

Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norman
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascarell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Posey
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ross

Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart

Suoizzi
Takano
Thornberry
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Valadao
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoho
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—20

Beyer
Biggs
Black
Blackburn
Brown (MD)
Calvert
DeFazio
DeGette
Faso
Gohmert
Issa
Labrador
Polis
Raskin
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Walz
Webster (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1417

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3562. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4009. An act to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct a central parking facility on National Zoological Park property in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2772. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for requirements relating to the reassignment of Department of Veterans Affairs senior executive employees.

H.R. 3249. An act to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2349. An act to direct the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to establish an interagency working group to study Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence and to make recommendations on the harmonization of such efforts, and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION
ACT OF 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 891 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in

the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1419

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEBER of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 16, 2018, amendment No. 9 printed in part C of House Report 115-677 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. HERRERA
BEUTLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 487, after line 4, insert the following:
(d) STEWARDSHIP PROJECT RECEIPTS.—Section 604(e) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591c(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting “subject to paragraph (3)(A),” before “shall”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “services received by the Chief or the Director” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “services and in-kind resources received by the Chief or the Director under a stewardship contract project conducted under this section shall not be considered monies received from the National Forest System or the public lands, but any payments made by the contractor to the Chief or Director under the project shall be considered monies received from the National Forest System or the public lands.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CONAWAY for the opportunity to speak on this important amendment that I am offering to the farm bill today.

I also want to thank my colleague, Congressman WESTERMAN, for his tireless work on behalf of our rural communities that are dependent on timber.

Mr. Chairman, the key takeaway here is simple: If moneys are generated during restorative work in our forests, then a portion of those moneys generated from that work ought to remain in the community.

NAYS—188

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Barragán
Bass
Bera
Bergman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Burgess
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Cheney
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clever
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Emmer
Español
Esty (CT)
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxx
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Knight
LaHood
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McGovern
McKinley
McSally
Moore
Murphy (FL)

Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Halloran
Pallone
Panetta
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Sires
Soto
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Torres
Turner
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Watson Coleman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Zeldin

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Rice (SC) Tonko

Traditional timber sales require that a quarter of the revenues stay in the local county. But when the U.S. Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management use what is called stewardship contracts to work in the forests, none of those proceeds remain locally.

Our forested counties are facing a financial crisis right now. Federal endangered species listings have left timber-dependent counties in southwest Washington with little to no revenue from timber sales.

In counties that are primarily federally owned, like Skamania County in my district, which is 97-percent owned by the government, they are unable to make up these drastically reduced revenues from property taxes. This means that, by no fault of their own, they lack the local tax base to support even the most basic needs of their local communities, like schools or roads or local fire and police.

To help make up some of that revenue, Congress created the Secure Rural Schools program in 2000. Unfortunately, despite my and my colleagues' persistent effort to find a long-term solution through SRS, we cannot keep relying on the Federal Government's short-term fixes. That is not doing right by these communities.

This commonsense amendment will empower desperately needed funds to stay in local communities. Individuals and families should not be victim to Federal dysfunction. Let's not allow a Federal contracting program for timber harvest and forest restoration to leave those neighboring communities empty-handed.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment to ensure that a portion of the proceeds from these contracts are being rightfully directed to timber counties.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER) for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is at the desk directs a portion of revenue from stewardship contracting toward individual counties for further investment in roads, schools, and the like.

This amendment has no effect on in-kind contributions or exchanges of timber for goods or services provided. This amendment only affects the rare instance where stewardship contracts are exchanged for cash.

Per the 1908 Forest Service revenue-sharing law, counties are entitled to 25 percent of all timber receipts sold from Federal lands within their borders. This amendment simply ensures that if it looks like a timber sale, where timber is exchanged for cash, counties receive the same share they would if the Forest Service had sold the timber outright.

The argument that this amendment siphons off money from the Forest Service is false. This amendment does not affect or reduce the reinvestment from in-kind contributions. Furthermore, little investment can be made in our Nation's forest at all if there are no local communities to cultivate the investment.

This amendment ensures that counties can continue to invest in their forests and their children's future, both by protecting the good work of stewardship contracting and by ensuring that our rural counties get their fair share.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support a fair share for rural communities.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8331 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 8331. GOOD NEIGHBOR AGREEMENTS.

Section 8206 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "Secretary or a Governor" and inserting "Secretary, Governor, county, or Indian Tribe";

(B) in paragraph (4) by striking "Secretary and a Governor" and inserting "Secretary and a Governor, county, or an Indian Tribe";

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(10) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian Tribe' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)."

"(11) COUNTY.—The term 'county' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of title 1, United States Code."; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting "county, or an Indian Tribe" after "Governor"; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting "county, or an Indian Tribe" after "Governor".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment that will empower local communities by allowing counties to be included in Good Neighbor Authority cooperative agreements and contracts in order to improve forest health and bolster watershed restoration.

The base farm bill reauthorizes Good Neighbor Authority through fiscal year

2023 and contains a provision that allows tribal governments to be eligible to enter into Good Neighbor Authority cooperative agreements and contracts. Our amendment simply builds on that commonsense provision by also authorizing counties to be eligible for Good Neighbor Authority.

Good Neighbor Authority projects have been remarkably successful. From 2002 to 2013, 63 projects treated more than 4,100 acres in Colorado and Utah. These worthwhile treatments mitigated the threat of catastrophic wildfire, reduced flooding, enhanced forest health, and improved water quality.

Counties on both sides of the aisle requested this amendment and new authority.

The problem in Coconino County, a liberal county represented by my colleague Mr. O'HALLERAN, is that the wood is low-value timber, so they can't attract private industry to thin their forest for pending work they need completed.

Counties want to do this type of work themselves or find a contractor if the Federal Government won't treat their forests. All that is missing is the authorization from Congress.

