream habitat restored or enhanced	Acres treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acres of forestland treated using timber sales
Region 1 (3 projects)						
2010	1,903	19	2,597	0	7,302	3,178
2011	1,916	692	6,364	11,219	24,333	1,154
2012	2,726	1,113	9,970	20,850	17,748	1,858
2013	3,536	1,603	5,600	8,942	28,534	1,288
2014	1,776	2,436	1,901	5,635	7,904	1,079
Region 2 (2 projects)						

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

2010	401	1,352	710	2,943	5,562	558
2011	1,606	7,396	1,498	5,147	16,053	101
2012	1,395	3,386	847	14,819	7,000	260
2013	1,564	5,758	821	8,867	10,642	754
2014	1,346	6,179	1,222	6,167	11,487	318
Region 3 (3 projects)						
2010	1,921	13,654	5,202	61,705	101,295	8,480
2011	121	9,513	2,550	100,393	38,352	867
2012	11,360	5,573	2,323	13,838	42,198	5,273
2013	3,833	28,518	3,979	55,176	77,044	7,013
2014	2,660	22,278	590	90,821	72,778	10,659
Region 4 (1 project)						
2012	1,053	2,409	2,169	22,909	14,155	2,437
2013	1,232	948	1,778	18,170	20,237	1,172
2014	737	2,697	2,365	15,557	18,571	891
Region 5 (3 projects)						
2010	28	43	0	0	3,150	330
2011	535	1,052	9	4,052	4,210	0
2012	995	3,796	163	1,654	7,421	0
2013	369	2,921	171	6,374	9,950	2,566
2014	333	3,910	47	3,653	8,230	2,601
Region 6 (5 projects)						
2010	0	600	0	1	23,928	2,478
2011	0	1,354	973	3,899	5,506	0
2012	638	9,376	4,309	17,607	51,956	817
2013	931	18,341	2,335	15,824	56,814	2,327
2014	7,376	22,141	4,830	38,306	86,238	4,926
Region 8 (5 projects)						
2010	3,649	1,500	0	1,300	13,115	0
2011	1,359	554	0	42,592	34,563	0
2012	2,857	4,223	2,469	193,107	177,211	2,552
2013	3,822	8,765	3,343	283,230	207,035	8,409
2014	2,939	7,657	1,963	229,073	196,751	8,446
Region 9 (1 project)						
2012	0	5,920	0	20,174	17,342	0
2013	252	657	153	1,760	9,621	526
2014	787	6,072	354	10,850	20,116	1,251

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

b. A table showing when NEPA scoping began for each CFLR project, when NEPA analysis was completed, or its anticipated completion data if it is not yet complete.

Answer: Currently, there are 23 Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLRP) projects. Each CFLRP project contains multiple NEPA analyses, which cover individual site-specific efforts. The table displays completed, pending, and ongoing site specific analyses by region. The NEPA status changes regularly once initiated. The actions listed here represent the NEPA status as of March 12, 2015. Status data were not available for two projects, the Accelerating Longleaf Restoration Project and the Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration and Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project.

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Bonners Ferry Ranger District Weeds EIS	Completed	1995		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Mission Brush	Completed	2006		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Northern Prairie	Completed	2008		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Eastport Hazardous Fuels	Completed	2006		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Myrtle Creek HFRA	Completed	2007		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Ruby Copper	Completed	2009		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	North Zone Roadside Salvage	Completed	2012		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	East Fork Meadow Creek	Completed	2012		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Leonia	Completed	2012		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Twenty Mile Creek	Completed	2014		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Idaho Buckhorn	Completed	2014		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Kreist Creek	Completed	2014		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	North Zone TSI	Completed	2014		
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Hellroaring	Pending		TBD	2013
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Deer Creek	Pending		TBD	2015
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Trout Ball	Pending		2015	2015
R1	Kootenai Valley	Boulder Creek	Pending		2015	2015

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
	Resource Initiative					
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	North Zone Landscape Burning	Pending		2017	2017
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Camp Dawson	Pending		2017	2017
R1	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	Blue Grouse Bear Road Decommissioning	Pending		2017	2017
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Interface Fuels Phase II	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Lodge Point Commercial Thin	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Iron Mtn. Whitebark Pine Restoration	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Fenn Face Rx Fire	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	North Selway Face Rx Fire	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	O'Hara Rx Fire	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	O'Hara Native Plant Restoration	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Selway-Bitterroot Invasive Plant Management	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	South Fork/West Fork Clear Creek Road Decom	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Clear Ridge Road Decom	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Fenn Pond Restoration	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Clear Creek Culvert Replacements	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Indian Hill Road Repair	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	O'Hara Culvert Replacements	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Selway Culvert Fish Passage	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Selway bank stabilization	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Upper Selway culvert replacements	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Whitecap bridge removal	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Clear Creek Vegetation Restoration	Pending		2015	Unknown
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Johnson Bar Fire	Pending		2015	Unknown

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
		Salvage				
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Lowell WUI Fuels Reduction	Pending		2015	
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Middle Fork Veg Mgmt.	Pending		TBD	2015
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	O'Hara-Goddard Veg. Mgmt.	Pending		TBD	2015
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Selway Road decom	Pending		TBD	2015
R1	Selway – Middle Fork	Selway drainage road improvements	Pending		TBD	Unknown
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Red Butte Fish Barrier Project	Completed	2014		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Whitebark Pine Planting {60 ac. /year next 5 years}	Completed	2014		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Condon Mountain Planting project	Completed	2013		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Lion Creek Trail Bridge	Completed	2013		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Glacier Loon Fuels Reduction and Forest Health	Completed	2013		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Whitebark Pine Planting	Completed	2012		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Swan Valley Ponderosa Pine Carbaryl Project	Completed	2011		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Mission Upland Burning	Completed	2011		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Lion Creek Mtn. Pine Beetle Project	Completed	2011		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Trails Reconstruction (ARRP work)	Completed	2010		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Forest Wide – Pre-commercial Thin	Completed	2011		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Piper Creek Bridge	Completed	2011		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	5 Bridge Installations	Completed	2012		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Bridge Abutments Holland Crk.	Completed	2010		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Jim Pack Rd. BMP	Completed	2012		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Cottonwood Stream Restoration Project	Completed	2014		
R1	Southwestern Crown of	Lodgepole Trailhead	Completed	2013		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
	the Continent	Improvement				
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Colt Summit (4 decision affirmations)	Completed	2013		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Horseshoe West Fuels Reduction and Restoration	Completed	2013		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	BT Insecticide Application – Big Larch Campground	Completed	2012		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Big Nelson and Monture Campgrounds Project (Fuels reduction)	Completed	2011		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Swan Face Prescribed Burn	Completed	2011		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Colt Summit Restoration / Fuels	Completed	2011		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Seeley Lake Campgrounds Project	Completed	2010		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Stonewall Creek Restoration	Completed	2014		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Poorman Creek Fish Improvement/Road Reroute	Completed	2014		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Sauerkraut Creek Restoration Project	Completed	2014		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Helmville Face Wildlife Habitat Improvement Project {10,480 ac)	Completed	2014		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Blackfoot – North Divide Winter Travel Pending	Completed	2013		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Alice Creek Wildlife Enhancement Project	Completed	2013		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Colby #1 & #2 Placer Project	Completed	2013		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Granite Butte Whitebark Pine Restoration	Completed	2012		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	South Fork Poorman Creek Fish Improvement / Road Reroute	Completed	2012		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Lincoln Compound Sanitation Salvage	Completed	2011		
R1	Southwestern Crown of	Lincoln Rip Rap	Completed	2011		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
	the Continent					
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Hogum Crk Prescribed Burn	Completed	2011		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Hazardous Tree Removal & Fuels Reduction	Completed	2010		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Holland Pierce Prescribed Fire	Completed	2006		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Conney McKay	Completed	2008		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Hemlock Elk	Completed	2008		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Meadow Smith	Completed	Unknown		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Holland-Pierce Fuel Reduction	Completed	2006		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Dick Creek Fuel Management Project	Completed	2008		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Auggie Fuels	Completed	2009		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Poorman Project	Completed	1998		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Arrasta Trail Reconstruction	Completed	2009		
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Blackfoot Non-Winter Travel	Pending		2015	Unknown
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Chilly James Legacy Roads	Pending		2015	2014
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Cold Jim	Pending		2015	2014
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Beaver Creek	Pending		2015	2014
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Stonewall	Pending		2015	2010
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Dalton Note: May be a Farm Bill CE	Pending		2016	2011
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	Center Horse	Pending		2016	2012
R1	Southwestern Crown of the Continent	RIBS	Pending		2019	Unknown
R2	CO Front Range	Trout West Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project	Completed	2003		
R2	CO Front Range	Upper Monument Creek	Pending		2016	2014
R2	CO Front Range	Upper South Platte	Completed	2009		
R2	CO Front Range	Hybrook	Complete	2015		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
R2	CO Front Range	Echo Beaver	Pending		2015	2013
R2	CO Front Range	Lake George EA	Not started		2016/ 2017	2015/2016
R2	CO Front Range	Catamount Forest Project	Completed	2011		
R2	CO Front Range	Rocky Messenger Howard	Completed	2007		
R2	CO Front Range	SledgeHammer Vegetation Management Project	Completed	2001		
R2	CO Front Range	Sugarloaf	Completed	2004		
R2	CO Front Range	James Creek	Completed	2004		
R2	CO Front Range	St Vrain	Completed	2006		
R2	CO Front Range	Lump Gulch	Completed	2009		
R2	CO Front Range	Forsythe I	Completed	2012		
R2	CO Front Range	Forsythe II	Pending		2015	2013
R2	CO Front Range	Clear Creek/Boulder Landscape	Pending		2017	2016
R2	CO Front Range	Estes Valley	Completed	2005		
R2	CO Front Range	Red Feather	Completed	2008		
R2	CO Front Range	Magic Sky	Completed	2011		
R2	CO Front Range	Thompson River	Completed	2008		
R2	CO Front Range	Cherokee Park	Pending		2015	2014
R2	CO Front Range	Glen Haven	Completed	2010		
R2	CO Front Range	Cedar Park	Completed	2012		
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	North Uncompahgre habitat and fuels reduction project	Pending		2015	2015
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	Escalante Landscape Restoration and Stewardship Project	Completed	2013		
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	UnC Mesa	Completed	2010		
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	Naturita Mechanical and prescribed fire	Completed	2014		
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	Calamity Basin Ponderosa Pine Thinning	Completed	2012		
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	Craig Point Travel Management Plan	Completed	2011		
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	Dominguez Creek Riparian Fence	Completed	2012		
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	Dominguez Ridge wildlife Improvements	Completed	2011		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	Hanks Valley Road Decommissioning	Completed	2012		
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	Telephone Draw Travel Management Plan	Completed	2011		
R2	Uncompaghre Plateau	Uncompahgre Pine Maintenance	Completed	2011		
R3	4FRI	4FRI #1 EIS	Pending		2015	2011
R3	4FRI	AZ Public Service-Salt River Project ROW Vegetation Management with Herbicides	Pending		2015	2014
R3	4FRI	4FRI #2 EIS	Not started		TBD	TBD
R3	4FRI	National Wildlife Turkey Federation (NWTF) Riparian Restoration Project	Completed	2012		
R3	4FRI	Timber Mesa/Vernon WUI	Completed	2012		
R3	4FRI	Wallow Aspen Project	Completed	2013		
R3	4FRI	Apache Trout Enhancement Project Rotenone Amendment	Completed	2013		
R3	4FRI	Rim Lakes	Completed	2013		
R3	4FRI	Beaver Creek Aquatic Organism Passage Project	Completed	2014		
R3	4FRI	South Fork Little Colorado River Lower Barrier Enhancement	Completed	2014		
R3	4FRI	Wallow Fire Bark Beetle Prevention Project	Completed	2014		
R3	4FRI	Lee Valley Barrier Removal and Creek Stabilization	Completed	2014		
R3	4FRI	Larson Forest Restoration Project	Pending		2015	2013
R3	4FRI	Upper Rocky Arroyo	Pending		2015	2015
R3	4FRI	Wallow Alpine Salvage and Fuel Reduction Project	Pending		2015	2012
R3	4FRI	Escudilla East	Pending		2016	2015
R3	4FRI	Hulsey Lake Restoration	Pending		2016	2015

