

Alaska Wilderness League * American Bird Conservancy * American Rivers * Center for Biological Diversity * Clean Water Action * Defenders of Wildlife * Detroiters Working for Environmental Justice * Earthjustice * Earthworks * Endangered Species Coalition * Environmental Investigation Agency * Environmental Working Group * Environment America * Friends of the Earth * Humane Society Legislative Fund * League of Conservation Voters * National Audubon Society * National Wildlife Refuge Association * Natural Resources Defense Council * Oceana * Ocean Conservancy * Sierra Club * Southern Environmental Law Center * The Humane Society of the United States * The Trust for Public Land * The Wilderness Society

July 13, 2016

OPPOSE THE HOUSE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 5538) & OUR POSITION ON KEY ENVIRONMENTAL AMENDMENTS

Dear Representative:

On behalf of our millions of members and supporters across the country, we urge you to oppose the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill (H.R. 5538). This spending bill has once again become a target for dozens of anti-environmental and superfluous policy provisions, which have no place in the appropriations process. This bill also makes funding cuts to key environmental programs and agencies, which we strongly oppose. Congress should be investing in America's future—not moving us backward by undermining bedrock laws or cutting funding for programs that help our communities thrive.

We urge you to oppose H.R. 5538 and all anti-environment amendments and support those amendments that would protect our air, water, lands, wildlife, and climate.

Please review the list of amendments below. All organizations listed above may not work on or have expertise in every amendment included.

We strongly encourage you to OPPOSE the following amendments:

14. Smith #120: This amendment would zero out funding for EPA's Air, Climate and Energy Research Program. This scientific research program seeks to better understand the harmful impacts of air pollutants and climate change as well as evaluate and improve approaches toward reducing those pollutants. Defunding this research program would hobble our understanding of the hazards and threats that we face, along with how best to improve Americans' health and reduce harmful impacts of climate change.

15. Chaffetz #62: This amendment increases funding to the EPA's Office of Inspector General at the expense of EPA's Environmental Programs and Management fund. While agency oversight is important, Congress should not raid other accounts that are critical to public health and the environment. Rather than forcing false choices, Congress should stop defunding EPA.

16. Gosar #1: The Forest Service Hazardous Fuels account should not be funded at the expense of an already depleted EPA budget. While the wildfire issue is important, Congress should not raid EPA accounts that support the defense of public health and the environment. This attempt to force a false choice and defund EPA should be opposed.

17. Westerman #25: This amendment would cut \$12 million from EPA's Environmental Programs and Management account and direct it to the Forest Service's Forest and Rangeland Research Account. This bill would already impose staggering cuts on the EPA, undermining their ability to keep our air clean, our water drinkable and our communities healthy.

20. Palmer #53: This amendment would defund the very successful Diesel Emission Reduction Act which protects human health by reducing harmful particulate and NOx emissions from diesel vehicles. The program has bipartisan support, has a record of pollution reductions, especially in areas of poor air quality, and should be continued.

42. Black #31: This provision would prevent EPA from applying vehicle efficiency and carbon pollution standards to heavy duty truck rebuilds. The amendment would unnecessarily perpetuate pollution and oil dependence by weakening heavy duty vehicle fuel economy standards.

43. Blackburn #18: This amendment would further slash funding for critical agencies and programs that protect our air, land, water, wildlife and public health. Funding for conservation comprises barely over 1 percent of the federal budget, and that meager percentage has been dropping for years; Congress should be investing in these programs which support communities and local economies across the country.

44. Boustany #4: This amendment would prohibit BOEM from putting into effect its proposed guidelines to determine a lessee's financial ability to carry out its obligations, primarily the decommissioning of OCS facilities, and the potential need for additional security. Prohibiting funds would undermine BOEM's Risk Management Program and its ability to make informed decisions to reduce the potential risk of financial loss faced by U.S. taxpayers.