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources is already entering into cooperative agreements with counties to partner in the management of Wisconsin County Forests, and it is working for them as well.

Some counties have actual foresters or other land management professionals on staff. These are not limited specifically to large counties either. For example, Adams County, Idaho, population of 4,000, has a natural resources committee that is chaired by a retired Forest Service employee who also serves on the local forest collaborative.

Coconino County has a forest restoration director who would be in charge of these county Good Neighbor Authority agreements. This is a director-level executive position that reports directly to the deputy county manager.

While some counties will likely contract with outside entities to perform the work, county contracts will be overseen by someone such as an auditor or a clerk.

The National Association of Counties supports this amendment, stating, "NACo stands ready to work with you to promote locally supported, consensus-driven solutions to address forest management challenges and reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire. NACo encourages the United States House of Representatives to adopt your amendment to H.R. 2 and give counties the opportunity to assist our Federal partners to make our national forests healthy again."

In addition to NACo, I am also honored to have the support of the National Water Resources Association, the Arizona Association of Conservation Districts, the Salt River Project, the Colorado Pork Producers Council,

and more than 20 other local and national organizations and elected officials.

I urge all of my colleagues in the House to support this commonsense amendment that will empower bipartisan communities throughout the country, improve forest health, and bolster watershed restoration.

Again, this is an authorization, not a requirement. It puts more power into the hands of local communities who need the work done but have nowhere to turn under the status quo.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), my good friend and colleague, who is a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment I cosponsored with Representative GOSAR that will expand the Good Neighbor Authority for counties.

Good Neighbor Authority allows the Forest Service to enter into cooperative agreements and contracts with States and Puerto Rico to execute projects that perform watershed restoration and forest management services on National Forest System lands.

The current text of the farm bill includes language to expand the Good Neighbor Authority to include Indian Tribes. This simple amendment seeks to build on that commonsense provision by empowering local communities and allowing the Forest Service to include counties as partners to these agreements.

□ 1430

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. GOSAR for offering this commonsense amendment.

Good Neighbor Authority was one of the hard-fought achievements in the 2014 farm bill that has proven useful in improving our national forests and our rural communities. I was pleased to expand the Good Neighbor Authority to Indian Tribes in the base text of this bill, and I am happy that my colleague continues to improve the forestry title with this amendment authorizing counties to be eligible.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GIANFORTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of part III of subtitle C of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 83. SALVAGE AND REFORESTATION IN RESPONSE TO CATASTROPHIC EVENTS.

(a) EXPEDITED SALVAGE OPERATIONS AND REFORESTATION ACTIVITIES FOLLOWING LARGE-SCALE CATASTROPHIC EVENTS.—

(1) EXPEDITED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an environmental assessment prepared by the Secretary concerned pursuant to section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) for a salvage operation or reforestation activity proposed to be conducted on National Forest System lands or public lands adversely impacted by a large-scale catastrophic event shall be completed within 60 days after the conclusion of the catastrophic event.

(2) EXPEDITED IMPLEMENTATION AND COMPLETION.—In the case of reforestation activities conducted on National Forest System lands or public lands adversely impacted by a large-scale catastrophic event, the Secretary concerned shall, to the maximum extent practicable, achieve reforestation of at least 75 percent of the impacted lands during the 5-year period following the conclusion of the catastrophic event.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF KNUTSON-VANDENBERG FUNDS.—Amounts in the special fund established pursuant to section 3 of the Act of June 9, 1930 (commonly known as the Knutson-Vandenberg Act; 16 U.S.C. 576b) shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for reforestation activities authorized by this section.

(4) TIMELINE FOR PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of a salvage operation or reforestation activity proposed to be conducted on National Forest System lands or public lands adversely impacted by a large-scale catastrophic event, the Secretary concerned shall allow 30 days for public scoping and comment, 15 days for filing an objection, and 15 days for the agency response to the filing of an objection. Upon completion of this process and expiration of the period specified in paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall implement the project immediately.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH FOREST PLAN.—A salvage operation or reforestation activity authorized by this section shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the forest plan applicable to the National Forest System lands or public lands covered by the salvage operation or reforestation activity.

(c) PROHIBITION ON RESTRAINING ORDERS, PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS, AND INJUNCTIONS PENDING APPEAL.—No restraining order, preliminary injunction, or injunction pending appeal shall be issued by any court of the United States with respect to any decision to prepare or conduct a salvage operation or reforestation activity in response to a large-scale catastrophic event. Section 705 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to any challenge to the salvage operation or reforestation activity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my amendment would allow land management agencies like

the U.S. Forest Service and BLM to quickly remove dead trees after wildfires to pay for reforestation and rehabilitation after devastating fires.

Last year, over 1 million acres burned in Montana. Livelihoods were threatened, wildlife habitats were destroyed, and whole landscapes were scarred.

My commonsense amendment was passed, verbatim, in the Resilient Federal Forests Act by this body. It would allow the agencies to quickly respond, as well as to raise funds to further rehabilitate the forest. An expedited environmental assessment would still be required and public input would still be included in order to move forward with the project. Most importantly, this amendment would require that at least 75 percent of the burned area would be reforested.

These landscape scale projects are badly needed. The Rice Ridge fire burned over 160,000 acres alone. Quickly responding to the damage caused will protect our public lands and restore our watersheds for the future and restore them to the quality we have come to love in Montana.

As I mentioned, similar language was included in the Resilient Federal Forests Act, which passed the House on a bipartisan basis on November 11, 2017.

My amendment is supported by the Federal Forest Resource Coalition, the National Association of Counties, the National Water Resources Association, and the Idaho Forest Group.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my good friend and colleague Congressman GIANFORTE's wildfire salvage operations amendment. I am glad that, with the farm bill package, we have the opportunity to look at the forest industry and wildfire issues from all sides.