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
R3	4FRI	Apache Trout Recovery	Pending		2016	2015
R3	4FRI	Eagle Creek Watershed restoration	Pending		2019	2018
R3	4FRI	Walnut	Pending		2019	2018
R3	4FRI	Wing Mountain Fuels Reduction and Forest Health Restoration	Completed	2012		
R3	4FRI	Pronghorn Fence Modification Project	Completed	2013		
R3	4FRI	Schultz Sediment Reduction Additions and Wupatki Trails Drainage Channel	Completed	2013		
R3	4FRI	Bill Dick, Foster, and Jones Spring Enhancement Project	Completed	2013		
R3	4FRI	Clints Well Forest Restoration Project	Completed	2013		
R3	4FRI	Hunter Access for Aspen Depredation Area	Completed	2013		
R3	4FRI	Allan Lake Wetland Restoration Project	Completed	2014		
R3	4FRI	Arizona Game and Fish Department Waters Catchment Reconstruction	Completed	2014		
R3	4FRI	Turkey Butte/Barney Pasture Forest Health Restoration	Pending		2015	2012
R3	4FRI	Flagstaff Watershed Protection Project	Pending		2015	2013
R3	4FRI	Mahan-Landmark Forest Restoration Project	Pending		2016	2012
R3	4FRI	Stock tank invasive aquatic species management	Pending		2015	2014
R3	4FRI	Pronghorn Fence Modification Project Phase II	Pending		2015	2014
R3	4FRI	CC Cragin Fuels Reduction	Pending		2017	2015
R3	4FRI	Eagle Rock Reforestation	Completed	2012		
R3	4FRI	Watts Vegetation	Completed	2014		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
		Management Project				
R3	4FRI	Duck Lake Wetland Restoration	Completed	2013		
R3	4FRI	Juan Tank Japanese Brome Management Project	Completed	2014		
R3	4FRI	Bill Williams Mountain Restoration Project	Pending		2015	2011
R3	4FRI	South Zone Grassland Restoration Project	Pending		2016	2014
R3	4FRI	McDougal grassland restoration	Pending		2016	2015
R3	4FRI	Canyon, Christopher and Haigler Creeks Aquatic Habitat Enhancements	Completed	2012		
R3	4FRI	Myrtle Wildland Urban Interface	Completed	2012		
R3	4FRI	Haigler and Canyon Creeks Aquatic and Riparian Enhancements	Pending		2016	2015
R3	Zuni Mtns	Puerco Landscape Restoration	Pending		2016	2015
R3	Southwest Jemez Mtns	Paliza Prescribed Burn (14K acre Rx within the SWJM Project Area)-EA	Completed	2011		
R3	Southwest Jemez Mtns	Southwest Jemez Mountains Landscape Restoration Project	Pending		2015	2012
R3	Southwest Jemez Mtns	Supplement to the Final EIS for Invasive Plant Control Project	Pending		2015	2009
R4	Weiser Little Salmon Headwaters	Mill Creek-Council Mountain	Complete	2012		
R4	Weiser Little Salmon Headwaters	Lost Creek Boulder Creek	Complete	2014		
R4	Weiser Little Salmon Headwaters	Middle Fork Weiser River	Pending		2016	2014
R4	Weiser Little Salmon Headwaters	Landscape #4 (Huckleberry)	Pending		2017	2016
R4	Weiser Little Salmon Headwaters	Landscape #5	Pending		2019	2018
R5	Burney Hat Creek Basins Project	Old Station WUI Vegetation Treatment	Completed	2008		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
		Project				
R5	Burney Hat Creek Basins Project	South Station Project	Completed	2003		
R5	Burney Hat Creek Basins Project	North 49 Forest Health Recovery Project	Completed	2008		
R5	Burney Hat Creek Basins Project	Whittington Forest Health Restoration Project	Completed	2012		
R5	Burney Hat Creek Basins Project	Reading Project	Completed	2013		
R5	Burney Hat Creek Basins Project	Eiler Fire Salvage and Restoration	Pending		2015	2014
R5	Burney Hat Creek Basins Project	Plum Forest Health	Pending		2016	2015
R5	Dinkey Landscape Restoration	Soaproot Restoration Project	Completed	2012		
R5	Dinkey Landscape Restoration	Eastfork Restoration Project	Completed	2012		
R5	Dinkey Landscape Restoration	Bald Mountain Restoration Project	Completed	2014		
R5	Dinkey Landscape Restoration	Exchequer Restoration Project	Pending		2016	2015
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Bailey Plantation Health Improvement	Completed	2011		
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Ramsey Fire Salvage	Completed	2013		
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	West Calaveras Plantation Thinning	Completed	2014		
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Hemlock Landscape Restoration	Pending		2015	2014
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	View 88	Completed	2010		
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Lost Horse	Completed	2009		
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Callecat	Completed	2012		
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Foster Firs	Pending		2015	2014
R5	Amador-Calaveras	Scottiago	Pending		2017	2017

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
	Consensus Group Cornerstone					
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Mokey Bear	Completed	2016		
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Prospect Rock	Completed	2006		
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Panther Creek	Pending		2016	2015
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Upper Cole	Pending		2016	2015
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Tiger Coop Burn	Pending		2014	2014
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Indian Valley Meadow Restoration	Completed	2012		
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Gold Note OHV Restoration	Completed	2011		
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Power Fire Reforestation	Pending		2015	2013
R5	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone	Foster Meadow Restoration	Pending		2016	2015
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Silvies Canyon Watershed Restoration Project # 10158	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Canyon Creek Wildland Urban Interface # 9170	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	16-Road Fuels # 8915	Complete	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Knox Hazardous Fuels / Forest Health Project # 15836	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Merit # 8727	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Logan Valley Meadow/Grassland Enhancement, Aspen Restoration Project # 30484	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues	Damon	Completed	Unknown		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
	Restoration Coalition					
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Jane Hazardous Fuel Reduction	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	SodaBear	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Starr HFRA Project	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Marshall/Devine Hazardous Fuel Reduction	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Upper Pine Hazardous Fuel Reduction Project	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Elk/16	Not started		TBD	2013
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Wolf Project	Not started		TBD	2014
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Summit	Not started		TBD	TBD
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Cliff/Knox	Not started		TBD	TBD
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Malheur National Forest Site-Specific Invasive Plants Treatment	Pending		TBD	2011
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Summit / Logan Valley Grazing Authorization Project # 24301	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Merit PCT # 11166	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Starr Aspen # 41023	Pending	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Aquatic Restoration Analysis # 43570	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	Malheur River Range Aquatics Projects # 35751	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	Sherman Creek Restoration and Growden Dam Removal	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	Swan Lake Quartz Trout Complex Allotment Management Planning	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	Malo East Lake Vegetation	Completed	Unknown		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
		Management Project				
R6	NEWVision 2020	Summit Pierre Vegetation Management Project	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	Kettle Face Vegetation Management Project	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	Walker Vegetation Management Project	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	East Wedge Vegetation Management Project	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	Boulder Complex Allotment Management Planning	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	Paradise Fuels Project	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	Deer Jasper Vegetation Management Project	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	Sherman / Ninemile Culvert Replacement	Completed	Unknown		
R6	NEWVision 2020	Orient Vegetation Management Project	Pending		TBD	2015
R6	NEWVision 2020	Sherman Vegetation Management Project	Pending		TBD	2014
R6	NEWVision 2020	Lambert Aquatic Restoration	Pending		TBD	2015
R6	NEWVision 2020	Sanpoil Vegetation Management Project	Pending		TBD	2016
R6	NEWVision 2020	Boyds Grazing Complex	Not started		TBD	TBD
R6	NEWVision 2020	Bulldog Vegetation Management Project	Not started			
R6	NEWVision 2020	Dollar Vegetation Management Project	Not started			
R6	NEWVision 2020	Little Boulder Vegetation Management Project	Not started			
R6	NEWVision 2020	Lonely Rock Vegetation Management Project	Not started			
R6	NEWVision 2020	Independley Vegetation Management Project	Not started			
R6	NEWVision 2020	North Kettle Vegetation Management Project	Not started			
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Phil's Trailhead	Completed	2012		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
		Enhancement				
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	West Bend Veg.	Completed	2013		
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Bearwallow Mastication	Completed	2013		
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	BMW Fuel Break	Completed	2013		
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Welcome Station Trails Connections	Completed	2014		
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Cascade Pit Restoration	Completed	2014		
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Rocket Veg.	Completed	2014		
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Ryan Ranch Wetland Restoration	Completed	2014		
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Ursus Fuels	Pending		2015	Unknown
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Lex Veg	Pending		TBD	2015
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Kew Veg	Pending		TBD	2015
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Drink Fuels	Pending		TBD	2015
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Popper	Cancelled		TBD	2015
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Melvin	Pending		TBD	2015
R6	Deschutes/Skyline	Indian Ford Creek	Pending		TBD	2015
R6	Tapash	Elderberry Restoration	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Tapash	Liberty Wildland Urban Interface Fuels Reduction (2006) and Liberty Hazardous Fuels Reduction Supplemental EA	Completed	Unknown		
R6	Tapash	Canteen Restoration	Completed	2007		
R6	Tapash	Roaring Thin Restoration	Complete	2008		
R6	Tapash	Upper Cle Elum Floodplain Restoration II	Complete	2011		
R6	Tapash	Iron Restoration	Complete	2007		
R6	Tapash	Cle Elum Conifer Release	Complete	2008		
R6	Tapash	Walter Springs	Complete	2012		
R6	Tapash	Walter Springs Road Decommissioning	Complete	2012		
R6	Tapash	I-90 East Project	Completed	2008		
R6	Tapash	Russell Ridge Restoration	Completed	2009		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
R6	Tapash	Glass Angel Restoration	Completed	2011		
R6	Tapash	FSR 1900 Improvement	Completed	2013		
R6	Tapash	Upper Yakima Restoration	Completed	2015		
R6	Tapash	Forest Service Road 3120 Flood Repair and Meadow Restoration	Completed	2012		
R6	Tapash	Nelli Restoration	Completed	2013		
R6	Tapash	Jungle Creek Road Project	Completed	2013		
R6	Tapash	Flood Repair Projects	Completed	2013		
R6	Tapash	Dry Restoration	Completed	2015		
R6	Tapash	Swauk Pine Restoration	Pending		2015	Unknown
R6	Tapash	Microwave Restoration	Pending		Unknown	2015
R6	Tapash	Little Crow Restoration	Pending		2016	Unknown
R6	Lakeview Stewardship	Launch	Pending		2007	Unknown
R6	Lakeview Stewardship	Burnt Willow	Pending		2006	Unknown
R6	Lakeview Stewardship	Jakabe	Pending		2007	Unknown
R6	Lakeview Stewardship	Abe	Pending		2007	Unknown
R6	Lakeview Stewardship	West Drews	Pending		2009	Unknown
R6	Lakeview Stewardship	Deuce	Pending		2014	Unknown
R6	Lakeview Stewardship	Camp Ck Plantation Thinning	Pending		2012	Unknown
R6	Lakeview Stewardship	Red Zone	Pending		2008	Unknown
R6	Lakeview Stewardship	Crooked Mud Honey	Pending		2015	Unknown
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Simpson Creek Watershed Improvement	Completed	2014		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	China Creek Trail Relocation	Pending		Unknown	2014
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Control of Non-Native Invasive Plant Species	On Hold		Unknown	2011

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
		in the Linville Gorge Wilderness				
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Singecat Prescribed Burn	Completed	2012		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Lost Bear West Prescribed Burn	Completed	2012		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	2010 HWA Suppression	Completed	2010		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Linville Gorge Wilderness Prescribed Fire	On Hold		Unknown	2011
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Dobson Knob / Lake James Prescribed Burns	Completed	2011		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Grandfather RD Rotational Prescribed Burns	Completed	2006		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Lost Bear Prescribed Burn	Completed	2006		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	2005 HWA Suppression	Completed	2005		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Roses Creek Project	Completed	2010		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Grandfather District Restoration Burns	Pending			
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Hawksbill Trail Reroute	Completed	2010		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Armstrong Creek Project	Pending		Unknown	2014
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Non-Native Invasive Species Control Project	Completed	2009		
R8	Grandfather Restoration	Thorps Creek Stream Rehabilitation	Completed	2010		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Oliver Branch	Completed	2002		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Stevens Branch	Completed	2004		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Lake Hinkle	Completed	2005		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	East Black Fork Creek	Completed	2005		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Hazel Creek	Completed	2005		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Shiloh (Nella)	Completed	2008		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Haw Creek	Completed	2008		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Jones Creek	Completed	2011		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Parks	Completed	2011		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Turkey Creek	Completed	2012		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Buffalo/Key Mountain	Completed	2012		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Nella	Pending		2015	2014
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Ross Creek	Completed	2014		
R8	Shortleaf - Bluestem Community	Fourche Mountain	In progress	2015		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Bearcat Hollow Habitat Enhancement	Completed	2007		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Bearcat Hollow Phase II	Completed	2012		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Boone Pine	Completed	2010		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Browder Plus	Completed	2008		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Burr Ridge Project	Completed	2007		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Cedar Mountain Salvage Reforestation	Completed	2011		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Fly Gap Kudzu Eradication Prescribed Burning	Completed	2008		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Lynn Hollow	Completed	2009		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Mulberry River Watershed Improvement and Access	Pending		2015	Unknown
R8	Ozark Highlands	South Fork	Completed	2010		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Spirits	Completed	2014		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Sugartree	Completed	2010		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Wedington Complex and Recreation Area Prescribed Burning	Completed	2011		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Wedington Restoration	Completed	2011		
R8	Ozark Highlands	Wedington Timber Stand Improvement	Completed	2008		
R8	Ozark Highlands	White Rock Mountain Road Relocation	Completed	2012		
R8	Ozark Highlands	White Rock Prescribed Burning	Completed	2013		

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Region	CFLRP PROJECT	NEPA PROJECT	STATUS	ACTUAL DECISION	PENDING DECISION	SCOPING FOR ONGOING/ PLANNED PROJECTS
R8	Accelerating Longleaf Restoration	Data is unavailable at this time.				
R9	MO Pine Oak	Cane Ridge East	Completed	2008		
R9	MO Pine Oak	Cane Ridge West Project	Completed	2009		
R9	MO Pine Oak	Handy Natural Community Restoration Project	Completed	2009		
R9	MO Pine Oak	Pineknot Project	Completed	2003		
R9	MO Pine Oak	Van Buren Project	Completed	2011		
R9	Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration & Hazardous Fuels Reduction	Data is unavailable at this time.				

Question 12: In an answer to a question for the record from our hearing in July of last year, you stated that the Forest Service has identified approximately 11.3 million acres for highest priority treatment. You went on to say that these acres are at a high or very high risk and that treating these acres specifically would greatly reduce the negative consequences of wildfires in the areas treated.

a. Where are these acres located? Please provide us with a table by national forest of these acres.