45. Boustany #5: This amendment would block implementation of the well control rule. Intended to strengthen safety in offshore oil and gas operations, the final rule was published on April 29, 2016 by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement. Although it could be stronger, this rule is crucial to reduce the risk of offshore drilling accidents and oil spills and to provide greater safety protections for workers and to the oceans and the environment more broadly.

46. Brat #157: This amendment would void all contract enforcement authority for Land and Water Conservation Fund state and local park grants after 20 years – retroactive to the beginning of the program. Currently, state and local LWCF grants are awarded for permanent conservation. This amendment would prevent DOI from enforcing the reversionary clause, which currently requires repayment of the grant if the park is developed, and instead allow unimpeded development – commercial or otherwise – of any LWCF-funded park after 20 years. Instead of protecting these lands and expanding permanent access to the outdoors for future generations, this amendment would put a 20 year time limit on the grant and undercut the very heart of the LWCF Act.

47. Buck #51: Colorado's three existing National Heritage Areas, Cache la Poudre, South Park and Sangre de Cristo, protect a variety of cultural, historic, natural, scenic and recreational resources. They work in partnership with the National Park Service and other state and local partners to provide public access to those resources and an enhanced public awareness of their value. It is the purview of Congress, moved by the will of the public, to designate new National Heritage Areas. The Buck amendment would eliminate the authority to establish new NHAs anywhere in the State of Colorado based upon the whim of one member of Congress. Representative Buck's amendment is punitive not pragmatic and should thus be opposed.

48. Burgess #39: This amendment would block EPA from utilizing the Title 42 Special Pay Program – an important program that allows agencies to offer higher pay in certain specialized fields and provide

recruitment and retention bonuses. It is important for agencies to have pay flexibilities and other tools and incentives available so that they are able to compete in the labor market for top-notch talent. Taking this authority away from EPA is yet another attempt to weaken the effectiveness of our environmental laws by preventing EPA from meeting its staffing needs.

50. Byrne #44: This amendment would undermine implementation of the National Ocean Policy – a common sense policy that improves the way we manage our oceans, supports the ocean economy, reduces duplicative efforts and conflicting government actions, and focuses attention on solving the most serious issues jeopardizing ocean health.

51. Cramer #93: This harmful amendment would block a vital new rule for managing non-federal oil and gas development on the National Wildlife Refuge System. The rule updates inadequate 50-year old regulations to facilitate responsible oil and gas operations on refuges, while conserving wildlife and ecosystems, enhancing public enjoyment of refuge resources and reducing the costs of oil-spill clean-up for American taxpayers. The misguided amendment would bar these common-sense measures intended to prevent avoidable damage to some of our nation’s most sensitive wildlife habitat.

52. Crawford #70: This amendment would prevent EPA from enforcing or implementing oil spill prevention requirements on farms, irrespective of the amount of oil they store. This approach is nonsensical, in view of the fact that oil spills are no less dangerous to waterways when they come from agricultural operations. The amendment also ignores a study Congress directed EPA to undertake, which identified a “lack of evidence that farms are inherently safer than other types of facilities,” and it ignores the fact that farms already are treated more leniently than other facilities under this program.

53. Crawford #135: This amendment is vaguely written and, for that reason, should be rejected. It would prohibit agency actions that “assist” the public in weighing in on pending regulatory matters, unless authorized by Congress. That restriction potentially could be understood to apply to efforts to streamline the mechanisms that business groups, state stakeholders, and concerned citizens use to express their views on proposed rules, environmental permits, and more.

54. Davis #160: This amendment effectively stops work by EPA’s Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations and reduces EPA’s core air and water program budgets by \$4.2 million. Members of Congress are commonly critical of EPA for being slow in responding to their requests and being insufficiently engaged with state governments on policy development. This amendment would only worsen those relationships. Because OCIR acts as the liaison to the rest of EPA for Congress, the amendment would also undermine Congressional offices’ ability to get technical assistance on legislative proposals and likely to get information regarding constituent questions or concerns about EPA programs.