This amendment is part and parcel of a broader wildfire strategy that requires proactive action from Congress for the steps before, during, and after wildfires are expected. Specifically, this amendment will ensure that the National Forest System forest is cleared and replanted if a catastrophic wildfire chars it to the ground.

Our National Forest System lands will be rehabilitated after wildfire devastates them, but in a way consistent with forest plans. That way, the ecosystem of the new forest will have better management and be less susceptible to another large-scale burn-down event.

This is a forward-thinking amendment to fix a backwards system we have devised in Congress, and I urge Members to vote for this demonstration that shows Congress isn't willing to just give up and let our forest system lands be catastrophically burnt.

Mr. Chair, I applaud Representative GIANFORTE for his strong leadership and tireless efforts to reduce the threat of dangerous wildfires. I urge adoption of this commonsense amendment.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Mr. GIANFORTE for offering this important amendment for Montana and, quite frankly, for our National Forest System as a whole.

Over the past several years, fires have had a devastating impact on our forest system lands, resulting in deteriorated landscapes. I have witnessed this firsthand across the country as the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture's Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry.

It is vital that the Forest Service has the right tools, the ability to restore these landscapes as quickly as possible to preserve habitat, clean air, and the significant impact that these incidents can have on clean water.

Unfortunately, litigation stalls many of these projects. As Madison County, Montana, Commissioner Dave Schulz noted before the House Natural Resources Federal Lands Subcommittee in May of 2015, due to the threat of litigation from outside groups refusing to meet or collaborate with the community, what started out as a consensus proposal for 100,000 acres of fire salvage and reforestation was reduced to less than 2,000 acres of salvage. "Fear of litigation prevents the Forest Service from thinking big."

In another quote, he offered, a "significant factor in preventing responsible management of our Nation's forests."

Mr. Chair, I certainly support this amendment. It has already passed the House. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chair, at this time, I urge adoption of my common-sense amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of part III of subtitle C of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 8334. ANALYSIS OF ONLY TWO ALTERNATIVES (ACTION VERSUS NO ACTION) IN PROPOSED COLLABORATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—This section shall apply whenever the Secretary concerned prepares an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement pursuant to

section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) for a forest management activity that—

(1) is developed through a collaborative process;

(2) is proposed by a resource advisory committee;

(3) will occur on lands identified by the Secretary concerned as suitable for timber production;

(4) will occur on lands designated by the Secretary (or designee thereof) pursuant to section 602(b) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591a(b)), notwithstanding whether such forest management activity is initiated prior to September 30, 2018; or

(5) is covered by a community wildfire protection plan.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES.—In an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement described in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall study, develop, and describe only the following two alternatives:

(1) The forest management activity.

(2) The alternative of no action.

(c) ELEMENTS OF NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE.—In the case of the alternative of no action, the Secretary concerned shall consider whether to evaluate—

(1) the effect of no action on—

(A) forest health;

(B) habitat diversity;

(C) wildfire potential;

(D) insect and disease potential; and

(E) timber production; and

(2) the implications of a resulting decline in forest health, loss of habitat diversity, wildfire, or insect or disease infestation, given fire and insect and disease historic cycles, on—

(A) domestic water supply in the project area;

(B) wildlife habitat loss; and

(C) other economic and social factors.

SEC. 8335. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

(a) BALANCING SHORT- AND LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES IN CONSIDERING INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—As part of its weighing the equities while considering any request for an injunction that applies to any agency action as part of a forest management activity the court reviewing the agency action shall balance the impact to the ecosystem likely affected by the forest management activity of—

(1) the short- and long-term effects of undertaking the agency action; against

(2) the short- and long-term effects of not undertaking the action.

(b) TIME LIMITATIONS FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) the length of any preliminary injunctive relief and stays pending appeal that applies to any agency action as part of a forest management activity, shall not exceed 60 days.

(2) RENEWAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A court of competent jurisdiction may issue one or more renewals of any preliminary injunction, or stay pending appeal, granted under paragraph (1).

(B) UPDATES.—In each renewal of an injunction in an action, the parties to the action shall present the court with updated information on the status of the authorized forest management activity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my amendment promotes collaborative forest management, cuts red tape, and encourages the Forest Service to plan for the long-term health of our Nation's forests.

Mr. Chair, if we were to go to the doctor and we had cancer and the doctor offered a treatment for that cancer but decided it might not be in our best interests, we wouldn't just leave. We would want to find out what the best treatment was.

What is happening in our national forests is, if one plan is rejected, we do nothing, and we don't treat the disease of mismanagement that is currently happening in our forests.

Implementing sound, scientifically-based management reforms is necessary to address the growing economic and environmental threats of catastrophic wildfire. Prevention through active management is the best medicine to make our forests healthy.

By requiring environmental analysis of a collaboratively developed proposal to be weighed against a "no action" alternative—the impacts of doing nothing on forest health and wildfire risk—this amendment ensures that taxpayer dollars are spent only on analysis and project planning that protects our forests' long-term health. Further, my amendment ensures that long-term forest health is considered by the courts when granting an injunction on critical forest management activities.

This amendment previously received bipartisan support in the House as part of the Resilient Federal Forests Act. It has no cost to the American taxpayer and is supported by a variety of organizations, including the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Home Builders, and more.

Mr. Chair, inaction itself is a forest management decision. Standing by and doing nothing is the reason we continue to watch our forests burn.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, this amendment significantly alters critical environmental review requirements and limits opportunity for the public to challenge forest management projects.

Restricting NEPA analysis to two alternatives may seem like it will save time and money, but this cuts right at the heart of critical environmental protections. NEPA doesn't hurt forest management projects; bad planning, ignoring science, and disingenuous intentions hurt forest management projects.