Answer:

The 11.3 million acres is an estimate based on a national scale analysis of fire potential that is regularly updated (annually or biennially) to incorporate landscape changes. These estimates reflect acres at high and very high risk of wildfire, near human development or in high value municipal watersheds, not in wilderness or roadless, and in fire regime groups I, II, or III. The numbers are constantly changing, as wildfires, land management, and development occur. Due to this, the analysis only readily generates data at the Regional level.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Forest Service Region	Priority Acres
1 Northern Region	1,443,000
2 Rocky Mountain Region	679,000
3 Southwestern Region	1,704,000
4 Intermountain Region	764,000
5 Pacific Southwest Region	3,698,000
6 Pacific Northwest Region	1,884,000
8 Southern Region	999,000
9 Eastern Region	137,000
Total	**11,308,000**

b. Under this proposed budget, how many of these acres are proposed to be treated in FY2015 and in FY2016?

Answer: The Forest Service expects to treat fuels on 2.145 million acres in 2015 and also in 2016. Much of this work will take place in the areas identified above. Fuels work will take place in areas that are high priority for integrated restoration objectives, important to reducing fire risk, or in areas where maintenance work is needed to protect previous landscape management investments (for example, maintenance burning in the Southeast.) Some areas require more than one treatment to effectively reduce risk or achieve restoration objectives.

c. How many of these acres are in Community Wildfire Protection Plans?

Answer: Typically, 80% to 90% of acres treated annually are in Community Wildfire Protection Plans.

d. How are you tracking the Forest Service's progress on treating these 11.3 million acres? Is there a performance measure in this budget proposal or is one being developed?

Answer: Treated acres are tracked within an enterprise system, including their mapped locations. We are piloting a new performance measure for our Strategic Plan that tracks risk reduced on NFS lands.

Question 13: Since last summer, the Forest Service has been working with the Tongass Advisory Committee (TAC), a group convened under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, to develop recommendations on how to accomplish the Transition. The vast majority of scientific data presented to the TAC strongly indicate that there it may be another 20 years before sufficient young-growth timber from the Tongass is available to permit a profitable transition to significant young-growth harvesting to begin. The Secretary in July 2013 Memorandum suggested a transition would occur more rapidly – in 10 to 15 years.

a. Assuming that the TAC can reach consensus on formal recommendations for the plan amendment this spring, what weight will the Forest Service give the TAC recommendations on the transition, including its pace?

Answer: The recommendations of the Tongass Advisory Committee may well represent one of the most reliable approaches to achieving the transition to young growth in the shortest timeframe possible, without losing an industry in the process. It is in the best interest of the public and the agency to pay close attention to any consensus recommendations presented by this group, and work diligently to adopt them as consistent with law, regulation, and policy.

Question 14: The Forest Service in Region 10 has determined that the market demand on the Tongass is 142 million board feet of timber annually under the Tongass Timber Reform Act (TTRA) requirement to meet market demand. Yet, the recently updated 5-year timber sale schedule provides for only 36 million board feet in this fiscal year, and an average of less than 50 million board feet *per year* over the next 5-years. Planning to provide only a third of the required market demand level does not comport with "seeking to meet the demand."

a. Why does the timber sale schedule fail to reflect the market demand number of 149 million board feet?

Answer: The Tongass Timber Reform Act requires the Forest Service to "seek to meet" the annual market demand to the extent consistent with providing for multiple use and sustained yield of all renewable forest resources and subject to appropriations. Calculated annual demand numbers, pursuant to TTRA, are not equated to the annual timber volume sold targets assigned to the Alaska Region. The Alaska Region has been consistently funded and targeted for a 70 MMBF output for at least the past eight years.

b. When will you direct Region-10 to revise their timber sale plans to provide at least the minimum volume required under TTRA?

Answer: The proposed FY 2015 President's Budget requested a national target of 2,900 million board feet and in FY 2016 a national target of 3,200 million board feet. To help meet this national goal the agency has assigned the Alaska Region with a target of 72.5 million board feet in FY 2015 but has not yet assigned a target to the Region in FY 2016.

The Tongass Timber Reform Act requires the Forest Service to "seek to meet" the annual market demand to the extent consistent with providing for multiple use and sustained yield of all renewable forest resources and subject to appropriations. Calculated annual demand numbers, pursuant to TTRA, are not equated to the annual timber volume sold targets assigned to the Alaska Region. All annual volume offered contributes to the TTRA goals; however, the Alaska Region is not funded nor is assigned targets by the TTRA.

Question 15: The approved Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP) from 2008 listed the Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ) for the Tongass as 267 million board feet. Since then, timber harvests in the forest have averaged about 35 million board feet, even though your own

documents support the conclusion that considerably more timber is needed to meet the current market demand.

a. Currently, the Forest service is working on an amendment to the existing TLMP; does the Forest Service plan to change the existing ASQ through that amendment process?

b. If so, can you provide me with the legal authority that permits such a change to take place by amendment?

Answer for 15a and 15b: The term ''allowable sale quantity'' (ASQ) is a term of art used in the 1982 Planning Rule. The term causes confusion about whether ASQ is a target or an upper limit for timber harvest. The 2012 Planning Rule, which will be used for the Tongass Plan Amendment, provides that forest plans identify an upper limit for timber harvest for the quantity of timber sold (36 C.F.R. § 219.7(f)) and the quantity of timber sold that can be removed annually in perpetuity on a sustained-yield basis, known as Sustained Yield Limit (SYL) (36 C.F.R. §219.11(d)(6)). The Tongass Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Statement will analyze a range of alternatives, including a No Action Alternative (current management), which identifies the ASQ of 267 MMBF. Alternatives to the No Action Alternative will include the SYL, consistent with the requirements of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) and the 2012 Planning Rule. (16 U.S.C. § 1611; 36 C.F.R. § 219.11(d)(6)).

Question 16: Young growth in the Tongass is subject to the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) non-declining, even flow requirement, the Tongass Timber Reform Act's (TTRA) stream buffer strip requirement's and the Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP) 1000 foot beach buffer zone requirement. The Secretary's July 2, 2013, Memorandum does not propose a departure from the NFMA requirement that National Forest timber be harvested on a sustained yield basis, which the Forest Service measures on a non-declining, even flow basis. Nor does the Secretary's Memorandum propose to modify TLMP's 1000 foot beach set back rule or the stream buffer rules set out in the TTRA.

a. What volume of economic young growth timber would be available for sale after the application of these requirements?

b. How does the Forest Service propose to increase this volume?

Answer for 16a and 16b: The current volume of commercial timber on the Tongass National Forest is unknown. The Tongass Plan Amendment will not change restrictions on commercial timber harvest under current law, such as the buffers required by TTRA. The Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Statement will include a range of alternatives. The Tongass has contracted the Environmental Analysis that will support the Forest Plan Amendment and modeling is currently underway to analyze the volume available by alternative.

Question 17: Until the recent passage of the Sealaska Bill the Culmination of Mean Annual Increment (CMAI) requirement of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) prohibited timber harvest on the Tongass until timber has reached its so-called "rotation age." The rotation

age for the Tongass is 90 to 100 years, depending upon site conditions. Since significant timber harvest did not occur on the Tongass until the 1960s, harvest of young growth would ordinarily not be allowed under the NFMA for another 30 to 40 years.

Since the harvest in the 1960s was along the beach and along streams, harvest of the oldest of the young growth timber will not be permitted in these areas in any event because of the Tongass Timber Reform Act (TTRA) and 2008 Amended Forest Plan restrictions. Thus, the oldest of the young growth is not available for harvest notwithstanding the departure from CMAI. So, as a practical matter, how and in what areas will the departure from CMAI increase the volume of economic 2nd growth timber available for harvest?

Answer: The Tongass contracted the Environmental Analysis that will support the Forest Plan Amendment and modeling is currently underway that considers a departure from CMAI. The model is using a "2-Log Rule" for looking at second growth. On the Tongass, the 2-Log Rule was developed to better predict when stands reach an economic condition to see where economic harvest opportunities may exist earlier than waiting for stands to reach CMAI. The 2-Log Rule implies at least half of the merchantable volume within a stand is comprised of trees with two or more logs. A log for this exercise is defined by trees that are at least a nine inches diameter at breast height, six inches in diameter at the small end, and at least 34 feet long. The stands that meet the 2-Log Rule that are selected by the model for each alternative will identify the areas where departure from CMAI could apply.

Question 18: For several years the Forest Service has been pushing to acquire the Sitka Native Urban Corporation's 23,000-acre inholding inside the wilderness of the Admiralty Island National Monument, the parcels near Cube Cove. Despite Cube Cove being Region 10's leading land acquisition priority your FY2016 budget, ranks Cube Cove its 40th priority nationally out of 54 – so low as to make it unlikely that your budget will be sufficient to acquire any more of the land in Southeast Alaska any time soon.

a. Given how low of a priority the Cube Cove acquisition is nationally (in terms of ranking) in your proposed budget, is the USFS still intending to acquire the parcels?

Answer: Yes, the Agency would still like to acquire the parcel. An appraisal of the property is currently being prepared. Any acquisitions depend on whether the value in the appraisal can be approved for Forest Service acquisition, whether the approved value is acceptable to the landowner, and the availability of appropriations.

b. Why is this land acquisition ranked 40th out of 54 in terms of acquisition priorities?

Answer: The national panel which reviews and ranks projects takes into account the ever-changing slate of available high priority parcels all over the country. While Cube Cove is a high priority, the project did not have a "willing seller" at the time the panel met, in that the agency did not know if the proponent would accept the appraised value. Given that there was an unobligated balance of $4 million dollars from as far back as 2011, the panel was not willing to

propose funding Cube Cove before other projects that had both willing sellers and the ability to obligate funds immediately.

Question 19: When the Forest Service sells timber, they commonly receive 25-50 percent less revenue per thousand board feet than timber sold from State or privately owned land in the same vicinity.

a. What factors contribute to this discrepancy in the price received for timber sales?

Answer: The States and the Forest Service are governed by very different laws and policies. By law, National Forest System (NFS) lands are managed for multiple uses. There are many factors affecting the advertised price and bids received for National Forest System timber. Design criteria prescribed to meet multiple uses, environmental protection law requirements, and hazardous fuels reduction treatments may reduce revenue.

b. What measures could the Forest Service take to increase the value of its timber offerings which would thereby increase the amount distributed to counties?

Answer: The value of timber is a function of market demand and competition. More competition in a market yields higher prices for timber in that market. The Forest Service is taking full advantage of the authorities of the Agricultural Act of 2014, such as designation by description and designation by prescription, Good Neighbor Authority, and the categorical exclusion for insect and disease treatments through commercial timber sales. All of these actions will help reduce sale preparation cost.

Question 20: In 2005, as part of the FY 2006 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, Congress expanded the Forest Service's authority to use money collected under the Knutson-Vandenberg (K-V) Act. This was done to allow the Forest Service to use this mechanism to expand its restoration work on the lands it manages.

On March 9, 2006 former Forest Service Chief, Dale Bosworth thanked Congress, "...for support that this Subcommittee has given the Forest Service in improving these authorities." He stated that in "...FY 2007, the Forest Service will continue to implement the FY 2006 changes to Knutson-Vandenberg (K-V) authority, which allow the Forest Service more flexibility in the expenditure of K-V funds."

It has come to the Committee's attention that, in fact, the Forest Service is not using these expanded authorities, and has given specific direction to the field that K-V collections cannot be made for projects outside of the sale area boundary which is contrary to what Congress authorized in 2005. What is the Forest Service's reasoning for not implementing the authorities Congress granted it?

Answer: The Forest Service currently is expending K-V collections funds as authorized through the expanded authority to perform approved resource work outside of the timber sale areas where funds were collected.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Responses from Chief Tidwell to Questions for the Record
Submitted by Senator John Barrasso

Question 1: I am concerned with the Forest Service's draft Good Neighbor agreements put out to the States comments. The intent of the law was simple; provide a way for States to perform work on federal land when engaging in similar work on State or private lands. In comments to the Forest Service the state of Wyoming submitted the following:

"*As presented, Wyoming State Forestry Division sees limited utility in the agreements and does not currently foresee pursuing projects under the Good Neighbor Authority, particularly those including a timber component.*"

"*If the spirit of Good Neighbor authority was to encourage States to voluntarily enter into these agreements in order to leverage resources and produce measureable outcomes, the draft agreements fall significantly short.*"

It is unacceptable for the Forest Service to turn what is a very useful law into something a State has no desire to participate in. Will you commit to fixing this problem and producing Good Neighbor agreements States will actually use?

Answer: The Forest Service has held a number of webinars and meetings with State foresters and other interested partners in the development of the agreements that will be used to implement projects under the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA). We have received many constructive comments from the States that the agency has used to improve the agreement templates. The Forest Service remains committed to ensuring the process and agreements necessary to implement projects under the GNA are streamlined and flexible while meeting the needs of our partners as well as the responsibilities of the agency.

Question 2: These actions on Good Neighbor Authority follow the agency's guidance restricting the effectiveness provided by the Designation by Prescription authority in the Farm Bill. One year ago, Congress adopted a Farm Bill that expanded the use of Designation by Prescription (DxP) on all timber sales. This was done after reviewing the successful use of DxP for stewardship contracts over the last 15 years. Congress supported this authorization because it had broad support from the forests currently implementing DxP in stewardship contracts, using DxP results in overall cost savings and leads to better results on-the-ground allowing field personnel to treat more acres with the limited budget they currently have. I understand the Forest Service recently sent direction for the implementation of this new authority which severely restricts its use by limiting the use of DxP to low valued thinning sales and requires purchasers to pre-mark leave trees and subsequently have the mark inspected and approved by the agency prior to operation. These limitations are not contained in the legislative changes to Section 14(g) of NFMA.

Please explain why the Forest Service has applied severe restriction on the use of DxP on regular timber sales and the legal reasoning for it. Does the Forest Service plan to reconsider its current policy decisions on Designation by Prescription authority?

