Riders Summary -- House Interior Appropriations Bill (6/10/15)

RIDER	LOCATION	TEXT	SUMMARY	ORG CONTACT
WILD LANDS	SEC. 112 (p.57)	SEC. 112. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Secretarial Order No. 3310 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.	Leaving Millions of Acres of Wilderness Quality Lands Open to Drilling, Mining, and Off-Road Vehicles – This provision inappropriately and unnecessarily restricts the Secretary of the Interior's ability to implement Secretarial Order #3310, thereby hindering the Bureau of Land Management's ability to protect wilderness quality but unprotected lands from damaging activities. The Secretarial Order simply directs and instructs the BLM to comply with its existing statutory obligations to protect lands managed by the BLM that harbor wilderness and other "natural" values. The Secretarial Order corrects an aberrant policy adopted by former Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton that severely restricted the BLM's ability to properly identify and manage lands containing wilderness characteristics, a policy that overturned two decades of bipartisan agreement regarding the BLM's statutory obligation to assure that environmentally sensitive areas are unimpaired for future generations. Although Congressional critics of this Secretarial Order maintain that it usurped Congressional authority, in fact it in no way impaired the central role that Congress plays in designating Wilderness Areas under the Wilderness Act. Wilderness designation remains exclusively the prerogative of Congress. S.O. #3310 acknowledges this Congressional responsibility, but clarifies the BLM's to conduct periodic assessments of our public lands to determine suitability for protection as wilderness, and to manage such areas to protect such characteristics.	Wilderness Society- Cameron Witten-cameron_witten@tws.org
SAGE-GROUSE	SEC. 117 (p.58)	None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to write or issue pursuant to section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533)— (1) a proposed rule for greater sage-grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus); (2) a proposed rule for the Columbia basin distinct population segment of greater sagegrouse.	This provision would prevent the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) from even considering greater sage-grouse and the Columbia Basin sage-grouse for possible listing under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for at least another year. Both populations have waited more than a decade for a listing decision. Additional delays would make conservation and recovery of these grouse more difficult, more expensive and more disruptive in the future. Additionally, the listing decision delay could undermine planning efforts presently underway to balance land uses with sage-grouse conservation on tens of millions of acres in the West. These planning processes could unravel if sage-grouse listing decisions are delayed.	Defenders of Wildlife - Mary Beth mbeetham@defenders.org
IVORY	SEC. 120 (p.59)	None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to draft, prepare, implement, or enforce any new or revised regulation or order that— (1) prohibits or restricts, within the United States, the possession, sale, delivery, receipt, shipment, or transportation of ivory that has been lawfully imported into the United States; (2) changes any means of determining, including any applicable presumptions concerning, when ivory has been lawfully imported; or (3) prohibits or restricts the importation of ivory that was lawfully importable into the United States as of February 1, 2014.	This provision would undermine efforts to stop the slaughter of elephants being fueled by the illegal ivory trade. The Obama administration and FWS are in the process of developing much tighter restrictions on the importation and sale of ivory in an attempt to shut down the U.S. as a major market for illegal poached ivory. This rider would shut down any effort to tighten those controls and would allow the flow of illegal ivory into this country continue unabated. It would block the US Fish and Wildlife Service from issuing any new or revised regulation or order that prohibits or restricts within the United States, the possession, sale, delivery, receipt, shipment, or transportation of ivory that has been lawfully imported into the United States; changes any means of determining when ivory has been lawfully imported; or prohibits or restricts the importation of ivory that was lawfully importable into the United States as of February 1, 2014. From 2010 through 2012, more than 100,000 elephants were slaughtered for their ivory tusks. Fueled by demand for ivory, poaching has slashed the number of African elephants from 1.3 million in 1979 to fewer than 500,000 today. While the largest ivory markets responsible for driving the elephant poaching crisis are in China, Thailand and other Asian countries, the United States also has a significant ivory market, and several tons of illegal ivory worth several million dollars have recently been seized from American retail outlets. Actions to tighten U.S. ivory laws to prevent such laundering of illegal ivory will also be critical to securing similar actions by China and other countries. The prohibitions under Section 115 would tie the hands of USFWS in attempting to address this problem, undercutting effor¬¬ts to ensure that our country is not contributing to the current elephant poaching crisis and potentially undermining the broader U.S. government efforts called for in the National Strategy for Combatting Wildlife Trafficking. Because the revised USFWS regulations are still under development, this provision would also unnecessarily preempt the public input process that normally informs regulatory decisions, denying citizens their right to help shape policy.	Defenders of Wildlife - Mary Beth Beetham-mbeetham@defenders.org