NEPA supports collaboration through public participation. It allows many voices and different voices to participate in the planning process,

which leads to better results and reduced costs.

NEPA ensures Federal agencies consider all alternatives, without requiring that agencies select the most environmentally friendly option or value the environment over other concerns.

Much like the forestry provisions in the base text of this bill, we have been down this road before. House Republicans tried to include harmful provisions to scale bedrock environmental laws and restrict access to the courts during the omnibus negotiations.

All of these toxic proposals were rejected by the Senate. Let's not make the Senate say "no" for a second time.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, this bill, again, does not sidestep any environmental activity. It just simply says that we have to evaluate the do-nothing option and what the effects to the forest are from that.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague, Mr. WESTERMAN.

The United States is about to embark on yet another year of ravaging catastrophic wildfire. I say "embark" because this is ultimately a choice. While some amount of summer wildfire is to be expected during the heat of summer, the devastation we have seen in recent years is unprecedented.

2017 was one of the worst wildfire seasons on record. More than 58,000 fires burned more than 9.2 million acres. The Forest Service spent more than \$2.5 billion on suppression costs this fiscal year alone, a new record.

These expenditures and destruction coincide perfectly with Congress' dereliction of its duty to ensure our land management agencies are equipped with the tools and authorities to properly manage our forests. Congress has provided some legislative fixes this year, but I think every Member understands full well we shouldn't pat ourselves on the back just yet.

As the coming months will demonstrate, we and, by extension, the American taxpayer are still on the hook here. We are susceptible to years more of supermassive fire blanketing the country unless we build on our progress.

Mr. WESTERMAN's amendment here does just that. It will require the government to holistically evaluate the impacts of its forestry decisions on overall forest health. By requiring the costs of inaction to be weighed, the Forest Service will have to demonstrate its decisions are ultimately in a forest's interest.

Mr. Chair, I applaud Mr. WESTERMAN for his strong leadership and tireless efforts to improve a failing system that we have inherited.

Mr. Chair, I urge the adoption of the commonsense amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, if my colleagues across the aisle are serious about the long-term health of our forests, they should stop and pause and listen to scientists, who tell us climate change threatens in a very factual and scientific way and direct way the health of our forests, wildlife, and the ever-increasing forest fires that we must confront every year. We can use NEPA as a tool to consider these impacts, and if we are smart, we will strengthen the law instead of weakening it piece by piece.

The issue of forest health is a serious issue. This amendment does not deal with the complexity of the seriousness of this issue. If, indeed, we are to deal with this issue, then it has to be comprehensive and it has to be looked at, not by eliminating protections and public access, but by truly doing something for the long-term health of these forests, and that is to consider all available information and not deny scientific information in the process of blaming NEPA or any other law that exists for the public and for the protection of our forests as the reason why we are having forest fires.

Forest fires are a direct result of climate change, and as such, not to consider that as part and parcel of a solution is a grave mistake that will not solve the problem.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment. It should not be tucked into this farm bill. It merits its own proper discussion and debate in this House, and that is the direction we should go.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, this amendment does not sidestep NEPA, it does not weaken NEPA, it just simply says you have to evaluate the alternative of doing nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I think that we have actually found some common ground when our colleague is saying, let's use science.

Effectively, that is what we are talking about with this amendment, to be able to have analysis, to be able to have project planning.

Let me give you a real-life example in southwestern Colorado: the West Fork Complex fire, which erupted because we had trees growing not at the elevation that they should, overgrowth in our forest that resulted in a massive fire.

I would suggest that if you care about endangered species, if you care about protecting our waterways, if you care about having an abundant resource to be able to develop to be able to support our schools through the rural school programs as well, this is an opportunity to be able to create those healthy forests and to be able to

move forward with good commonsense planning that is going to be provided by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage the passage of the amendment and applaud Mr. WESTERMAN's efforts on this.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this amendment ensures that we prioritize the long-term health of our forest and we equip the Forest Service with the tools they need to execute a plan.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the sustained health of our Nation's forests, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of part III of subtitle C of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 83. APPLICATION OF ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION RULE.

The roadless area conservation rule established under part 294 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), shall not apply to any National Forest System land in the State of Alaska.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. The Clinton era Roadless Rule applies a one-size-fits-all approach to areas where those policies rarely work, especially the federally locked lands in Alaska.

At 16.8 million acres, the Tongass National Forest is the largest of the National Forest System. Coupled with the Chugach National Forest, Alaska contains 12 percent of the total acres of national forest lands in the total United States.

The Roadless Rule is nothing more than another effort to end the multiple-use mandate of Federal forest

lands, something that is required by law but often ignored by nameless, faceless, unelected bureaucrats.

Although the Tongass is over 100 years old, only 400,000 acres have been harvested. Of the remaining acreage, much of the forest is not topographically suitable for timber harvest, and 6.6 million acres are congressionally designated as wilderness areas, national monuments, and roadless areas.

Not only does the Roadless Rule violate the authorities granted under the Alaska National Lands Act, it was adopted without proper consultation or consideration of the countless communities that rely on responsible resource development.

Nearly 96 percent of the Tongass National Forest and 99 percent of the Chugach National Forest are protected by ANILCA and forest management plans.

Exempting Alaska from the Roadless Rule would help make certain that what is left of the timber industry in the southeast can survive.

Many individuals adamantly oppose logging old growth in roadless areas. However, old growth will continue to be predominant in the Tongass, and given the remote nature of Alaska, the vast majority of the forest is in a roadless state.

Over 90 percent of the Tongass is inaccessible by road. The lack of access to timber not only costs good-paying jobs, but results in trees dying of disease and infestations. Dead trees serve no purpose other than to become kindling, creating fires. So by having a robust timber industry, we can help prevent the spread of serious wildfires like have been seen in the lower 48.