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Answer: Prior to the 2014 Farm Bill, the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003 granted broad authority for the use of Designation by Prescription on stewardship contracts/agreements, however not to regular timber sales. The Forest Service is in the process of re-evaluating Designation by Prescription policies in light of the 2014 Farm Bill. As part of this evaluation, the Forest Service issued an internal letter summarizing current policies pertaining to the use of Designation by Prescription on standard timber sales because differences in contractual procedures between stewardship contracts and standard timber sales are significant. We will update our policies pertaining to the broader use of Designation by Prescription on standard timber sales as authorized by the 2014 Farm Bill.

Question 3: The recent Good Neighbor and DxP decisions follow another decision last year not to take full advantage of the Knutson-Vandenberg authority to accomplish restoration work through traditional timber sale contracts and the KV authority. Please explain the Forest Service's current policy for using KV funds for restoration work and why the agency's policy limiting the use of funds for restoration work was made.

Answer: The Knutson-Vandenberg Act of 1930 was amended in 2005, providing the Forest Service authority to use K-V funds to accomplish restoration work outside of the sale area in which it was collected but within the region in which the timber sale occurred. The amendment limits restoration activities to "watershed restoration, wildlife habitat improvement, control of insects, disease and noxious weeds, community protection activities, and the maintenance of forest roads." In addition to these examples, timber sale-related restoration activities are an appropriate use of funds when performed to meet restoration objectives.

Question 4: I appreciated the time Chief Tidwell took to meet with me last November about the Bighorn and Domestic Sheep issue. I want to emphasis the Forest Service needs to take the time to get this right. I want to also stress once again the need for alternative allotments to be made available to permittees prior to removing any domestic sheep from their current allotments. If relocation is needed once a risk assessment is completed which actually involved the State, State agencies, and impacted permittees, will you commit to making sure permittees have suitable alternative allotments, with an updated NEPA analysis in place prior to removing them from their current allotments?

Answer: Deputy Chief for National Forest System, Leslie Weldon, issued a letter of clarification on July 31, 2014, regarding the importance of balancing multiple-use demands with the management practices necessary to support viable populations of bighorn sheep and a healthy domestic sheep industry. We have previously shared this letter with members of Congress. When staff determines that the potential risk for contact, as identified through the four-step process, is at an unacceptable level, the staff must then identify and analyze potential replacement allotments when developing management alternatives. The analysis for alternatives for replacement allotments should be part of a single decision-making process as part of ongoing collaborative efforts to identify and develop site-specific solutions.

Although each forest will be attempting to identify suitable replacement allotments on a case-by-case basis, the agency cannot guarantee that replacement allotments can be found in all cases. In

some situations the analysis might show that available allotments are not capable of replacing the full complement of sheep grazing needs. In other situations, comparable replacement allotments might be a significant distance from the original allotment and make it unprofitable for a rancher to use. Further, there may by situations where there are no available allotments that meet the needs of the rancher and the agency.

Question 5: In the reply letter to the 37 members of Congress on the bighorn/domestic sheep topic, Under Secretary Bonnie wrote that "*the Forest Service has instructed its line officers that best management practices to maintain separation need to be applied.*" Will you provide my office with a copy of those best management practices?

Answer: The term 'Best Management Practices' is used as a way to describe a variety of management practices that could be implemented to maintain species separation and help support viable populations of bighorn sheep and a healthy domestic sheep industry. In this context it is part of the overall planning process referred to in the August 19, 2011, and July 31, 2014, letters of guidance from the Deputy Chief for the National Forest System.

Question 6: Under Secretary Bonnie's letter also stated the Forest Service would be "*considering State wildlife management plans for Bighorn sheep.*" It is my understanding Region 4 has primarily based their risk assessment on the flawed Payette National Forest model. Region 4 is only now beginning to give the successful Wyoming Bighorn/Domestic Sheep Working Group plan consideration. What update can you give me on how Region 4 is using Wyoming's management plan?

Answer: In a meeting between the Region 4 Regional Forester and Wyoming Governor Mead's staff, it was recommended that the Forest Service adopt the Wyoming Bighorn Sheep/Domestic Sheep Interaction Working Group – Final Report and Recommendations (Wyoming Plan). The Regional Forester's staff has thoroughly reviewed that Plan and believes it represents an important collaborative effort and serves as a valuable framework to meet our mutual resource management objectives. The Plan identifies Core Herds of bighorn sheep, identifies separation from domestic sheep as important to maintain healthy Core Herds, and identifies many management tools to achieve separation. The Region will use the Plan as a framework to meet our agency objectives regarding bighorn sheep sustainability on the Bridger-Teton National Forests.

The Region recognizes the Plan's identification of the Targhee, Jackson, and Whiskey herds as the Core Native Bighorn Sheep Herds on the Bridger-Teton National Forests; maintaining the long-term health of these herds by providing effective separation from domestic sheep also meets our sustainability objectives. The Plan identifies the Darby herd as a 'non-emphasis' herd and the Region is not currently planning to address risks that domestic sheep may represent to that herd. The Region believes there is a need to identify specific domestic sheep allotments that pose a risk to maintaining healthy Core Herds on the Bridger-Teton National Forests.

Other herds of interest include the Temple and Absaroka herds that are mostly within the bounds of the Shoshone National Forest.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Question 7: Another concern I have is that Region 4 is mapping bighorn core herd home ranges on Region 2, BLM, and Wind River Reservation lands. Have you approved Region 4 taking these actions outside of their jurisdiction?

Answer: The Intermountain Region of the Forest Service continues to prepare information needed for risk assessments in the western States as outlined in the Four Step Outline for Conducting Bighorn Sheep Viability Analysis (at Forest Planning Level). This work has broadly been in coordination with the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Wild Sheep Working Group to develop a geospatial layer identifying Bighorn Sheep habitat, whether occupied or unoccupied. In addition, the Intermountain Region of the Forest Service has been working in collaboration with the Bureau Land Management (BLM) to develop geospatial tools that analyze (model) the risk of contact between active domestic sheep grazing allotments and bighorn sheep in the Region. This model accounts for occasional long-distance movements by Bighorn sheep.

The Rocky Mountain Region has developed its own process for analyzing potential conflicts between domestic sheep and bighorn sheep at the forest level that is in collaboration with the State and in alignment with the Wyoming State plan. Specific decision-making authority remains with the individual Regional Foresters and the local line officers.

Question 8: Does either the Administration proposal or S. 235 contain language providing legislative reforms aimed at streamlining active management and reducing litigation?

Answer: Both S. 235 and the Administration's proposal are focused strictly on fixing the fire suppression funding situation. With the money that becomes available by not having to fund the entire 10-year average, the Forest Service is proposing to increase or maintain a significant investment in active management programs, including Hazardous Fuels, Integrated Resource Restoration, the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program, and Landscape Scale Restoration.

Question 9: The 2014 Farm Bill provided the Forest Service with several new tools to expedite management on the national forest system; notably Designation by Description and Prescription, nation-wide Good Neighbor Authority, and expanded authority to implement forest health treatments on designated insect and disease treatment areas. The 2016 budget justification does not make mention of any of these authorities, except to note the permanent authority for Stewardship Contracting. Please explain the following:

a) How do you expect the new authorities to result in program efficiencies in 2015 and 2016?

Answer: Within the designated areas, the Farm Bill authorizes the use of expedited NEPA procedures outlined in section 104 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act and it allows for application of the newly legislated Categorical Exclusion (CE). These provisions will improve the efficiency of the NEPA process and will increase program efficiencies in future years. By the time the NEPA provisions became available in 2014, the program FY 2015 had already been put in place.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

The Farm Bill also provided the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) that the agency, along with our State and other partners, will use to accomplish work in forested landscapes of mutual interest. Among other things, we expect the GNA to provide efficiencies by leveraging State resources to increase capacity to accomplish work across jurisdictional boundaries.

The Forest Service is developing agreement templates that State agencies and forests will use to implement projects under the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA). The agreement templates are necessary to ensure that the Forest Service maintains its land management stewardship and oversight responsibilities while authorizing States to act on behalf of the agency to perform work on NFS lands.

The permanent authority for stewardship contracting that the Farm Bill provides is fundamentally the same as the stewardship contracting authority the Forest Service and BLM have implemented for the past 15 years. The Forest Service is working through the regulatory process to publish a final rule that codifies existing policy consistent with the permanent authority received in the Farm Bill later this year. The agency continues to implement stewardship contracting projects while working through the regulatory process.

b) How many acres designated as insect and disease treatment areas does the agency anticipate treating in 2015 and 2016 under the proposed budget?

Answer: Currently, eight Farm Bill projects have been entered in the Agency's Planning Appeals and Litigation System (PALS) database. Six are categorical exclusions and two are Environmental Assessments (EA). Two of the six Categorical Exclusions have decisions associated with them, and plans are to implement them this year. The estimated size of these two projects is approximately 700 aces. The number of acres to be treated in FY 2016 is difficult to estimate at this time because it will depend on decisions made on existing projects as well as additional new environmental analysis completed this year.

c) How many projects on designated insect and disease treatment areas are carried out using the authorized categorical exclusion?

Answer: The Forest Service started six projects that will use the authorized categorical exclusion. Two of the six have decisions associated with them and plans to implement them this year.

d) What level of NEPA review (CE, EA, EIS) does the Forest Service use to analyze projects on insect & disease treatment areas?

Answer: The Forest Service plans to use all levels of analyses. So far the agency is using categorical exclusions (6) and environmental assessments (2).

e) How many acres does the Forest Service believe can be treated using Designation by Description and Designation by Prescription in 2015 and 2016?

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Answer: The Forest Service cannot estimate nationally how many acres within a timber harvest contract or a stewardship contract would be designated for harvesting by description or prescription because we do not maintain or collect data on these types of designation at this time.

Question 10: It seems the Forest Service may be relying on questionable numbers to inflate timber harvest accomplishments and reduce unit costs. Please provide the committee with:

a) the percent of the overall timber accomplishment for FY 2014 that was made up of personal use firewood, or firewood sold by permit,

Answer: Firewood comprised 10% of the overall timber sold accomplishment in 2014, including both personal use and commercial sales.

b) the unit cost for timber sales in the IRR pilot regions less the amount of personal use firewood, and
c) the unit cost for timber sales in the IRR pilot region less the amount of firewood sold under a 2400-6, IRTC, or IRSC to commercial firewood operators.

Answer for 10b & 10c: Because IRR includes multiple restoration BLIs, the Forest Service does not have an accurate estimate of the unit cost for timber sales in the IRR pilot regions. In addition, agency databases do not enable accurate distinction of the volume of firewood by personal use permit, commercial permit, and commercial contract.

Question 11: How much money does the Forest Service spend annually to comply with the "Survey and Manage" requirements of the Northwest Forest Plan in Regions 5 and 6? How many acres of Forest Service timber land are encumbered by complying with the "Management Recommendations" associated with the "Survey and Manage" requirements of the Northwest Forest Plan in Regions 5 and 6?

Answer: In recent years, estimates of the average annual expenditures for Survey and Manage compliance are approximately $3 million in Region 6 and undetermined for Region 5. The cost varies year-to-year depending on specific projects and design. This amount includes the cost of surveys, site management, data management, and program management.

The Survey and Manage Standards and Guidelines require the forests to conduct pre-disturbance surveys prior to implementing projects that may disturb the habitat for a variety of species. Some species require a 2-year survey effort and/or multiple visits to the same area to determine presence/non-presence. The survey effort on Forest Service lands has varied greatly over the years. At present, approximately 27,000 acres in western Oregon and Washington are associated with Management Recommendations. Only a small portion of Forest Service lands have actually been surveyed for these species.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Responses from Chief Tidwell to Questions for the Record
Submitted by Senator Maria Cantwell

Question 1: Flexibility for Local Resources

Last year in Washington State during the Carlton Complex Fire, one of the largest in our State's history, a private landowner had human and mechanical resources available for two days and had those assets only three miles away from the fire. The landowner offered the assets to the fire teams and commanders, but their offer was rejected as the citizens did not have red cards. That allowed the fire to grow out of control. It seems to be that this is a simple problem with a simple solution.

Would the Forest Service work with the local communities to allow locals without a current red card, but who have beneficial resources to build fire lines to contain fires until a team that is hours away gets mobilized and on-site?

Would the Forest Service work with the local areas in Washington, through a mechanism like Community Wildfire Protection Plans, to connect existing non-motorized trail systems with additional areas that could serve as a fire break during these events?

Answer: While we appreciate the interest of private citizens to want to help fight fires, federal policies are consistent across all federal agencies and do not allow us to involve anyone who has not received extensive training. This is to ensure the safety of our firefighters as well as maintaining maximum effectiveness in operations. It is not feasible for us to enlist any and all available potential resources during an operational period to support fire operations, since it is not possible to evaluate equipment to ensure it meets standards or train individuals on-the-fly without compromising overall mission capability.

We work with all members of local communities prior to the fire season to identify what resources could be available including equipment and people to support fire operations. This way we can be sure that they are up to the necessary standards. We also identify, in our pre-seasonal activities, how we can leverage existing road and trail infrastructure on to support the establishment of fire line.

Question 2: Preventative Management Practices

While quick and decisive response efforts are important, there also needs to be renewed focus on forest health, including thinning and site management through under burning. Not only would this help mitigate future fires from getting out of control, but would also benefit recreational uses of National Forest Service land, such as cross-country skiing.

What specific mechanisms does the Forest Service have to work with tourism and recreation organizations in a public and private partnership to thin the canopy around the existing trails for pre-fire suppression efforts?

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Answer: The Forest Service often uses partnership agreements, such as Challenge Cost Share and Participating Agreements, to work with tourism and recreation groups to conduct trail improvement activities, which may include thinning the canopy around existing trails. These agreements formalize the collaborative arrangement between the Forest Service and the partner in which all participants agree to work together to achieve a common purpose or undertake a specific task.