55. Duffy #9: This amendment attempts to undercut statutes that the Congress enacted by looking at only the cost of rules implementing those laws, without concern with their benefits. If a rule would have \$10 billion worth of benefits for the American people, this amendment would make it impossible for it to be implemented if it costs some sectors more than \$100 million. It is the perfect example of pennywise, pound foolish.

56. Duffy #10: This amendment would deny EPA to quickly respond to pressing threats to the public health, safety, and the environment. This kind of micromanagement of agency rulemaking is best accomplished through executive orders, where it can be undertaken flexibly and in a way that best serves the public.

57. Goodlatte, Thompson, Glenn #20: This amendment limits EPA’s key authority to protect clean water in the 64,000 square mile Chesapeake Bay watershed which spans 6 states and the District of

Columbia. This authority is critical to ensure full Clean Water Act protections for over 18 million residents and to the success of the historic federal-state collaboration to restore the Chesapeake Bay.

58. Gosar #7: This amendment would block finalization of the draft EPA-USGS Technical Report entitled “Protecting Aquatic Life from Effects of Hydrologic Alteration,” which explains and documents the effects of water flow alteration on physical, chemical and biological integrity and providing examples of how states are already addressing flow alteration under existing authorities and programs. This report is a scientifically sound and much-needed compendium on opportunities to better protect aquatic life for our nation’s rivers and streams and should be finalized.

59. Hartzler #171: This amendment would prevent the installation of any new air pollution monitors to tell Americans whether they are suffering unsafe levels of smog pollution under a more protective ozone health standard. This ‘see no evil’ approach to air pollution monitoring only serves to deny Americans’ access to clean air, while obstructing steps needed to reduce unsafe levels of smog pollution.

60. Hudson #130: This is a snarky amendment that demonstrates the silliness of this process and the extent of the anti-environmental beliefs of its sponsors. Among other responsibilities, EPA responds to chemical, oil, biological, and radiological releases and large-scale national emergencies, including homeland security incidents. This amendment barring EPA employees from air travel would block this response capability.

61. Huizenga #52: This amendment would limit a prevailing citizen’s request for reimbursement under the Endangered Species Act to the restrictions of the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA). While EAJA affords a vital means of court access for citizens, EAJA’s hourly fee cap is outdated and inadequate. In subjecting ESA citizen enforcement cases to EAJA’s below-market cap on attorneys’ fees, this amendment would make it more difficult for citizens from across the political spectrum to challenge illegal government actions.

65. LaMalfa #140: This amendment prevents federal funds from being used to remove four dams on the Klamath River.

66. Lamborn #26: This amendment seeks to stop the implementation of BLM’s common-sense hydraulic fracturing rule. BLM’s rule takes modest steps to improve well integrity, reduce the impact of toxic wastewater, and increase transparency around chemicals used in the fracking process.

67. Lamborn #27: This amendment would devastate conservation and recovery efforts for listed species any time the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service fails to meet its obligation to complete a 5-year review of the species’ status as required by the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The agencies are often prevented from completing these reviews on time due to lack of funding, or due to competing priorities. This amendment would inevitably leave many species in a state of limbo, because they would retain their ESA status, but all federal funding for recovery efforts, law enforcement efforts, and consultations would be blocked.

68. Lamborn #28: This amendment would block federal funding for the threatened Preble’s Meadow Jumping Mouse under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), thwarting recovery efforts for this western species, which continues to experience habitat loss and face other threats throughout its range. It would eliminate crucial recovery programs for the mouse that require federal funding, such as development and approval of Habitat Conservation Plans, and leave stakeholders uncertain about whether projects can go forward without violating the ESA.

69. Loudermilk #166: This amendment prevents EPA from regulating greenhouse gas emissions from heavy duty truck trailers. Medium and heavy duty vehicles represent a disproportionate share of transportation emissions. New EPA-NHTSA standards for medium and heavy duty vehicles can reduce these emissions with known and available technology, including efficiency improvements to trailers. These measures will help the nation slow climate change and reduce its reliance on oil. Congress should reduce our oil dependency rather than perpetuate it.