To be clear, we are not talking about clearcutting the entire national forest. We just want to help it stay healthy and fulfill its multi-use mandate of the Tongass.

By significantly limiting the areas that are eligible for harvesting, the implementation of the Roadless Rule actually makes conservation more difficult since locations with less conservation value often can't be selected.

If any reasonable form of timber industry is to exist in the near future, it is imperative we restore Alaska's exemption from the Roadless Rule as quickly as possible. It has placed an undue burden on my State and the people of my State.

Mr. Chairman, we worry about immigration. We worry about homelessness. We worry about employment. We worry about education. I am saying this Roadless Rule takes away the opportunity for people to supply for their family so they can have a sustainable silviculture industry taking care of our forests in southeast Alaska. The Roadless Rule should have never applied to Alaska to begin with.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment exempts all national forests in Alaska from the Forest Service's Roadless Rule, one of the country's most important conservation safeguards.

Inventoried roadless areas account for only 2 percent of our Nation's land mass, but they provide invaluable benefits: clean drinking water for over 60 million Americans, wildlife habitats for numerous threatened and endangered species, and they act as critical carbon sinks that mitigate the impacts of climate change. All of these benefits are threatened by this amendment.

Nationwide, the Roadless Rule is incredibly popular. Our constituents understand the importance of keeping intact roadless areas and managing our last truly wild places in a manner that protects old-growth forest and other precious resources from the pressures of development and extraction.

It is not just people in the lower 48. Alaskans understand the importance of protecting the roadless landscape. That is why hundreds of businesses in southeast Alaska have joined together to oppose overturning the recently adopted Tongass Forest Plan and efforts like this amendment to overturn protection for roadless areas.

These businesses rely on clean water and healthy forests to support thriving salmon populations and a robust tourist economy. By rolling back safeguards that protect old-growth forests from harmful development, this amendment threatens fundamental linchpins of the regional economy.

The Roadless Rule is not a job killer, as some make it out to be, because the Tongass Forest Plan balances protections of the old-growth forest by allowing public roads, hydropower projects, utility connectors, and access to inholdings, including mines. So its application in Alaska does not adversely affect community access or economic development projects in the legitimate public interest.

An exception for Alaska is a major policy change that hasn't had a hearing or any other form of consideration in the House. This controversial provision shouldn't be stuck in this farm bill without any accountability to the American public.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, just simply, I support the gentleman's amendment. It is common sense. It allows Alaskans to do a better job of taking care of Alaska, and I trust them to make that happen.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment and urge adoption.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the comments from the other side of the aisle were talking about Alaskans opposing this amendment.

With all due respect, I am an elected representative, and if they don't like what I do, they don't vote for me. I just believe in jobs.

When I first got elected to this job, when I first started this Tongass battle, we had 15,000 jobs in Alaska in the timber industry in the Tongass. And through the National Land Act itself, we were told that no other jobs would be lost in the timber industry, and they slowly crept around and eliminated what remaining jobs occurred. And the sad part about it, from my point of view, they have killed the timber industry. That was not the intent. We were supposed to have a timber industry.

Then along comes the Clinton era Roadless Rule that means you can't build a road anywhere that has no road. How do you have a hydropower site? We had to fight for 4 years to get a hydropower site.

This action here by an administration—this and past administrations—have to understand, this is about employment. This is about managing—managing—timber. And those who don't want to manage anything, you destroy it.

Mr. Chairman, I am urging this body, this Congress, to do what is right for the State of Alaska and right for the timber, and the right for the people that live there and that depend upon a source of income other than living off, very frankly, somebody giving them something. They want to work for it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, Alaska recently lost in Federal court on this very issue. The Supreme Court refused to hear the State's appeal of a ruling that struck down the Tongass exemption. This ended the case.

This amendment attempts to run around that ruling and would exempt Alaska from protections that are widely supported and intended to protect our pristine public lands.

With regard to the Roadless Rule, if the very important and significant issues we confront, whether it is immigration, whether it is employment, whether it is education, the issues of poverty and hunger in this country, I would suggest that the cause for not finding solutions rests in this Chamber, it doesn't rest with the Roadless Rule.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. ____ CONVEYANCE OF LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS TO THE VILLAGE OF SANTA CLARA, NEW MEXICO.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Subject to the provisions of this section, if the Village of Santa Clara, New Mexico, submits to the Secretary a written request for conveyance, the Secretary shall convey to the Village of Santa Clara all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 1,520 acres of National Forest System land, as generally depicted on the map.

(b) MAP.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be kept on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate office of the Forest Service.

(2) CORRECTION OF ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct minor errors in the map.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance of land under subsection (a), the Village of Santa Clara shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the market value of the land, as determined by the appraisal under subsection (g).

(2) INSTALLMENTS.—The amount described in paragraph (1) may be paid in periodic installments to the Secretary.

(3) PARCEL CONVEYANCES.—Upon receipt of an installment pursuant to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall convey to the Village of Santa Clara all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of the land described subsection (a) that is equal in value to such installment and identified by the Village of Santa Clara at the time such installment is paid.

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) subject to valid existing rights;

(2) made by quitclaim deed;

(3) subject to the reservation by the Secretary of an access easement over and across Fort Bayard Road; and

(4) subject to any other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—As a condition for the conveyance under subsection (a) and in addition to the consideration paid under subsection (c), the Village of Santa Clara shall pay for all costs associated with the conveyance, including for—

(1) the land survey under subsection (f);

(2) any environmental analysis and resource surveys determined necessary by Federal law; and

(3) the appraisal under subsection (g).

(f) SURVEY.—The actual acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary; notwithstanding section 7 of title 43, United States Code, the Secretary is authorized to perform and approve any required cadastral surveys.