Question 3: Fire Fighting Resources

Once fires are out necessary resources need to be put in place to protect watersheds from erosion. Sediment needs to be prevented from entering salmon-bearing streams.

What plans are in place to ensure that the lands within the Carlton Complex Fire have or will have the appropriate measures installed to protect these streams? In areas that have been burned by wildfire, are you providing enough funding to cover invasive weed abatement?

Answer: The Carleton Complex BAER (Burned Area Emergency Response) analysis and plan was completed in early September on the Forest Service portion of the Carlton Complex fire. Approximately 70% of the fire was outside of National Forest System lands, primarily in State and private ownership.

The FS BAER plan called for about $435,000 of emergency (BAER) funding for work to stabilize NFS roads and road crossings, clean culverts and ditches, and reshape road prisms in high burn severity areas contiguous to critical fisheries habitat to prevent road failures that would produce massive sediment yield. Some of that stabilization work was completed before winter and the rest will occur as soon as conditions allow.

The FS BAER plan also provides $240,000 of emergency (BAER) funding for seeding as a preventative measure to control the spread of invasive plants and for early detection/rapid response weed control measures on NFS lands throughout the growing season of 2015. Non-emergency funding sources will also be used for erosion control, invasive plant abatement and other longer-term restoration measures for the next 1 to 5 years while the burned area recovers.

Question 4: Lobbying Congress

The President's Budget for the Forest Service includes a requested language change to the general provisions that accompanied last year's Interior-and-Related-Agencies appropriation. The Forest Service requests that the language preventing the Agency from using appropriated funds for promoting or opposing legislative proposals be deleted. The reason given was because "it restricts agency flexibility."

If this language was deleted, would your Agency be the only Federal agency with this authority or are there other Federal agencies that currently have this authority?

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Please provide an example of how the Forest Service would use this increased flexibility?

Answer: The President's budget for the agencies funded under the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, including the Forest Service, proposed that this General Provision be deleted because it is duplicative of other laws. There is a federal government-wide anti-lobbying provision in the Treasury Appropriations Act for FY 2015 in section 715, which states:

SEC. 715. No part of any funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used by any agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

For this reason, deletion of the General Provision would not substantively affect the anti-lobbying guidance for Forest Service employees that is currently in effect.

Question 5: Small Business Set-Aside

Setting work aside for small businesses, oftentimes, results in greater job creation and partnership between the Agency and the communities that surround the National Forests. However, I am hearing a lot of concern from both large and small businesses in my State about the Forest Service's proposed plans for timber sale set-asides. Looking forward, operators and processors need certainty and predictability about what opportunities they should expect to be available in the future. Your regulation updates regarding timber sale set-asides have been hanging in limbo for over 10 years. And with time, these regulation updates have only become more important. Last year, 729 million board feet was sold through stewardship contracts, and the set-aside program has not figured out how to address this contracting tool.

Will your revised regulations for this program be finalized in time to address the upcoming re-computation date?

Answer: The Forest Service has joined with the Small Business Administration (SBA) to prepare a joint Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making. The Small Business Administration should publish the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making by mid-April 2015 to solicit public comments on two main items:

- The possibility of including saw timber volume sold as part of a stewardship contracts in the calculation of the timber sale share of small business;

- How timber sale appraisals should be performed for small business set aside sales and associated costs and benefits to stakeholders (i.e. should appraisals be to the nearest small business (SBA) mill or remain to the nearest mill).

The actual 5-year re-computation process will take place during October 2015 – March 2016, with the new small business market share(s) effective October 1, 2015. Under the current schedule the SBA's rule should be completed before the five year re-computation of the SBA Set-Aside Program.

Question 6: Oso landslide

On March 22, 2014, 43 people were killed by a catastrophic land slide near Oso, Washington. Can you tell me about what the Forest Service is planning to do over the next year to assist in the recovery efforts following the Oso landslide?

Answer: The Forest Service continues to work with the local community on recovery efforts following the Oso landslide. These efforts include:

- continued communication with the Mayor of Darrington, WA to discuss a potential forest management collaborative centered on Darrington. The Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest has provided advice, counsel, and agency resources, particularly to other successful collaboratives across the region;
- continued coordination with local groups to provide information on the potential to pave the remaining portion of the Mountain Loop Highway. This is a grass roots effort to build support for the project which would pave the remaining 14 miles of gravel road with the ultimate goal of turning the road over to Snohomish County;
- ongoing collaboration with a local group to put together a Stewardship Project focusing on a forest road. This project is designed to reduce maintenance costs on that road by removing hardwoods that shade the road and drop leaf litter and woody material that plugs culverts and keeps the road wet longer;
- working with the Snohomish County Economic Development (ED) to identify additional recreation opportunities on the Darrington Ranger District. One example is a discussion with ED and one of the Snohomish County Commissioners to create additional snow park opportunities; and
- developing relationships and partners. The forest will work with local individuals and organizations, as well as more formal State and national groups to improve the understanding of the needs and desires of the local communities, the users, and the conservation community.

Question 7: Landownership Management

Your FY16 budget requests $20.8 million to mark the boundary lines of the National Forests and Grasslands.

Can you tell me how many miles of boundary lines exist on the National Forests and Grasslands,

how many are marked, and how many need to be marked?

The Forest Service Budget Justification says that the Agency intend to employ 592 full-time equivalent employees in FY16 for all of the Agency's Landowner Management activities, an increase of 32 full-time equivalent employees.

Can you tell me how many of the 592 employees will be primarily employed to locate land boundaries on the National Forests and Grasslands? Approximately, how many vacancies currently exist in your boundary marking program? Approximately, how many do you plan to fill with your FY16 requested budget?

Does the Forest Service have special hiring authorities to hire Veteran's into the Agency? The military training and experience of Veteran's appears to make them unusually well-qualified to assist with the Forest Service's land surveying and boundary marking needs. Can the Forest Service commit to hiring Veteran's for a large portion of these vacancies?

Answer: The Forest Service has an estimated 276,100 miles of boundary lines on the National Forests and National Grasslands. From 1959 to 2014, the Forest Service has surveyed and marked 121,900 miles leaving 154,100 miles that have never been marked. Of those previously surveyed and marked, 33,700 miles of boundary line remain marked to Forest Service standards. The other 88,200 miles of previously marked boundary lines are in various stages of decay, obliteration, or have completely disappeared due to a lack of boundary maintenance, fire, or other natural and man-caused activities. The Forest Service boundary maintenance cycle is approximately 10 years, meaning that marked boundary lines need to be maintained every 10 years to ensure they don't disappear.

The Forest Service has approximately 140 full-time equivalents (FTE) working to locate boundary lines. On an annual basis there are approximately 8 vacancies each year due to retirements and transfers to other agencies. For FY 2016 we may fill up to 5 such vacancies, budgets permitting.

The Forest Service does use Veterans Recruitment Authority (VRA) and is a leader among federal agencies in hiring veterans. For example, during the first quarter of FY 2015, 27.45% of the Forest Service's new hires were Veterans (612 new hires, including 168 Veterans).

Question 8: Wildfire Budgeting

In your FY16 budget proposal, the Forest Service is requesting over $6 million to pay for "pay and health benefits" for season hires. Why is this increase requested to be paid for under the Suppression budget line item, rather than the Preparedness budget line item?

Answer: The Fire Suppression Program funds active incident response. A significant part of that response is provided by on-the-ground firefighters. Approximately 40% of these firefighters are seasonal employees who will be charging primarily to the Suppression program because they are

hired for active incident management. Therefore, the funding increase is requested in the Suppression budget line item.

Question 9: Biomass

Your FY16 budget proposal, requests an additional $1 million under "Biomass Air Quality Improvement" to help cost-share important woodstove and wood pellet "change-out" programs. Last October, the Alliance for Green Heat put out a report summarizing the best practices for operating these important "change-out" programs.

a. Will the Forest Service require that programs comply with the best practices outlined in this report to qualify for these funds?

Answer: While we work closely with the Alliance for Green Heat, the Forest Service makes no commitment to standards or guidelines suggested by any particular non-profit organization.

b. How would the Forest Service potentially use this funding?

Answer: Funding will be used to work with architects, engineers, developers, and others to increase the use of wood construction materials, establish demonstration projects, conduct life cycle assessments and pursue Environmental Product Declarations, if specific needs are identified. The funds in the FY 2016 President's Budget will be strategically targeted to advance the development of biomass, wood products, and wood energy.

Question 10: Good Neighbor Authority

I wanted to inquire about implementation of the various farm bill authorities, particularly the Good Neighbor Authority.

When will the Forest Service finalize its guidance on the Good Neighbor Authority, so States, like Washington, will be able to assist the Forest Service in carrying out its projects more efficiently and effectively?

Can you also provide me an update on administrative guidance that is necessary for the Forest Service to begin using its Designation by Description authority? Can you tell me how that authority can be used in Washington and its effect on the costs to treat acres?

Answer: The Forest Service is developing agreement templates that State agencies and National Forests will use to implement projects under the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA). The agreement templates are necessary to ensure that the Forest Service maintains its land management stewardship and oversight responsibilities while authorizing States to act on behalf of the agency to perform work on NFS lands. The GNA agreement templates are subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act, which includes OMB review of the information collection forms and the associated burden on the States. The final approval of the GNA templates is anticipated from

OMB later this spring. Upon approval, the agency can begin to enter into agreements with States to carry out projects under the GNA authority.

Some forms of Designation by Description (DxD) have been in Forest Service timber sale contract standard provisions since 1966. In 2001, the Forest Service adopted a National special provision on Designation by Species and Diameter. This provision is used in understory or overstory removal units where both diameter and species are used to designate timber to be cut or left. In 2004, the Forest Service adopted 3 additional National Special Designation by Description (DxD) contract provisions: (1) Designation by Spacing, (2) Designation by Damage Class, and (3) Designation by Row Spacing. Administrative guidance for these DxD provisions was included in a letter issued when these provisions were adopted and is in the instructions accompanying each provision. All of the DxD provisions are available for use in both regular timber sale contracts and stewardship Integrated Resource Timber Contracts, nation-wide and in the national forests of Washington State. When used in the appropriate stand conditions, these provisions can reduce sale preparation costs because none of them require paint marking individual trees to cut or leave by either the Forest Service or the purchaser.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Responses from Chief Tidwell to Questions for the Record
Submitted by Senator Steve Daines

Question 1: What is the status of the Forest Service Next Generation 2.0 solicitation? It was announced last year that it would be issued in December 2014 and to date it has not been issued.

Answer: The RFP for the contract was released on February 19, 2015, and it will be open until March 24, 2015.

Question 2: Would it not be more effective to use the $65M reserved for the acquisition of large airtankers in your 2015 budget to contract up to 12 line items on the Next Generation 2.0 solicitation rather than purchasing a single C-130J aircraft? You could have increased your planned 7 line items for 12 by using $35M of this $65 million and have $30 million left over for hazardous fuels reduction work.

Answer: The Forest Service believes the intent of the Congressionally- appropriated $65M was to acquire a new aircraft capable of conversion to an airtanker. The aircraft acquisition represents a long-term (20-30 years) investment in the next generation large airtanker fleet, ensuring we are able to sustain operational capability over an extended period of time. Additionally, this government-owned aircraft would have the capability for year-round operations, including non-airtanker missions. Our intent, as outlined in the Aviation Modernization Strategy, is to maintain a mix of contractor-owned and operated and government-owned / contractor-operated airtankers.

Question 3: By awarding up to 12 line items on the Next Generation 2.0 solicitation wouldn't you eliminate a very high probability of a protest of awards? By awarding up to 12 line items you would have engaged every modern large airtanker available in the industry in 2015.

Answer: We have no way of guaranteeing that there would not be a protest of the Next Generation 2.0 contract award even if more line items were awarded. Awarding a contract to every available airtanker is not fiscally prudent nor is it in keeping with the Forest Service's Aviation Modernization Strategy where we have stated we will maintain a combination of contractor owned and operated and government-owned / contractor-operated airtankers.

Question 4: There is a private landowner in Montana that had been in a dispute with the Forest Service for several years regarding access to a road which runs through his property. At some point, the Forest Service had threatened to acquire access to the road across his property through Eminent Domain. The landowner has subsequently agreed to build another access road for the public to use at his own expense. The following questions speak to the Forest Service's questionable use of the Eminent Domain authority:

4a: It is my understanding that the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), P.L. 94-579, Section 205 provided for both the Secretary of Interior, with respect to public (BLM) lands, and the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to Forest Service lands, to obtain public access to these federally managed lands by the use of eminent domain. Now codified as 43 U.S.C. 1715(a), the language providing that authority appears to provide a different standard

of criteria for the Secretary of the Interior in using eminent domain from that required of the Secretary of Agriculture. Do you agree?

Answer: Section 205 of FLPMA imposes certain limitations on the Secretary of the Interior that do not apply to the Secretary of Agriculture.

4b: Is there any compelling reason that the standard required of the Secretary of the Interior should not also apply to the Secretary of Agriculture? That is, it seems that if BLM is required to demonstrate that there is a necessity to use eminent domain to secure public access, and that the power of eminent domain be limited to only the minimum corridor required to provide public access, such a demonstration of necessity, and limitation to the minimum amount of land necessary should also apply to the Forest Service in exercising the power of eminent domain. Do you agree?