Riders Summary -- House Interior Appropriations Bill (6/10/15)

RIDER	LOCATION	TEXT	SUMMARY	ORG CONTACT
GRAY WOLF	SEC. 121 (p.60)	Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue the final rule published on December 28, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 81666 et seq.) and the final rule published on September 10, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 55530 et seq.), without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rules. Such reissuances (including this section) shall not be subject to judicial review.	This provision would legislatively order the Secretary of the Interior to reissue rules delisting gray wolves in Wyoming and the Great Lakes states and shield those rules from any additional judicial review. The rules were declared unlawful under the Endangered Species Act and invalidated by two separate federal judges. This provision would short-stop wolf recovery in the lower-48 states and invite further Congressional micro-management of the ESA.	Defenders of Wildlife - Mary Beth Beetham- mbeetham@defenders.org Earthjustice - Marjorie Mulhall mmulhall@earthjustice.org
NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT	SEC. 122 (p.60)	Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall amend the interim rule pertaining to the northern long-eared bat published by the Department of the Interior in the Federal Register on April 2, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 17974 et seq.), only in such a way that— (1) take incidental to any activity conducted in accordance with the habitat conservation measures identified at pages 18024 to 18205 of volume 80 of the Federal Register (April 2, 2015), as applicable, is not prohibited; and (2) the public comment period for such interim rule is reopened for not less than 90 days.	This ambiguously-drafted provision appears to expand and statutorily codify an already problematic U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service special rule for the northern long-eared bat. The agency's so-called 4(d) rule eliminates vital legal protections that might otherwise help the species survive and establishes "conservation measures" that are too limited geographically and temporally.	Defenders of Wildlife - Mary Beth mbeetham@defenders.org
BIOMASS	p.72	The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall base agency policies and actions regarding air emissions from forest biomass including, but not limited to, air emissions from facilities that combust forest biomass for energy, on the principle that forest biomass emissions do not increase overall carbon dioxide accumulations in the atmosphere when USDA Forest Inventory and Analysis data show that forest carbon stocks in the U.S. are stable or increasing on a national scale, or when forest biomass is derived from mill residuals, harvest residuals or forest management activities. Such policies and actions shall not pre-empt existing authorities of States to determine how to utilize biomass as a renewable energy source and shall not inhibit States' authority to apply the same policies to forest biomass as other renewable fuels in implementing Federal law.	In spite of the fact that emissions from wood biomass are often worse for the climate than coal, this rider would require the EPA to treat wood biomass as producing zero carbon emissions, thereby encouraging one of the least sensible portions of our energy mix and a documented threat to our forests.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org Lukas Ross- Friends of the Earth- lross@foe.org
NATIONAL OCEA	SEC 425 (p. 124)	None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.	This rider impedes the full implementation of the National Ocean Policy, a commonsense policy with bipartisan roots and support. This rider would limit coordination between agencies, states, and stakeholders, adversely affect the marine environment and resources that sustain ocean industries, and undermine valuable ocean planning work being voluntarily undertaken in states and regions around the country.	Ocean Conservancy, achristianson@oceanconservancy.org
CERCLA	p.98	Provided further, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for ATSDR to issue in excess of toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 2016, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.	Toxic Substances and Environmental Public Health: Delay and Weaken Critical Health Assessments in Communities with Superfund Sites – This provision would limit the health studies that the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) is required to do by removing both the deadlines and the guidelines for studying the impacts of chemical exposure on communities that petition for help. This provision would remove the right of citizens to petition the government from timely assistance after toxic chemical exposure. ATSDR health assessments provide invaluable information concerning the threats posed by the contaminated sites to nearby communities. This provision would weaken the requirement for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) to perform health assessments under Section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA by removing the one-year deadline for completing assessments for Superfund sites on the National Priorities List (NPL), the list of the most contaminated sites in the nation. The provision also allows ATSDR to skirt its responsibility to complete a full "health assessment" by permitting the agency to substitute a less rigorous (undefined) health study. Removing this one-year deadline for these critical health assessments and diminishing the comprehensiveness of the assessments constitutes a threat to human health.	NRDC - Scott Slesinger sslesinger@nrdc.org