(g) APPRAISAL.—The Secretary shall complete an appraisal of the land to be conveyed under subsection (a) in accordance with—

(1) the “Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions”; and

(2) the “Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice”.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Village of Santa Clara Conveyance Act 2018” and dated February 21, 2018.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, this amendment deals with a small community that is kind of circled around by the Gila National Forest.

This amendment basically is going to allow the Forest Service to sell parcels of Forest Service land to the village of Santa Clara. It is a small village. About 2,000 people live in it. They, like many of our mountain communities, like many of our communities in the Forest Service, are slowly starving to death.

The land that the Forest Service would sell to them is adjacent to the village. It is not a part of the larger national forest. It is just an isolated parcel. The Forest Service does not want to manage this land.

It is in the state that it is in because it was set apart back in 1869 as a part of the Fort Bayard Military Reservation. Because the land is reserved as a military post, it cannot be disposed of in the normal fashion by the Forest Service. They must be released by law.

Back in 1968, there was a bill that released other parcels of Fort Bayard to be sold and to be distributed to the State. This parcel just was not included in that for some reason, so the amendment steps around and includes that now to where the Forest Service would be allowed to dispose of the land.

It would have to be appraised. It would be sold through normal processes. It is just that it requires a law to do it. It cannot go any other way.

The village is desperately in need of expansion room. Like I said, this Forest Service land butts up against the village and stops their growth, stops their economic potential, and it is a very key piece of property for the village, but it is not a key piece of property for the Forest Service.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this non-controversial amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8506. STREAMLINING THE FOREST SERVICE PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATION APPLICATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY.—The term “communications facility” includes—

(A) any infrastructure, including any transmitting device, tower, or support structure, and any equipment, switches, wiring, cabling, power sources, shelters, or cabinets, associated with the licensed or permitted unlicensed wireless or wireline transmission of writings, signs, signals, data, images, pictures, and sounds of all kinds; and

(B) any antenna or apparatus that—

(i) is designed for the purpose of emitting radio frequency;

(ii) is designed to be operated, or is operating, from a fixed location pursuant to authorization by the Federal Communications Commission or is using duly authorized devices that do not require individual licenses; and

(iii) is added to a tower, building, or other structure.

(2) COMMUNICATIONS SITE.—The term “communications site” means an area of covered land designated for communications uses.

(3) COMMUNICATIONS USE.—The term “communications use” means the placement and operation of communications facility.

(4) COMMUNICATIONS USE AUTHORIZATION.—The term “communications use authorization” means an easement, right-of-way, lease, license, or other authorization to locate or modify a communications facility on covered land by the Forest Service for the primary purpose of authorizing the occupancy and use of the covered land for communications use.

(5) COVERED LAND.—The term “covered land” means National Forest System land.

(6) FOREST SERVICE.—The term “Forest Service” means the United States Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

(7) ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT.—The term “organizational unit” means, within the Forest Service—

(A) a regional office;

(B) the headquarters;

(C) a management unit; or

(D) a ranger district office.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 6409 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1455) or section 606 of the Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-141), not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations—

(1) to streamline the process for considering applications to locate or modify communications facilities on covered land;

(2) to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the process is uniform and standardized across the organizational units of the Forest Service; and

(3) to require that the applications described in paragraph (1) be considered and granted on a competitively neutral, technology neutral, and non-discriminatory basis.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations issued under subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) Procedures for the tracking of applications described in subsection (b)(1), including—

(A) identifying the number of applications—

- (i) received;
- (ii) approved; and
- (iii) denied;

(B) in the case of an application that is denied, describing the reasons for the denial; and

(C) describing the amount of time between the receipt of an application and the issuance of a final decision on an application.

(2) Provision for minimum lease terms of not less than 15 years for leases with respect to the location of communications facilities on covered land.

(3) A policy under which a communications use authorization renews automatically on expiration, unless the communications use authorization is revoked for good cause.

(4) A structure of fees for—

(A) submitting an application described in subsection (b)(1), based on the cost to the Forest Service of considering such an application; and

(B) issuing communications use authorizations, based on the cost to the Forest Service of any maintenance or other activities required to be performed by the Forest Service as a result of the location or modification of the communications facility.

(5) Provision that if the Forest Service does not grant or deny an application under subparagraph (A) by the deadline established in section 6409 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act as amended by the Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018 (47 U.S.C. 1455(b)(3)(A)), the Forest Service shall be deemed to have granted the application.

(6) Provision for prioritization or streamlining the consideration of applications to locate or modify communications facilities on covered land in a previously disturbed right-of-way.

(d) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—In issuing regulations under subsection (b), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) how discrete reviews in considering an application described in subsection (b)(1) can be conducted simultaneously, rather than sequentially, by any organizational units of the Forest Service that must approve the location or modification; and

(2) how to eliminate overlapping requirements among the organizational units of the Forest Service with respect to the location or modification of a communications facility on covered land administered by those organizational units.

(e) COMMUNICATION OF STREAMLINED PROCESS TO ORGANIZATIONAL UNITS.—The Secretary shall, with respect to the regulations issued under subsection (b)—

(1) communicate the regulations to the organizational units of the Forest Service; and

(2) ensure that the organizational units of the Forest Service follow the regulations.

(f) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

(1) SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish a special account in the Treasury for the Forest Service for the deposit of fees collected by the Forest Service under subsection (c)(4) for communications use authorizations on covered land granted, issued, or executed by the Forest Service.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR FEES COLLECTED.—Fees collected by the Forest Service under subsection (c)(4) shall be—

(A) based on the costs described in subsection (c)(4); and

(B) competitively neutral, technology neutral, and nondiscriminatory with respect to other users of the communications site.

(3) DEPOSIT OF FEES.—Fees collected by the Forest Service under subsection (c)(4) shall be deposited in the special account established for the Forest Service under paragraph (1).