Answer: We cannot speculate on whether Congress had a compelling reason for imposing certain limitations on the Secretary of the Interior that were not imposed on the Secretary of Agriculture.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Responses from Chief Tidwell to Questions for the Record
Submitted by Senator Jeff Flake

Question 1: We continue to hear from private industry in Arizona's eastern forests about the tremendous uncertainty regarding the availability of timber. As you know, the White Mountain Stewardship contract revitalized industry in Arizona, and helped the State begin to take significant steps toward restoring our forests and promoting healthy watersheds. Through those efforts, we have seen more than $130 million in private investment flow into Arizona's eastern forests. It is unconscionable to think that we would now jeopardize that by failing to allow access to acres for treatment. Yet, with the expiration of the White Mountain Stewardship contract last year and the destruction of 56,000 NEPA-approved acres in the Wallow fire, that is where we find ourselves—on the precipice of losing the only viable option to effectively treat our forests, private industry. According to those on the ground in Arizona, it is very difficult to get straight answers about what acreage will be available for treatment and when it will be available. What specifically is the Forest Service going to do to ensure that the industry that has built up in eastern Arizona is not starved out of existence because they do not have access to timber?

Answer: The Forest Service is consistently increasing the supply of timber in Arizona with over 100 million board feet (mmbf) currently advertised for sale which will treat approximately 25,000 acres. The Four-Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI) currently has twenty-three timber sales or stewardship contracts for restoration treatments outside of the 4FRI phase 1 contract, totaling about 100 mmbf on 22,000 acres. Eleven of those contracts, totaling more than 52 mmbf on more than 13,000 acres, are in Eastern Arizona (the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest) and the forest will advertise another 40 mmbf on approximately 10,000 acres in the next six months.

Question 2: As we discussed during the budget hearing, an E&E News story on January 6, 2014, reported that the USFS abandoned a $10 million initiative to hire an outside firm to help with a five-year "strategic organizational transformation" and "branding management." However, the report did go on to say that the Forest Service's Intermountain Region and the Pacific Northwest Research Station have a contract worth over $1 million with the Metropolitan Group to "foster a more powerful and shared appreciation of agency mission amongst internal and external stakeholders." According to the same article, the Metropolitan Group also holds a $500,000 contract to help Forest Service leadership "take the regional branding and identity effort nationwide." Please identify how much money the Forest Service has committed in FY16 to these contracts for branding and community outreach efforts?

Answer: The Forest Service has not committed funding for these contracts in FY 2016.

Question 3: What studies has the Forest Service undertaken to evaluate the effectiveness of the Integrated Resource Restoration or IRR pilot project? What metrics is the Forest Service using in those evaluations?

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Answer: The Forest Service completed annual reports on the 2012 and 2013 performance of the IRR pilot program and has had two third-party evaluation reports completed by Colorado State University and the Ecosystem Workforce Program at the University of Oregon (referred to as the Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports). These reports are available on the Forest Service website at http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/IRR/. The Forest Service wrote a three-year evaluation report on the IRR pilot program, in response to the request from Congress in the 2015 Appropriations Act, and that report will be delivered to Congress as soon as the clearance process is completed.

The annual reports and the three-year report rely on agency performance data, specifically the five core measures that the Forest Service chose to annually measure IRR performance. These performance measures include:

- number of watersheds moved to an improved condition class (as determined by the Watershed Condition Framework);
- volume of timber sold;
- acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience;
- miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced; and
- miles of roads decommissioned.

Question 4: Arizona has been a part of Region Three's IRR pilot project for several years now. Given the fiscal situation in our country, I can only support measures that result in cost savings and greater efficiencies. Can you tell me whether unit costs in the IRR pilot regions have dropped since the project began? What about unit costs for each acre actually treated, not just awarded? What are the unit costs per acre and per each unit of wood for Region Three for the last 5 years? What about unit costs minus acres awarded but not yet treated in the 4FRI project area?

Answer: The Agency's focus has been on affecting the outcome of improved watersheds and all watersheds are different in terms of the number, scale, complexity, or cost of projects; therefore, a unit cost approach to evaluating IRR has not been implemented.

Question 5: How have the CFLR authorities and IRR pilot allowed you to expedite management on the National Forests in Arizona? For instance, the 4FRI NEPA process began in 2011, and the record of decision was adopted in November 2014. Is that the length of time we should expect for the Forest Service to complete the NEPA process for proactive forest-treatment activities?

Answer: The average length of time required to reach a decision through an environmental analysis varies greatly. The 4FRI project timeline was influenced by the extensive collaboration, expansive analysis area, and natural resource issues specific to that project. Other CFLR projects have other challenges and some projects reach a decision faster than others depending on various parameters that need to be considered in the NEPA process. We continue to look for opportunities to increase efficiencies and to expedite the NEPA process. The Forest Service will continue to monitor IRR pilot performance in 2015.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Question 6: It has come to my attention that the Forest Service is considering a Traditional Cultural Properties listing on the National Register of Historic Places for land in and around Oak Flat. What is the status of that listing? Does it include any private property? Has the Forest Service consulted with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office about the potential listing?

Answer: The national register nomination package is currently in the regional office for review. This package has been shared with the Arizona SHPO and there is no private land associated with the Traditional Cultural Properties nomination.

Question 7: The Southwest Ecological Restoration Institutes continue to prove helpful in developing effective public policy aimed at restoring healthier forests and watersheds. Can you describe the role that these institutes play in helping the Forest Service advance proactive forest and watershed management policies?

Answer: The Southwest Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention Act of 2004 established three forest restoration institutes, called Southwest Ecological Restoration Institutes (SWERI), at Northern Arizona University, Colorado State University, and New Mexico Highlands University. Forest Service Region 3 develops annual work plans for each institute in consultation with the Department of the Interior and the State Foresters. SWERIs play a critical role in the transfer of current scientific information regarding management of fire-adapted ecosystems in the interior West through all types of media. They deliver short-courses and workshops on ecological restoration and the historic conditions in ponderosa, mixed conifer and piñon-juniper ecosystems and provide on-the-ground consultations and rapid assessments to inform treatment designs.

Question 8: There is a proposal for the President to bypass Congress and designate over 1.7 million acres of land in northern Arizona as the Grand Canyon Watershed National Monument. This would lock up not only Federal land, including nearly 1 million acres of the Kaibab National Forest, but would also lock up over 60,000 acres of State Trust land and nearly 30,000 acres of private land. Such a designation would have a devastating effect on the economic productivity of State trust land which is managed primarily to benefit Arizona public schools. It would have a similarly chilling effect on the economic productivity on private land and existing mining operations. The creation of this monument has been strongly opposed by representatives of the State. Would any of the Service's proposed funding be used to pursue the designation of a national monument in Arizona?

Answer: We have not received, nor have we participated in, a proposal to designate a national monument in Arizona; therefore, we cannot speculate on how or if we would participate.

Question 9: In 2005, Congress passed the Northern Arizona Land Exchange and Verde River Basin Partnership Act of 2005 (Public Law No. 109-110). Among other things, the law provided for the sale of Forest Service land to Young Life. Although the text of the legislation specified that 237.5 acres would be conveyed to Young Life, the Forest Service contends that the August 2004 map referenced in the Act only depicted 212.8 acres. Because the Act states that in cases of any discrepancy, the map would prevail, only 212.8 acres have been offered to Young Life. A

November 1, 2014 briefing paper provided to my office by the Kaibab National Forest states that the "Forest Service does not have the authority to see the additional 25 acres to bring the total to 237.5 acres." Would the Forest Service support legislation that would give it the authority to sell the additional 25 contested acres to Young Life?

Answer: The Forest Service cannot take a position on potential future legislation.

Question 10: I have been very supportive of the 4FRI efforts as a way to improve the health of Arizona's forests, provide much needed supply for the Arizona timber industry, protect water quality in important watersheds, and head off catastrophic wildfires. However, I am concerned that the program, which is entering its fifth year, has yet to treat a significant amount of acreage. The December 3, 2014 update from the USFS Southwestern Region reports that since FY13 there have been notices to proceed on over 21,000 acres, yet only 3,114 acres have actually been treated. What is the next milestone for these task orders? What criteria does the USFS use to evaluate the contractor's performance on these task orders? What is the next step in the event of non-performance on any of these task orders?

Answer: Treatment activity continues to ramp up for 4FRI, with 3,357 acres treated to date. Good Earth Power has also made progress establishing markets for timber products and the Lumberjack Sawmill on the east side of the contract recently added a second shift. Currently, all activities in the woods have been suspended due to weather and ground conditions. When conditions permit, activities will resume.

An additional 28,000 acres will be issued in task orders in FY 2015, beginning this spring. The Forest Service evaluates the contractor's performance based on meeting the requirements of an individual task order, and the timeline established for each task order. Should a contractor fail to meet the requirements, the Contracting Officer will issue a show cause letter and the contractor will have a specific amount of time to correct the issue. If they fail to correct the issue, the Forest Service will follow standard contracting procedures which might include a reduction in payments or termination of the contract.

Question 11: The 4FRI Phase I final EIS and draft Record of Decision were published on December 5, 2014. What is the timeline to finalize the ROD, work through the objections that have been filed, and complete the NEPA process on this important next step for 4FRI?

Answer: Forest and Regional Office specialists are completing their review of the objections and will provide detailed responses to the objection points to the Regional Forester (the Objection Deciding Official). The Regional Forester will meet with the objectors and a final decision on the objections will occur following any negotiations (likely April 2015). The Record of Decision will be issued after the negotiations and any needed revisions are completed.

Question 12: In the Forest Service's budget justification, the anticipated cost of wildfire suppression based on the average of the previous 10 years is $1.1 billion. The Service's anticipated 'worst case' scenario cost, based on a Forest Service mathematical model is $1.6 billion. The Service claims that the 'on budget' funding is sufficient to fight the predictable 99%

of the fires which account for 70% of the costs. But, the Service has only requested enough funds to cover 70% of the *predictable* costs, not the *worst case* costs - meaning that the plan going into the year is to have insufficient funds to fight the fires that are predicted to happen. Why doesn't the Service request 'on-budget' discretionary amounts sufficient to cover at least 70% of the worst case scenario?

Answer: If the Forest Service was to budget for 70% of the "worst case scenario" that amount would be $1.15 billion – an increase of $355 million from what was proposed in FY 2016 and an increase of $139 million over what was appropriated in FY 2015. In a constrained budget, we would have to decrease core mission delivery even further to fund this kind of increase. Instead the Administration is proposing a new funding mechanism that would allow us to continue to manage most wildland fires as we currently do, but take those that are most costly outside of our budget. That strategy will allow us to even further invest in the restoration and active management programs that will improve the health and resilience of forests and grasslands.

Question 13: In order to address wildfire funding issues in a fiscally responsible manner, I have joined Senators McCain and Barrasso in introducing the Flame Act Amendments (S.508), which would provide for on-budget wildfire suppression with a limited process for accessing emergency funds in the event of a catastrophic fire, facilitate the use of larger long-term stewardship contracts, focus on reducing hazardous fuels, and increasing timber harvests. Is the Forest Service willing to work with us on this fiscally responsible alternative approach?

Answer: The Forest Service appreciates all efforts to bring attention to and fix the wildfire suppression funding problem and we will work with Congress on developing approaches for doing so.

Question 14: Please identify which Forest Services accounts are used to fund: hazardous fuels reduction projects; activities authorized under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act and the Tribal Forest Protection Act; forest restoration and fuel reduction activities carried out outside of the wildland urban interface on condition class 3 Federal land or condition class 2 Federal land and located within fire regime I, fire regime II, or fire regime III; and timber sales, pre-commercial thinning, and wood salvage harvests carried out in accordance with 16 U.S.C. 472a. How much was appropriated for those accounts in each of fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015?

Answer: See below for specific accounts:

- Hazardous fuels reduction projects; activities authorized under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act: Projects that are undertaken specifically to reduce hazardous fuels in the wildland urban interface are funded by the Hazardous Fuels BLI.
  Areas outside the wildland urban interface are proposed to be funded under the Integrated Resource Restoration Budget Line Item.

- Activities authorized under the Tribal Forest Protection Act: Activities authorized under the Tribal Forest Protection Act are broad in nature, including hazardous fuels reduction, watershed improvement, reforestation, and cultural resource protection. These activities are

primarily funded by the Hazardous Fuels BLI; Integrated Resource Restoration; Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP); Forest Products; Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat Management; Forest Health Federal; Vegetation and Watershed Management and Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness.

- Forest restoration and fuel reduction activities carried out outside of the wildland urban interface on condition class 3 Federal land or condition class 2 Federal land and located within fire regime I, fire regime II, or fire regime III: Hazardous Fuels BLI primarily, but forest restoration on federal land can also be funded by many other Budget Line Item's, primarily Integrated Resource Restoration; CFLRP; Forest Products; Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat Management; Forest Health Federal; and Vegetation and Watershed Management.

- Timber sales, pre-commercial thinning, and wood salvage harvests carried out in accordance with 16 U.S.C. 472a. Funding for these activities comes primarily from the Forest Products and Integrated Resource Restoration BLI, but other BLIs can fund these types of activities if these tools are used for management purposes like reducing hazardous fuels or thinning wildlife habitat. The programs would be the same BLIs as those listed in the previous bullet.

Appropriations in FY 2013, 2014, and 2015
(Dollars in thousands)

	2013 Enacted	2014 Enacted	2015 Enacted
Forest Health Mgmt. - Fed Lands	60,095	58,922	58,922
Integrated Resource Restoration*	0	0	0
Collaborative Forest Landscape Rest	37,885	40,000	40,000
Wildlife & Fisheries Habitat Management	130,887	140,466	140,466
Forest Products	318,280	339,130	339,130
Vegetation & Watershed Management	172,173	184,716	184,716
Hazardous Fuels	301,056	306,500	361,749
Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness	261,932	261,719	261,719

**IRR was enacted as a pilot using funds from Wildlife and Fisheries Mgmt; Forest Products; Vegetation and Watershed Management; Legacy Roads and Trails and Non-WUI Hazardous Fuels.*

Question 15: Would you support amending the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act (S.235/H.R.167) to include the four criteria outlined on page 253 of the Forest Service's FY16 Budget request, limiting the Forest Service's ability to access the proposed budget cap adjustments?