70. Lummis #58: This dangerous amendment prevents EPA's common sense proposal to monitor groundwater where in-situ uranium mining takes place. These increasingly common mining activities threaten to contaminate groundwater resources with uranium and other harmful pollutants like arsenic. Groundwater that is contaminated by these activities cannot be restored to pre-mining conditions. These long lived contaminants can also migrate to other water sources, demanding that we carefully monitor their movements at a very minimum. This amendment is an affront to public health and safety.

73. Newhouse #145: This amendment would block all Endangered Species Act (ESA) protections for gray wolves in the continental United States by 2017. This species is currently listed as endangered in most of the lower-48 states. While the return of gray wolves in the northern Rocky Mountains and the Great Lakes has been an incredible success story, this iconic American species still only occupies a small portion of its former range and wolves have only just started to re-enter areas like northern California, where there are large swaths of suitable habitat. A national delisting for wolves would reverse the incredible progress that the ESA has achieved for this species over the past few decades and once again put the gray wolf at risk of extinction.

74. Newhouse #152: This amendment would prohibit EPA from writing any rule that would require the largest industrial animal farms (Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations, or CAFOs) to properly store, transport, or dispose of their wastes, including the hundreds of millions of tons of manure they generate annually. CAFO wastes contain dangerous pollutants that can increase the risk of birth defects, infant deaths, diabetes, and cancer. When not handled properly, CAFO wastes endanger drinking water sources and pose a particularly severe risk to rural communities reliant on well water.

76. Palmer #55: This amendment would disarm and disable federal law enforcement officers, potentially placing officers in harm's way while enforcing federal laws. It would prevent EPA from exercising basic authorities granted during the Reagan administration – like carrying firearms, executing and serving warrants, and making arrests – when investigating and acting to stop environmental crimes. Without detailing how this enforcement authority would be handled once removed from the EPA, the amendment would make it harder to stop environmental violations that are so egregious that Congress subjects them to criminal sanction.

77. Pearce #59: This amendment would block federal funding for the endangered New Mexico Meadow Jumping Mouse under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), thwarting recovery efforts for the rare southwestern subspecies, which has suffered a significant reduction in occupied localities due to habitat loss and fragmentation throughout its range. It would eliminate crucial recovery programs for the mouse that require federal funding, such as development and approval of Habitat Conservation Plans, and leave stakeholders uncertain about whether projects can go forward without violating the ESA.

78. Pearce #61: This amendment would block federal funding for the endangered Mexican gray wolf under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) even though there are fewer than 100 of these rare wolves left in the United States and fewer than 25 in Mexico. It would also limit recovery to "historic range," even though the extent of that range is far from clear, and scientists say the wolves must be restored to new

habitats to recover. Blocking federal funding to help recover these wolves and keeping them out of suitable habitats they need to recover is a recipe for extinction.

79. Perry #126: This amendment prevents the Department of Interior and EPA from any surveying, mapping, or collection of remote sensing data using any unmanned aircraft system. The amendment limits the tools that these agencies need to achieve their missions for the American people. For instance, it could impede DOI's effective wildlife conservation if drones were the least intrusive and most efficient means to monitor roadless settings. While agencies must use new technology carefully and responsibly, this overly broad language could have a chilling effect and limit emerging options that allow more effective, less intrusive, and potentially safer ways to monitor wildlife and environmental conditions.

80. Perry #127: This amendment would severely cut the EPA's budget and greatly hinder its ability to carry out its responsibilities. It cuts the EPA's overall budget by 17%.

81. Perry #125: This amendment is just another attempt to roll back the Clean Air Act and block any potential plan to address climate change. Instead of listening to the national security experts, faith leaders, scientists, energy innovators, health professionals and many others who are sounding the alarm on climate change and have implored our nation's elected officials to support action, this amendment simply seeks another way to say "no."