(4) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Amounts deposited in the special account for the Forest Service shall be available, to the extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts, to the Secretary to cover costs incurred by the Forest Service described in subsection (c)(4), including the following:

(A) Preparing needs assessments or other programmatic analyses necessary to designate communications sites and issue communications use authorizations.

(B) Developing management plans for communications sites.

(C) Training for management of communications sites.

(D) Obtaining or improving access to communications sites.

(5) NO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), no other amounts are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

(g) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—

(1) REAL PROPERTY AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall be construed as providing any executive agency with any new leasing or other real property authorities not existing prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, and no actions taken pursuant to this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall impact a decision or determination by any executive agency to sell, dispose of, declare excess or surplus, lease, reuse, or redevelop any Federal real property pursuant to title 40, United States Code, the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-387), or any other law governing real property activities of the Federal Government. No agreement entered into pursuant to this section, or the amendments made by this section, may obligate the Federal Government to hold, control, or otherwise retain or use real property that may otherwise be deemed as excess, surplus, or that could otherwise be sold, leased or redeveloped.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, the largest broadband deployment gap exists in rural communities, where more than 12 million Americans lack coverage.

Wireless communications companies require access to land or infrastructure to site the antennas necessary to provide service. Often, to reach more rural areas throughout our country, they require access to Federal land to ensure more complete coverage, including for providing emergency services. This need is expected to increase as providers deploy facilities to support 5G wireless services, which will require more antennas spaced closer together.

Unfortunately, the process for securing access to Federal land and property

has been problematic, with red-tape bureaucracy being the main issue. Providers have experienced lost or missing applications, paperwork left to languish for years, varying or undisclosed rules within agencies, redundant historical or environmental reviews, and inconsistent denials of the process.

In some cases, providers do not even receive a response from Federal agencies, resulting in stalled build-out and discouragement in rural areas. This is completely unacceptable.

My amendment today seeks to streamline and expedite the regulatory framework necessary to utilize Federal lands for broadband infrastructure deployments.

Specifically, the language would require the Secretary of Agriculture, within 1 year of enactment, to issue regulations that would streamline the siting process for Forest Service land and ensure that the process is uniform across all of the organizational units of the Forest Service, while eliminating overlapping requirements.

Applications would be trackable and deemed granted if not acted upon within 270 days, which is 9 months.

Lastly, any fees collected for allowing siting on Forest Service land can be used for processing the applications and the development, management, and improvement of sites for communications facilities.

I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that simply aims to improve access to rural broadband coverage for rural Americans, who deserve it, across this Nation.

Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), my colleague and good friend.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my good friend and colleague Congressman LAMALFA's amendment.

The amendment aims to streamline a bureaucratic process that is hampering broadband infrastructure development in rural America.

As chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus and Representative for Arizona's Fourth Congressional District, I can tell you that this problem is all too real in the communities that I represent.

Many families and businesses in the West still lack basic broadband. According to a November 2017 Brookings Institution study, more than 50 percent of my district live in neighborhoods without an available broadband connection. Many of you all will find this hard to believe, but a huge chunk of my district has no social media platform whatsoever.

Closing the broadband availability gap should be a priority for all Members of Congress. Doing so will create jobs, improve education, and grow our economy.

I applaud Representative LAMALFA for his leadership and tireless efforts to close the broadband availability gap, and I urge adoption of this excellent amendment.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Arizona. I appreciate the support and his excellent words toward that.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, again, the concerns about this might be on environmental issues. This amendment does not allow anyone to circumvent environmental protections already in place. It simply requires an agency to fix the current regulatory maze, filled with excessive red tape, to deploy broadband infrastructure. That is it.

To be clear, if you wanted to deploy broadband networks across the country that support 5G, we should really be doing something about it now.

Americans rely on broadband for their jobs, telemedicine, distance learning, emergency services, and many more good reasons. Again, with almost half of rural Americans not having access to good broadband internet today, they will continue to lag behind and suffer if we do not address these regulatory barriers.

Mr. Chairman, 270 days, 9 months, really, that should be a long enough gestation period to process applications by these Federal agencies.

Mr. Chair, I ask for the “aye” vote, and I appreciate support on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 85 . . . REPORT ON WILDFIRE, INSECT INFESTATION, AND DISEASE PREVENTION ON FEDERAL LAND.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every year thereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Interior shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a jointly written report on—

(1) the number of acres of Federal land treated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior for wildfire, insect infestation, or disease prevention;

(2) the number of acres of Federal land categorized as a high or extreme fire risk;

(3) the total timber production from Federal land;

(4) the number of acres and average fire intensity of wildfires affecting Federal land treated for wildfire, insect infestation, or disease prevention;

(5) the number of acres and average fire intensity of wildfires affecting Federal land not treated for wildfire, insect infestation, or disease prevention; and

(6) the Federal response time for each fire on greater than 25,000 acres.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is simple. It calls for the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to report back on the progress they are making to address the problem of catastrophic wildfires, a problem that has continued to get worse year after year under the current program.

Our current forest management process took decades of mismanagement, inaction, and neglect to create. We have essentially slowly and methodically loved our trees to death on much of our Federal lands. It will take decades to reverse the effects this mismanagement has had on our forests, during which time we will likely see more major, devastating wildfires.

This amendment simply requires our Federal agencies addressing this issue to report back on how they are doing, not only so Congress can provide oversight on their progress but so the American people can know how their Federal Government is doing so that we can measure, monitor, and demand accountability.

Mr. Chairman, I think I speak for this entire Chamber when I say that our goal is to reduce the effects of wildfires and be transparent for the American people each step of the way. My amendment promotes transparency and accountability as we work towards this goal.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8506. COLLABORATIVE FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION PROGRAM.