Answer: The Administration supports declaration criteria for accessing the cap adjustment.

Question 16: On October 3, 2014, Senator McCain and I wrote a letter to you requesting that you withdraw the USFS Proposed Directive on Groundwater Resource Management. We have concerns about the overreach asserting federal authority over private-property rights outside National Forests, that it contradicts established Arizona water law, and is grounded on flawed legal authority. I was encouraged by your response to Senator Gardner that you have temporarily halted the directive and that the USFS is "going to sit down with – primarily with the States, the

State water engineers – to really sit down with them and get their ideas about how we can do this, and ideally how we can do it together." Please elaborate on the timeline and process for consultation with the States on this issue.

Answer: On May 6, 2014, the Forest Service published a proposed groundwater directive for public comment and initiated tribal consultation. After a 150-day comment period on the proposed directive, the Agency received 255 comment submittals. From the nature of the comments, including the letter from you and Senator McCain, it is clear that the Agency's intent for the directive was not clearly communicated and there are substantial concerns that the proposed directive would exceed the agency's authorities and infringe on State authorities to allocate water. Therefore, the Agency has temporarily halted the process to provide time for staff to engage with representatives of States and tribes that commented on the proposed groundwater directive to make sure the Agency fully understands the nature of their concerns. The Agency will not move forward until we are confident that we have identified and can address the concerns raised through the public comment and tribal consultation processes. In addition, after we consider and address all comments received, the Agency will develop a revised proposed directive that will be published in the Federal Register for a second round of public comment and engagement with all interested parties.

The Forest Service initiated discussions with the Western States Water Council over the proposed directive. My staff and I have met with or are in the process of reaching out to governors and state agencies that commented on the proposed directive. I expect those conversations will continue through the spring and into the summer. Since we are in the midst of our discussions with States and tribes, I cannot at this time predict when we will be satisfied that we fully understand their concerns and that we can respond appropriately through a revised proposed directive.

Question 17: I have introduced the bipartisan Stewardship End Result Contracting Improvement Act (S.326) that would amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide the USFS and BLM flexibility to obligate funds for cancellation ceilings over multiple years, facilitating larger longer-term stewardship contracts. Are you aware of the July 25, 1998 Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Establishments regarding Federal Use of Energy Savings Performance Contracting, in which then-acting director of the Office of Management and Budget, Jacob Lew, encouraged the use of multi-year obligation for cancellation ceilings? Are you aware of the November 2008 GAO report "Use of Stewardship Contracting is Increasing, but Agencies Could Benefit from Better Data and Contracting Strategies" in which the GAO cites several Forest Service officials expressing an opinion that the USFS should be exempt from having to obligate funds for the cancellation ceiling at the outset of the contract; cites other USFS officials as saying that the first year obligation requirement "needlessly ties up agency funds that could be used to conduct additional work;" and states the first year obligation may create a reluctance to "enter into a multiyear contract that involves a large cancellation ceiling"? Will the Forest Service support S.326, which allows multi-year obligation of cancellation ceiling funds consistent with the GAO recommendation and the 1998 OMB memorandum?

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
February 26, 2015 Hearing: The U.S. Forest Service's Budget Request for FY 2016

Answer: The Forest Service does not yet have a position on S.326 The Stewardship End Result Contract Improvement Act. However, we look forward to working with you in the future on the implementation of stewardship contracting.

Question 18: The Fish and Wildlife service has been adding to the lists of threatened and endangered species at an astonishing rate. In the past two years just in the Southwest Region, there have been 27 species added to these lists. What effect has this deluge of listings had on the USFS' ability to conduct wildfire management, hazardous fuel control, and timber sales?

Answer: While some delays have been experienced, overall the new listings have not yet significantly impacted wildfire management, hazardous fuel control, or timber sales on National Forest lands. Not all newly listed species occur on Forest Service lands or in proposed project areas. For most of the newly federally listed species that occur on Forest Service land we have already been proactively managing for them under our Sensitive Species program, which diminishes impacts if the species becomes listed. When possible we are partnering or proactively working with the Fish and Wildlife Service to recover federally listed species and to reduce the impact on Forest Service projects.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Response from Chief Tidwell to Question for the Record
Submitted by Senator Al Franken

Question: The forest products industry is the fifth largest manufacturing sector in Minnesota, employing an estimated 30,000 people statewide. And it is particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change. For example, the number of aspen, birch, and balsam fir trees – all economically important timber species – in Minnesota is expected to decline significantly due to rising temperatures. What is the Forest Service doing to help the forest products industry develop strategies to mitigate the loss of economically important tree species from our forests?

Answer: Forest Service Research and Development is working with partners to develop growing stock adapted for changing environmental conditions. We are also partnering to develop and test management options, systems, and practices for sustainably delivering needed goods and services under changing conditions.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Responses from Chief Tidwell to Questions for the Record
Submitted by Senator Cory Gardner

Question 1: An important issue in Colorado is the funding level for the programs that reside within the National Forest System, since there are 14.5 million acres of National Forests and Grasslands in Colorado. Would the Forest Service please provide my office with a breakdown of enacted funding for National Forest System programs on the top-line as well as specific to Colorado's Region 2 since fiscal year 2000, including the budget proposal for this year?

Question 2: Please also provide the total agency budget and the trend (by percentage) that goes to the National Forest System for each of those years since fiscal year 2000.

Answer for Question 1 & 2: Please see the table on the following pages that depicts the National Forest System funding, both nationally and for Region 2, for FYs 2000 to 2015.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD

02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Forest Service NFS vs. Total Enacted Appropriations FY 2000 to FY 2015 and Region 2 NFS Allocations

Budget Fiscal Year	FY 2000			FY 2001		
	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total
National Forest System						
Ecosystem Assessment and Planning	179,165	16,614	9%			
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration						
Restoration Partnerships						
Land Management Planning				78,134	6,360	8%
Inventory and Monitoring				174,069	12,091	7%
Public Services and Uses	485,989	40,811	8%			
Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness				229,763	22,169	10%
Ecosystem Conservation	445,325	38,798	9%			
Wildlife & Fisheries Habitat Mgmt				128,744	8,551	7%
Wildlife Habitat Management						
Inland Fisheries Habitat Mgmt						
Anadromous Fisheries Hab Mgmt						
TE&S Species Mgmt						
Grazing Management				33,782	6,470	19%
Forest Products				255,281	21,203	8%
Vegetation & Watershed Mgmt				181,634	16,479	9%
Minerals & Geology Management				47,840	4,973	10%
Landownership Management				86,418	8,910	10%
Law Enforcement Operations				74,194	1,012	1%
Valles Caldera National Preserve				988		
Centennial of Service Challenge						
Quincy Library Group Implementation				1,996		
Tongass NF Timber Pipeline				4,989		
Land Between the Lakes NRA						
National Forest System Total	**1,110,479**	**96,223**	**9%**	**1,297,832**	**108,218**	**8%**
Total Forest Service Discretionary	**2,810,933**			**3,883,770**		

Notes: Discretionary funding only. Does not include supplementals, fire borrowing or fire transfer repayment. Source: Forest Service Budget Justifications.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Budget Fiscal Year	FY 2002			FY 2003		
	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total
National Forest System						
Ecosystem Assessment and Planning						
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration						
Restoration Partnerships						
Land Management Planning	70,358	6,728	10%	71,726	8,568	12%
Inventory and Monitoring	173,316	10,777	6%	174,216	11,119	6%
Public Services and Uses						
Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness	245,500	22,007	9%	252,542	23,330	9%
Ecosystem Conservation						
Wildlife & Fisheries Habitat Mgmt	131,847	8,993	7%	132,936	9,291	7%
Wildlife Habitat Management						
Inland Fisheries Habitat Mgmt						
Anadromous Fisheries Hab Mgmt						
TE&S Species Mgmt						
Grazing Management	34,775	5,869	17%	40,584	5,886	15%
Forest Products	266,340	22,024	8%	263,628	21,743	8%
Vegetation & Watershed Mgmt	190,113	16,630	9%	189,703	16,311	9%
Minerals & Geology Management	48,956	4,940	10%	52,293	5,953	11%
Landownership Management	88,434	8,365	9%	92,411	8,726	9%
Law Enforcement Operations	79,000	1,014	1%	80,275	4,679	6%
Valles Caldera National Preserve	2,800			3,130		
Centennial of Service Challenge						
Quincy Library Group Implementation						
Tongass NF Timber Pipeline						
Land Between the Lakes NRA						
National Forest System Tot	**1,331,439**	**107,347**	**8%**	**1,353,444**	**115,606**	**9%**
Total Forest Service Discretiona	**3,784,416**			**3,975,577**		

Notes: Discretionary funding only. Does not include supplementals, fire borrowing or fire transfer repayment. Source: Forest Service Budget Justifications.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Budget Fiscal Year	FY 2004			FY 2005		
	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total
National Forest System						
Ecosystem Assessment and Planning						
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration						
Restoration Partnerships						
Land Management Planning	69,995	7,498	11%	63,167	4,808	8%
Inventory and Monitoring	169,659	8,224	5%	167,302	10,507	6%
Public Services and Uses						
Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness	255,050	23,239	9%	257,343	24,021	9%
Ecosystem Conservation						
Wildlife & Fisheries Habitat Mgmt	135,683	9,649	7%	134,749	9,002	7%
Wildlife Habitat Management						
Inland Fisheries Habitat Mgmt						
Anadromous Fisheries Hab Mgmt						
TE&S Species Mgmt						
Grazing Management	45,899	6,856	15%	48,034	7,613	16%
Forest Products	265,013	24,898	9%	273,247	24,774	9%
Vegetation & Watershed Mgmt	193,689	16,759	9%	189,614	16,728	9%
Minerals & Geology Management	53,399	5,660	11%	55,747	6,554	12%
Landownership Management	91,550	8,146	9%	92,129	8,242	9%
Law Enforcement Operations	82,828	5,371	6%	86,014		
Valles Caldera National Preserve	3,112			3,599		
Centennial of Service Challenge				9,861	1,000	10%
Quincy Library Group Implementation						
Tongass NF Timber Pipeline						
Land Between the Lakes NRA						
National Forest System Total	**1,365,877**	**116,300**	**9%**	**1,380,806**	**113,249**	**8%**
Total Forest Service Discretionary	**4,192,166**			**4,238,120**		

Notes: Discretionary funding only. Does not include supplementals, fire borrowing or fire transfer repayment. Source: Forest Service Budget Justifications.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD

02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Budget Fiscal Year	FY 2006			FY 2007		
	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total
National Forest System						
Ecosystem Assessment and Planning						
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration						
Restoration Partnerships						
Land Management Planning	57,675	4,288	7%	57,675	3,256	6%
Inventory and Monitoring	166,638	8,252	5%	166,638	9,425	6%
Public Services and Uses						
Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness	258,797	24,577	9%	258,797	22,960	9%
Ecosystem Conservation						
Wildlife & Fisheries Habitat Mgmt	131,734	9,048	7%	131,734	8,572	7%
Wildlife Habitat Management						
Inland Fisheries Habitat Mgmt						
Anadromous Fisheries Hab Mgmt						
TE&S Species Mgmt						
Grazing Management	47,826	6,583	14%	47,826	6,274	13%
Forest Products	277,583	27,443	10%	319,614	21,549	7%
Vegetation & Watershed Mgmt	179,852	17,531	10%	176,849	15,200	9%
Minerals & Geology Management	84,164	10,407	12%	84,164	10,041	12%
Landownership Management	90,932	8,151	9%	90,932	7,408	8%
Law Enforcement Operations	110,937			115,000		
Valles Caldera National Preserve	5,074			3,500		
Centennial of Service Challenge	4,434	396	9%			
Quincy Library Group Implementation						
Tongass NF Timber Pipeline						
Land Between the Lakes NRA						
National Forest System Total	**1,415,646**	**116,676**	**8%**	**1,452,729**	**104,685**	**7%**
Total Forest Service Discretionary	**4,200,972**			**4,327,796**		

Notes: Discretionary funding only. Does not include supplementals, fire borrowing or fire transfer repayment. Source: Forest Service Budget Justifications.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Budget Fiscal Year	FY 2008			FY 2009		
	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total
National Forest System						
Ecosystem Assessment and Planning						
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration						
Restoration Partnerships						
Land Management Planning	48,833	3,351	7%	48,833	3,625	7%
Inventory and Monitoring	166,580	9,740	6%	167,580	10,080	6%
Public Services and Uses						
Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness	262,635	23,149	9%	277,635	25,881	9%
Ecosystem Conservation						
Wildlife & Fisheries Habitat Mgmt	132,385	8,461	6%	139,385	8,865	6%
Wildlife Habitat Management						
Inland Fisheries Habitat Mgmt						
Anadromous Fisheries Hab Mgmt						
TE&S Species Mgmt						
Grazing Management	48,163	6,823	14%	50,000	7,542	15%
Forest Products	322,503	22,599	7%	332,666	22,450	7%
Vegetation & Watershed Mgmt	177,437	13,640	8%	180,437	14,841	8%
Minerals & Geology Management	84,143	8,876	11%	85,470	9,900	12%
Landownership Management	91,299	7,340	8%	93,299	7,654	8%
Law Enforcement Operations	131,910			135,500		
Valles Caldera National Preserve	3,691			4,000		
Centennial of Service Challenge						
Quincy Library Group Implementation						
Tongass NF Timber Pipeline						
Land Between the Lakes NRA						
National Forest System Total	**1,469,579**	**103,979**	**7%**	**1,514,805**	**110,838**	**7%**
Total Forest Service Discretionary	**4,487,228**			**4,762,566**		