Riders Summary -- House Interior Appropriations Bill (6/10/15)

RIDER	LOCATION	TEXT	SUMMARY	ORG CONTACT
REPORT ON USE OF CLIMATE CHANGE FUNDS	SEC. 416 (p.120)	Not later than 120 days after the date on which the President's fiscal year 2017 budget request is submitted to the Congress, the President shall submit a comprehensive report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate describing in detail all Federal agency funding, domestic and 16 international, for climate change programs, projects, and activities in fiscal years 2015 and 2016, including an accounting of funding by agency with each agency identifying climate change programs, projects, and activities and associated costs by line item as presented in the President's Budget Appendix, and including citations and linkages where practicable to each strategic plan that is driving funding within each climate change program, project, and activity listed in the report.	This provision would require the President to submit a report to the House and Senate appropriations committees on "all Federal agency funding, domestic and international, for... programs, projects and activities in fiscal year 2015 and 2016" on climate change, creating an unnecessary burden on federal agencies and creating an opportunity for further political targeting much-needed climate programs of climate programs.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org
PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS	SEC. 417 (p.121)	Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to promulgate or implement any regulation requiring the issuance of permits under title V of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7661 et seq.) for carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, water vapor, or methane emissions resulting from biological processes associated with livestock production.	Despite clear evidence that factory farms contribute significantly to anthropogenic emissions of methane, nitrous oxide, hydrogen sulfide, and ammonia, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has not required animal feeding operations to meet any testing, performance, or emission standards under the Clean Air Act. This provision would prevent the use of the Clean Air Act permitting tools to control greenhouse gases from the largest sources of livestock waste.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org
GREENHOUSE GAS REPORTING RESTRICTIONS	SEC. 418 (p.121)	Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to implement any provision in a rule, if that provision requires mandatory reporting of green house gas emissions from manure management systems.	This provision would tie EPA's hands on climate change science and impede the agency's ability to gather critical baseline data on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by barring EPA from implementing its rule on mandatory reporting of greenhouse gases from manure management systems (CAFOs). Congress wisely recognized that emissions data on all sectors is needed to craft effective climate change policies when it established the statutory requirement in the FY08 Consolidated Appropriations Act for "mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions above appropriate thresholds in all sectors of the economy of the United States." Congress should not now to insist that the EPA put up blinders with respect to the very largest industrial animal agriculture facilities – those emitting 25,000 metric tons or more of GHG emissions per year. Domestically, manure management and enteric fermentation are responsible for about one-third of all anthropogenic methane emissions, and methane is more than 20 times as potent a GHG as carbon dioxide. In 2008, methane emissions from manure management were 54 percent higher than in 1990. In addition, the direct and indirect emissions of nitrous oxide – 310 times as potent a GHG as carbon dioxide – from manure management increased 19 percent between 1990 and 2008. As other countries around the globe are collecting similar information from animal agriculture, such an amendment would hamper the United States' ability to be a leader on international efforts to assess and combat climate change. It would also undercut the potential to accurately account for and give credit for GHG emissions reduction measures taken by agricultural entities.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org

Riders Summary -- House Interior Appropriations Bill (6/10/15)