Section 4003 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by inserting “, except the Secretary may waive, on a case-by-case basis, the 10-year period requirement under paragraph (1)(B) of such subsection” after “subsection (b)”;

and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “proposal” and all that follows through “in excess” and inserting “proposal in excess”; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking “2019” and inserting “2023”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would reauthorize the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program, CFLRP, for another 5-year period. This program was initiated in 2009, and, basically, it aims to restore vital sections of our national forestlands.

There are two projects in New Mexico, the Zuni Mountains and the Southwest Jemez, with over 420,000 acres total, that would be covered under this collaborative project.

The Zuni Mountains project supports one of the last mills in New Mexico. We used to have 123 mills that processed timber. Now we are down to just one or two. That destruction in the capacity and the infrastructure for our national forest has been devastating to our ability to really accomplish projects of selective thinning and balanced management of our forests.

The extension of the program is going to provide enough certainty so that this last mill operator can make investments that will reduce the cost of conducting forest management activities in western New Mexico.

If we lose the mill, if it does, in fact, close—which should not be an option—it is going to increase the cost of the projects due to transportation costs. So it makes sense for the government, it makes sense for the U.S. Forest Service, the taxpayer, and the local economy to keep this mill open and to find others that would reopen with these collaborative projects that come under this program.

This program is a good starting point, and, when paired with other reforms that open up more acreage for treatment, it is going to increase the profitability of restoration projects. That will, in turn, save taxpayers money.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this non-controversial amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 538, after line 23, add the following new section:

SEC. 8506. WEST FORK FIRE STATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNTY.—The term “County” means Dolores County, Colorado.

(2) WEST FORK FIRE STATION CONVEYANCE PARCEL.—The term “West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel” means the parcel of approximately 3.61 acres of National Forest System land in the County, as depicted on the map entitled “Map for West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel” and dated November 21, 2017.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF WEST FORK FIRE STATION CONVEYANCE PARCEL, DOLORES COUNTY, COLORADO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of a request from the County and subject to such terms and conditions as are mutually satisfactory to the Secretary and the County, including such additional terms as the Secretary determines to be necessary, the Secretary shall convey to the County without consideration all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel.

(2) COSTS.—Any costs relating to the conveyance under paragraph (1), including processing and transaction costs, shall be paid by the County.

(3) USE OF LAND.—The land conveyed to the County under paragraph (1) shall be used by the County only for a fire station, related infrastructure, and roads to facilitate access to and through the West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel.

(4) REVERSION.—If any portion of the land conveyed under paragraph (1) is used in a manner that is inconsistent with the use described in paragraph (3), the land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, West Fork is in a remote part of Dolores County, Colorado, surrounded by the San Juan National Forest. Emergency and fire response is a challenge in this part of the county because the closest fire station is currently 26 miles away.

The amendment I have offered would authorize the Forest Service to convey approximately 3.6 acres of National Forest System land to Dolores County for the strict purpose of building and operating a fire station in the West Fork area.

In addition to creating emergency and fire response challenges, the lack of a dedicated fire station has created insurance challenges for homeowners in West Fork. In an area surrounded by the national forestland, it is critical to have fire insurance for your home and other structures on your property. With no fire station in reasonable proximity to the area, it is nearly impossible for homeowners to obtain fire insurance in West Fork.

The text of this amendment is identical to the West Fork Fire Station Act, which passed the House by a voice vote last month. I encourage my colleagues to once again support this measure as an amendment to H.R. 2.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 601, after line 26, add the following new section:

SEC. 11105. REGIONAL CATTLE AND CARCASS GRADING CORRELATION AND TRAINING CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish not more than three regional centers, to be known as “Cattle and Carcass Grading Correlation and Training Centers” (referred to in this section as the “Centers”), to provide education and training for cattle and carcass beef graders of the Agricultural Marketing Service, cattle producers, and other professionals involved in the reporting, delivery, and grading of feeder cattle, live cattle, and carcasses—

(1) to limit the subjectivity in the application of beef grading standards;

(2) to provide producers with greater confidence in the price of the producers’ cattle; and

(3) to provide investors with both long and short positions more assurance in the cattle delivery system.

(b) LOCATION.—The Centers shall be located near cattle feeding and slaughter populations and areas shall be strategically identified in order to capture regional variances in cattle production.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Each Center shall be organized and administered by offices of the Department of Agriculture in operation on the date on which the respective Center is established, or in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies or academic institutions.

(d) TRAINING PROGRAM.—The Centers shall offer intensive instructional programs involving classroom and field training work for individuals described in subsection (a).

(e) COORDINATION OF RESOURCES.—Each Center, in carrying out the functions of the Center, shall make use of information generated by the Department of Agriculture, the State agricultural extension and research stations, relevant designated contract markets, and the practical experience of area cattle producers, especially cattle producers cooperating in on-farm demonstrations, correlations, and research projects.

(f) PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.—Funds made available to carry out this section shall not be used for the construction of a new building or facility or the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of an existing building or facility (including site grading and improvement, and architect fees). Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Secretary may use funds made available to carry out this section to provide a Center with payment for the cost of the rental of a space determined to be necessary by the Center for conducting training under this section and may accept donations (including in-kind contributions) to cover such cost.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 2018.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to commend the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. CONAWAY, for his work not only in formulating this bill but in promoting and protecting the interests of rural America. I think it is a great tribute to him dealing with a number of complex issues, and I appreciate very much a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, when we go to the grocery store, we make decisions about what type of beef and what grade of beef we are going to purchase. The challenge is that the grades are different from place to place because there is not a uniform grading system across the country.

My amendment requires USDA to set up three training centers to train graders so that there can be more standardization. If you are going to buy a prime or a choice steak in one place, it should be roughly the same as a prime or choice steak in another place.

This will benefit consumers. It will benefit the beef industry, and I hope our colleagues will support it.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION
ACT OF 2018**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 900 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1515

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEBER of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.