Notes: Discretionary funding only. Does not include supplementals, fire borrowing or fire transfer repayment. Source: Forest Service Budget Justifications.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Budget Fiscal Year	FY 2010			FY 2011		
	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total
National Forest System						
Ecosystem Assessment and Planning						
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration				14,970	4,438	30%
Restoration Partnerships						
Land Management Planning	45,917	3,190	7%	45,033	3,447	8%
Inventory and Monitoring	170,502	9,656	6%	167,219	9,763	6%
Public Services and Uses						
Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness	285,117	26,731	9%	281,627	25,721	9%
Ecosystem Conservation						
Wildlife & Fisheries Habitat Mgmt	143,014	8,925	6%	140,260	8,683	6%
Wildlife Habitat Management						
Inland Fisheries Habitat Mgmt						
Anadromous Fisheries Hab Mgmt						
TE&S Species Mgmt						
Grazing Management	50,714	7,821	15%	49,738	7,735	16%
Forest Products	336,722	24,809	7%	336,049	24,777	7%
Vegetation & Watershed Mgmt	187,960	14,319	8%	184,341	13,577	7%
Minerals & Geology Management	87,240	9,385	11%	83,560	8,741	10%
Landownership Management	95,606	7,686	8%	91,765	7,220	8%
Law Enforcement Operations	145,047			144,254		
Valles Caldera National Preserve	3,500			3,432		
Centennial of Service Challenge						
Quincy Library Group Implementation						
Tongass NF Timber Pipeline						
Land Between the Lakes NRA						
National Forest System Total	**1,551,339**	**112,522**	**7%**	**1,542,248**	**114,102**	**7%**
Total Forest Service Discretionary	**5,389,112**			**5,096,746**		

Notes: Discretionary funding only. Does not include supplementals, fire borrowing or fire transfer repayment. Source: Forest Service Budget Justifications.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Budget Fiscal Year	FY 2012 w/ Rescission			FY 2013		
	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total
National Forest System						
Ecosystem Assessment and Planning						
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration	39,936	4,149	10%	37,885	3,744	10%
Restoration Partnerships						
Land Management Planning	39,936	2,518	6%	37,203	2,564	7%
Inventory and Monitoring	161,721	9,076	6%	150,652	8,382	6%
Public Services and Uses						
Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness	281,176	25,757	9%	261,932	23,754	9%
Ecosystem Conservation						
Wildlife & Fisheries Habitat Mgmt	140,036	9,289	7%	130,887	8,629	7%
Wildlife Habitat Management						
Inland Fisheries Habitat Mgmt						
Anadromous Fisheries Hab Mgmt						
TE&S Species Mgmt						
Grazing Management	55,356	8,946	16%	51,568	8,405	16%
Forest Products	335,511	25,707	8%	318,280	23,842	7%
Vegetation & Watershed Mgmt	184,046	13,494	7%	172,173	12,913	8%
Minerals & Geology Management	83,426	8,539	10%	77,716	7,594	10%
Landownership Management	85,738	6,705	8%	79,869	6,406	8%
Law Enforcement Operations	143,829			133,984		
Valles Caldera National Preserve	3,426			3,192		
Centennial of Service Challenge						
Quincy Library Group Implementation						
Tongass NF Timber Pipeline						
Land Between the Lakes NRA						
National Forest System Total	**1,554,137**	**114,180**	**7%**	**1,455,341**	**106,233**	**7%**
Total Forest Service Discretionary	**4,845,876**			**4,552,469**		

Notes: Discretionary funding only. Does not include supplementals, fire borrowing or fire transfer repayment. Source: Forest Service Budget Justifications.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD

02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Budget Fiscal Year	FY 2014			FY 2015		
	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total	Enacted FS Total	Region 2 Allocation	Percent of FS Total
National Forest System						
Ecosystem Assessment and Planning						
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration	40,000	3,368	8%	40,000		
Restoration Partnerships	2,000					
Land Management Planning	37,754	1,766	5%	37,754		
Inventory and Monitoring	151,019	9,483	6%	151,019		
Public Services and Uses						
Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness	261,719	24,015	9%	261,719		
Ecosystem Conservation						
Wildlife & Fisheries Habitat Mgmt	140,466	9,938	7%	140,466		
Wildlife Habitat Management						
Inland Fisheries Habitat Mgmt						
Anadromous Fisheries Hab Mgmt						
TE&S Species Mgmt						
Grazing Management	55,356	8,945	16%	55,356		
Forest Products	339,130	30,217	9%	339,130		
Vegetation & Watershed Mgmt	184,716	14,217	8%	184,716		
Minerals & Geology Management	76,423	8,386	11%	76,423		
Landownership Management	77,730	6,533	8%	77,730		
Law Enforcement Operations	126,653			126,653		
Valles Caldera National Preserve	3,364			3,364		
Centennial of Service Challenge						
Quincy Library Group Implementation						
Tongass NF Timber Pipeline						
Land Between the Lakes NRA						
National Forest System Total	**1,496,330**	**116,868**	**8%**	**1,494,330**		
Total Forest Service Discretionary	**4,896,611**			**5,073,246**		

Notes: Discretionary funding only. Does not include supplementals, fire borrowing or fire transfer repayment. Source: Forest Service Budget Justifications.

***FY 2015 regional allocation data will be available at the end of the calendar year 2015.*

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Responses from Chief Tidwell to Questions for the Record
Submitted by Senator Mazie K. Hirono

Question 1: Forestry Research and Development: Chief Tidwell, I understand that your FY2016 budget for Forest Research and Development is $292 million, an amount that is $4 million less than what was enacted in FY2015. Despite this overall decrease in the R&D budget, the Forest Inventory Analysis (FIA) Program within Forest R&D sees an increase of $13 million over the FY2015 enacted level.

With the research top line decreasing and the FIA program significantly increasing, I assume that other programs within Forestry R&D will be negatively impacted. Can you indicate what current research programs will be reduced or eliminated to accommodate for this discrepancy? Also, will reductions or eliminations within these research programs result in cuts to existing staff?

Answer: The decrease to non-FIA work won't prevent other research projects from moving forward, but it will slow progress on both new and existing projects. The Forest Service will take steps to minimize the impact of the proposed funding reduction on our existing staff. If reductions to the workforce occur, it would be through not filling vacant positions.

Question 2: Budget Flexibility (Follow-up to Question 1): Assuming that the President's budget were enacted as currently proposed, what flexibility would the Forest Service have in addressing R&D programs outside of the FIA program with essentially $17 million less to work with ($4 million decrease in the overall R&D budget and $13 million increase in the FIA program) than what is currently enacted?

Answer: When possible, we would work across Research Stations to leverage funding and expertise needed to address our highest priority research areas. In addition to internal impacts the proposed funding levels would reduce our ability to leverage funding on collaborative efforts with partners, which would further reduce our capacity and ability to respond to emerging issues. In FY 2016, priority research areas would continue, but at a reduced level commensurate to available funding.

Question 3: Impacts to Hawaii: Additional follow-up to Question 1: Can you indicate what specific programs, projects, or activities in Hawaii would be negatively impacted by this proposed Forest R&D budget?

Answer: The Pacific Southwest Station (PSW) research informs conservation, restoration, and management of Hawaii's abundant diversity of native plants and animals, including many of the nation's threatened and endangered species. The FY 2016 President's Budget reduces the funding to Hawaii by $262,000 but is partially offset by $100,000 to support Forest Inventory and Analysis activities. At the FY 2016 President's Budget funding level, we would sustain the current Hawaiian programs at current or at slightly reduced levels. PSW would continue to focus on high-priority research on watershed management and invasive species. However, funding for lower-priority programs such as invasive amphibians' research and ohia and koa silviculture research would be reduced. The Hawaii Experimental Tropical Forest (HETF), the first of its

kind in Hawaii and the U.S.-affiliated Pacific Islands, is a key installation for the Forest Service. We would continue to provide funding to support construction and key research being conducted there.

Question 4: Forest Land Protection: Chief Tidwell, I would like to thank you for your commitment to protecting forested land in Hawaii through the inclusion of the Helemano Wilderness Area in the President's budget. Without the increase of $8 million to the Forest Legacy Program budget over the FY2015 enacted level, the Helemano Wilderness Area would not make the list to receive discretionary funding in FY2016.

In the Forest Service's National Insect and Disease Forest Risk Assessment for Hawaii it was found that 76,514 acres are susceptible to high levels, or at least 25%, of overall tree mortality between now and 2027. Can you highlight existing or planned projects in Hawaii that will prevent this from occurring? What kind of investments can the Forest Service make now to protect Hawaii's forests and watersheds for the future?

Answer: Between 2012 and 2015, $3.6 million of US Forest Service funds have been used to support insect, disease and invasive plant work in Hawai'i. These funds were matched by Hawai'i State and other essential partners to accomplish pest-related work across multiple ownership boundaries. In addition, over a half million dollars is invested annually on Forest Service research in Hawai'i focused entirely upon biological control and the management of invasive plants.

Projects that will help protect and enhance forest health in Hawai'i are focused on:

- The native wiliwili tree (*Erythrina sandwicensis*). The wiliwili is a tree of significant ecological importance and is threatened by the *Erythrina* gall wasp. 12,000 acres have been identified as "at risk" on the National Insect and Disease Risk Map (NIDRM). The Forest Service and partners have developed an integrated pest management strategy. Plant health and regeneration are being monitored to determine the effectiveness of the biocontrol agents that have been released.

- Naio (*Myoporum sandwicense*). Another ecologically important and dominant tree, the naio, has experienced infestations of *Myoporum thrips*, which cause leaf distortion and can eventually result in tree death. Naio trees continue to decline in the long-term monitoring plots established on the island of Hawai'i. Efforts are continuing to find alternatives to control with insecticides. Efforts to detect thrips are ongoing and island-specific rapid response plans are being developed.

- Koa (*Acacia koa*). One of the tallest growing trees in the State, koa is a notable timber species and threatened by koa wilt. Work is ongoing to develop wilt-resistant koa seedlings and integrated pest management tools to combat koa seed and cone insects. A Koa Action Plan is almost complete and will be used to inform work priorities for the next 5-10 years.
- Ohi'a (*Metrosideros polymorpha*). The flowering evergreen ohi'a is native to the six largest islands and a dominant tree in native forests there. Threatened by both ohi'a rust and a wilt

fungus, efforts to enhance the species' health are underway. Work is ongoing to monitor for presence of the rust pathogen as well as methods for its control. A wilt fungus found in the Puna section on Hawai'i was determined to be the cause of recent and rapid dieback of ohi'a. The Forest Service is responding with its partners to further delimit the extent of the dieback, assess the range of susceptibility in ohi'a, and develop response measures to this new wilt fungus. The main concern at present is to mitigate to prevent spread of the disease to the other islands.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
02.26.15 Full Committee Hearing Forest Service Budget FY16

Responses from Chief Tidwell to Questions for the Record
Submitted by Senator Ron Wyden

Question 1: Chief Tidwell, I see that the Forest Service has proposed an increase of $20 million to the budget for the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLR) program, which I wholeheartedly support. As you know, Oregon has several forest collaboratives that have proven to be quite successful. However, despite being CFLRP recipients, some of these collaboratives – such as the Malheur in Oregon – still struggle to get enough timber to the mills, which puts a strain on local economies. Can you tell me how the Forest Service is working to ensure that the existing and new collaborative projects are providing enough timber to support existing infrastructure in local communities?

Answer: By investing in restoration, the 23 CFLR projects generate considerable economic impacts in local communities - many of which were hit hard by the economic downturn of 2008. Though timber prices are still depressed nationwide, CFLR projects have helped forestry and related businesses stay open, or even expand. Program-wide, timber volume sold from CFLR landscapes continues to rise as projects ramp up and accelerate implementation, from 216 million board feet (MMBF) in FY 2012 to 417 MMBF in FY 2014. The FY 2015 target of 462 MMBF continues this upward trend.

To support the generation of restoration byproducts made available for commercial forestry activities, the CFLR projects take advantage of a suite of tools to accelerate work on the ground. For example, stewardship contracts – which utilize receipts to pay for other ecological restoration work – are used for thinning projects that both reduce the risk of catastrophic fire and generate woody biomass. In FY2014 alone, the three CFLR projects in Oregon generated over $532,000 in goods for services through stewardship contract work on CFLR landscapes. The Forest Service will continue to make use of authorities, such as stewardship contracting, that enable us to work with partners and get work done on the ground to support local communities.

Question 2: Chief Tidwell, as you know Congress passed the Mt. Hood Wilderness Act early in 2009 and within it was a land exchange that was intended to consolidate the development on Oregon's beautiful Mt. Hood on the south side of the mountain where the current infrastructure exists. My office, along with Congressman Blumenauer have worked to see this exchange completed for almost 6 years, and now there seems to be considerable concern over the agency's interpretation of the easements. Could you give me some assurance that the Forest Service will do everything possible to ensure this exchange is successful.

Answer: To date substantial time and resources have been invested by both Mount Hood Meadows and the Forest Service in processing the Cooper Spur-Government Camp Land Exchange. The Forest Service is committed to moving this land exchange towards successful completion. In response to concerns raised by Mount Hood Meadows, the Forest Service has revised the conservation easement; it is currently being reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel to ensure the easement meets the intent of the Act and sufficiently protects the wetlands. Once the conservation easement is finalized, the Forest Service is poised to begin the appraisal and environmental analysis necessary to complete the exchange. Mount Hood Meadows

recently notified the Forest of their plans to begin timber harvest on their land proposed for exchange. If this harvest is completed, a new timber cruise will be required post-harvest, causing a delay to the start of the appraisal.