RIDER	LOCATION	TEXT	SUMMARY	ORG CONTACT
FUNDING PROHIB	SEC. 421 (p.121)	None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to regulate the lead content of ammunition, ammunition components, or fishing tackle under the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2601 10 et seq.) or any other law.	This provision would prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency and all federal land management agencies from regulating the use of lead in ammunition, ammunition components and fishing tackle under the Toxic Substances Control Act or any other law. In 1991, the federal government banned the use of lead shot for all waterfowl hunting because of the extensive scientific evidence that lead shot was poisoning millions of ducks, geese, and swans each year. Besides waterfowl hunting ammunition, there are currently no other regulations or limitations on the use of lead in ammunition. Today, spent ammunition represents one of the largest sources for lead entering the environment, and continues to poison millions of birds and thousands of mammals each year. A 2012 study in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences concluded that critically endangered California Condors continue to be poisoned by lead from ammunition in "epidemic proportions." Despite the fact that the EPA has not taken any steps to regulate the use of lead in ammunition, this rider would prohibit the EPA from taking steps to control the use of lead in any type of ammunition and fishing tackle, even if there was scientific evidence that simple changes to the chemical composition of these items could mitigate their environmental impacts.	Defenders of Wildlife - Mary Beth mbeetham@defenders.org"
WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES	SEC. 422 (p.122)	None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations and guidance in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control 18 Act (33 U.S.C. 1251, et seq.), including the provisions of the rules dated November 13, 1986, and August 25, 1993, relating to said jurisdiction, and the guidance documents dated January 15, 2003, and December 2, 2008, relating to said jurisdiction.	This provision would block funding to move forward with the Clean Water Protection Rule – a rule clarifying the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act. Several Supreme Court cases created confusion and an unwieldy process for determining which waters were under the jurisdiction of the CWA. This provision would bring to a halt the public, transparent process behind this rulemaking before it is even out of the public comment stage.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org
STREAM BUFFER	SEC. 423 (p.122-3	None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, carry out, or implement (1) any guidance, policy, or directive to reinterpret or change the historic interpretation of 30 C.F.R. 816.57, which was promulgated on June 30, 1983 by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement of the Department of the Interior (48 Fed. Reg. 30312); or (2) proposed regulations or supporting materials described in the Federal Register notice published on June 18, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 8 34667) by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement of the Department of the Interior.	This provision would keep the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement within the Department of the Interior from continuing work to revise regulations, adopted in the waning days of the Bush administration, which opened up streams to destructive and polluting practices associated with surface coal mining. Federal courts have recently invalidated the rulemakings put forward under the previous administration, and this provision could hinder the agency's ability to respond to the court's ruling.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org
HUNTING, FISHING, AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING ON FEDERAL LAND	SEC. 424 (p.124)	None of the funds made available by this or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to prohibit the use of or access to Federal land (as such term is defined in section 3 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6502)) for hunting, fishing, or recreational shooting if such use or access— (1) was not prohibited on such Federal land as of January 1, 2013; and (2) was conducted in compliance with the resource management plan (as defined in section 101 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6511)) applicable to such Federal land as of January 1, 2013.	This provision elevates hunting, fishing and shooting as priority uses on public lands by prohibiting the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management from balancing these activities with other multiple uses of the public domain. While the vast majority of public lands will always be available for sporting pursuits, federal law also requires these agencies to consider other public values, such as endangered species protection, habitat conservation, commercial development and other recreational activities, when planning for federal land use and management.	Defenders of Wildlife - Jenny Keatinge-jkeatinge@defenders.org

Riders Summary -- House Interior Appropriations Bill (6/10/15)

RIDER	LOCATION	TEXT	SUMMARY	ORG CONTACT
PROTECTION OF WATER RIGHTS	Sec. 434 (p.128-9	None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to condition the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement on the transfer of any water right, including sole and joint ownership, directly to the United States, or any impairment of title, in whole or in part, granted or otherwise recognized under State law, by Federal or State adjudication, decree, or other judgment, or pursuant to any interstate water compact. Additionally, none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to require any water user to apply for or acquire a water right in the name of the United States under State law as a condition of the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement.	This rider would override the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, and all federal lands management statutes, among other laws, by prohibiting federal agencies from placing any limit or condition on any applicant, for any agency activity, that might in any way impair the applicant's water right or exercising of a water right.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org
LEAD TEST	SEC. 426 (p.125)	None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce regulations under subpart E of part 745 of title 40, Code of Federal 5 Regulations (commonly referred to as the ''Lead; Renovation, Repair, and Painting Rule''), or any subsequent amendments to such regulations, until the Administrator 8 of the Environmental Protection Agency publicizes Environmental Protection Agency recognition of a commercially available lead test kit that meets both criteria under section 745.88(c) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.	This provision would prohibit funding for the EPA to implement the "lead contractor" rule until the agency approves a commercially available lead paint test kit. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote. EPA issued a rule requiring the use of lead-safe practices and other actions aimed at preventing lead poisoning. Under the rule, beginning contractors performing renovation, repair and painting projects that disturb lead-based paint in homes, child care facilities, and schools built before 1978 must be certified and must follow specific work practices to prevent lead contamination. Thousands of contractors have been trained under the new rules; this amendment will stop enforcement of this rule.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org
FINANCIAL ASSU	SEC. 427 (p.125)	None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, propose, finalize, implement, enforce, or administer any regulation that would establish 16 new financial responsibility requirements pursuant to section 108(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 19 U.S.C. 9608(b)).	This section would repeal for the length of the appropriations, EPA's ability to require any risky industries from carrying insurance to cover environmental damages they cause. Whereas automobile drivers are required to carry insurance to pay compensation when they injured another party, the Superfund laws allow EPA to "maintain evidence of financial responsibility consistent with the degree and duration of risk associated" for businesses with a history of creating Superfund waste sites. (CERCLA, Section 108). This amendment would allow those risky industries to pass off the damages they cause to the public. Superfund is based on the theory that the responsible party pays for their pollution; this amendment changes that to taxpayer pays.	Scott Slesinger - NRDC - sslesinger@nrdc.org

Riders Summary -- House Interior Appropriations Bill (6/10/15)

RIDER	LOCATION	TEXT	SUMMARY	ORG CONTACT
GHG REGULATIONS	SEC. 428 (pp. 125	None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to propose, finalize, implement, or enforce— (1) any standard of performance under section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(b)) for any new fossil fuel-fired electricity utility generating unit if the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency's determination that a technology is adequately demonstrated includes consideration of one or more facilities for which assistance is provided (including any tax credit) under subtitle A of title IV of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 8 15961 et seq.) or section 48A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; (2) any regulation or guidance under section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(b)) establishing any standard of performance for emissions of any greenhouse gas from any modified or reconstructed source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit; or (3) any regulation or guidance under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)) that applies to the emission of any greenhouse gas by an existing source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit.	This provision would effectively block EPA from finalizing the first ever carbon pollution standards for new and existing fossil fuel power plants. Electric power plants are the largest source of the dangerous carbon pollution that is driving climate change and extreme weather. Power plants have limits on arsenic, lead, and mercury, yet there are currently no national limits on how much carbon pollution these plants can dump into the atmosphere. This pollution fuels climate change, which will lead to more asthma attacks and increase the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events like droughts that destroy crops, floods that wipe out communities, and massively damaging storms. The EPA, honoring its obligations under the Clean Air Act, has proposed standards that will avoid up to 150,000 child asthma attacks and 6,600 premature deaths, totaling $93 billion in benefits, and reduce electricity bills by roughly 8 percent. These standards represent the most important step the United States has taken to slow climate change. This provision would block EPA's work to protect this and future generations from carbon pollution.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org
DEFINITION OF FILL MATERIAL	SEC. 429 (p.126-7	None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definitions of the terms ''fill material'' or ''discharge of fill material'' for the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 4 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).	This provision would prohibit EPA from changing regulations defining "fill Material" under the Clean Water Act. A 2002 rulemaking by EPA and the Corps of Engineers altered the definition of "fill material" under the Clean Water Act and these changes cleared the way for industrial mining operations to obtain permits to dump harmful mining waste in streams and rivers. This rider would lock in these industry loopholes, leaving many of our nation's waterways vulnerable to harmful pollution.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org
AVAILABILITY OF VACANT GRAZING ALLOTMENTS	SEC. 433 (p.127-8	The Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, and the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to the National Forest System lands, shall make vacant grazing allotments available to a holder of a grazing permit or lease issued by either Secretary if the lands covered by the permit or lease or other grazing lands used by the holder of the permit or lease are unusable because of drought or wildfire, as determined by the Secretary concerned. The terms and conditions contained in a permit or lease made available pursuant to this section shall be the same as the terms and conditions of the most recent permit or lease that was applicable to the vacant grazing allotment made available. Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) shall not apply with respect to any Federal agency action under this section.	Requires Vacant Grazing Allotments Be Made Available Without Review or Public Input – This section mandates that BLM and Forest Service lands damaged by drought or wildfire are made available for grazing. Although the lands may be severely damaged, the terms of the new permits are the same as prior to the drought or wildfire that made the lands unusable. Moreover, because "NEPA shall not apply" to these decisions, it is unlikely the permits will reflect the current conditions of the lands or their suitability for grazing. By waiving NEPA, the public land use is unjustifiably removed from public scrutiny, input, and accountability.	Defenders of Wildlife - Mary Beth Beetham-mbeetham@defenders.org
LIMITATION ON STATUS CHANGES (HFCs)	SEC. 435 (p.129)	None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to propose, finalize, implement, or enforce any regulation or guidance under Section 612 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7671k) that changes the status from acceptable to unacceptable for purposes of the Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) program of any hydrofluorocarbon used as a refrigerant or in foam blowing agents, applications or uses. Nothing in this section shall prevent EPA from approving new materials, applications or uses as acceptable under the SNAP program.	This rider would block EPA's ability to set standards curtailing use of super-polluting hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) refrigerants and foam blowing agents. EPA has proposed limiting the use of the most polluting HFCs (some of which have global warming potentials thousands of times worse than carbon dioxide) where less harmful substitutes, including substitutes made in the United States, are available. EPA's proposed action comes in the form of a proposal to remove the most polluting chemicals from the list of acceptable chemicals under EPA's Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) Program. By preventing EPA from removing chemicals from the list, the rider would allow unlimited use of these extremely potent greenhouse gases. The rider would also damage the United States' international credibility and frustrate efforts to negotiate a global HFC phase-out under the Montreal Protocol.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org

Riders Summary -- House Interior Appropriations Bill (6/10/15)

RIDER	LOCATION	TEXT	SUMMARY	ORG CONTACT
SOCIAL COST OF	SEC. 437 (p.132)	None of the funds made available by this or any other Act shall be used for the social cost of carbon (SCC) to be incorporated into any rulemaking or guidance document until a new Interagency Working Group (IWG) revises the estimates using the discount rates and the domestic-only limitation on benefits estimates in accordance with Executive Order 12866 and OMB Circular A-4 as of January 1, 2015: Provided, That such IWG shall provide to the public all documents, models, and assumptions used in developing the SCC and solicit public comment prior to finalizing any revised estimates.	This rider would force the federal government to blind itself to the costs of climate change that our emissions impose on the rest of the world. This is a "bad science" rider that would block our government from assessing the full costs of extreme weather and other climate impacts caused by our pollution, and the full benefits of any actions to improve energy efficiency or clean up carbon pollution. The administration is following the Golden Rule in accounting for all the damages caused by U.S. carbon pollution. We want Europe and China to be responsible for the harms their emissions impose on us, so it's only right for us to consider the effects of our carbon pollution on others.	Marc Boom - NRDC - mboom@nrdc.org