82. Pompeo #170: In response to West, Texas and countless other chemical plant disasters, President Obama asked the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to revise its Risk Management Program (RMP) rule, our nation's major defense against catastrophic chemical disasters. This amendment would prevent the EPA from finalizing and implementing the recently proposed rule to modernize our chemical safety safeguards. The revisions to the RMP include requirements for chemical facilities to identify safer alternative chemicals or processes that can eliminate the possibility of a chemical facility disaster. The public, particularly fence-line communities - often poorer neighborhoods and communities of color who already bear the greatest burden of living next to these polluting and high-risk facilities - look to the EPA to protect their health and safety. This undermines that.

83. Price #161: This amendment would block implementation of existing statutes as long as they are "major." Under this standard, a rule with benefits magnitudes higher than its cost would still be barred as long as it had impacts of more than \$100 million.

84. Ratcliffe #57: This amendment would block a proposed, optional program that encourages and rewards early action to reduce carbon pollution, something many states and power companies have asked for as EPA developed the Clean Power Plan. In addition to providing incentives for clean energy technologies like wind and solar, the program would provide a double credit for energy efficiency investments in low-income communities. By releasing the Clean Energy Incentive Program proposed rule and taking public comment, EPA is doing the prudent thing by continuing to work with those states, power companies, and stakeholders that are continuing to plan for future Clean Power Plan implementation – EPA's work to develop this voluntary program imposes no planning or compliance obligations on states or the regulated community. Blocking this effort could harm clean energy development and energy efficiency investments in low income communities.

85. Smith #119: Under CERCLA, damages for destruction or loss of natural resources, including the reasonable costs of assessing damages, are recoverable from responsible parties. Sums recovered for Natural Resource Damages are available only to restore, replace or acquire the equivalent of a natural resource and to reimburse the Trustees' cost of assessing damages. The idea is to make the plaintiff whole. Under this amendment, funds could not be spent unless they were specifically appropriated. Congress is

unlikely to approve such specific spending and is likely to use these funds for unintended purposes that are irrelevant to the natural resources loss or to the Superfund claim. Someone who pays to make recompense for natural resources losses shouldn't see those funds spent on unrelated issues. This amendment discourages the difficult but important work in restoring natural resources destroyed by polluters.

86. Smith #121: This amendment would severely undermine the National Environmental Education Act by prohibiting all funding for environmental education grants to elementary and high schools, colleges and universities and state education and environmental agencies under this law. These grants help state and local educators develop curricula for America's school children; train teachers, state and local officials, and not-for-profit organizations; and advance environmental education, science and research. The amendment would cripple valuable federal support for environmental education under a law adopted during the first Bush administration.

87. Westerman #167: This amendment would block enforcement of a federal court decision that found that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) violated the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) when it authorized the killing of double crested cormorants in 24 states east of the Mississippi without current data or adequate scientific analysis. The court determined that FWS violated NEPA by failing to take the required "hard look" at the consequences of its actions and ignoring a range of reasonable non-lethal alternatives. This amendment would inappropriately block the enforcement of the court order and allow an ill-informed lethal practice to continue.

88. Westmoreland #139: This amendment seeks to discourage citizens from enforcing essential protections of the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Water Act and targets settlements involving congressionally mandated federal agency actions, including requirements to protect public health and the environment. Congress long ago recognized that the government needs citizens to be partners in enforcing all manner of America's laws, including environmental protection laws, and this principle is enshrined in the numerous federal laws that provide reasonable fee recovery for successful plaintiffs. This nonsensical amendment would change this by barring payment of citizens' legal fees whenever parties avoid costly litigation by agreeing to a settlement.

89. Young #37: This amendment would prohibit funding for any new regulation connected to offshore oil and gas exploration and development in the Arctic Ocean. It specifically targets the recent decision by DOI to issue final safety regulations for future exploratory drilling activities on the U.S. Arctic Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). These are important improvements to the rules that govern offshore drilling, but it has not modernized the regulations that govern offshore oil and gas planning, lease sales, or the review and permitting of exploratory drilling. This amendment would undermine future efforts to ensure if and when any development were to occur in the Arctic Ocean, the strictest regulations would be in place for these risky offshore drilling activities.

90. Young #38: This amendment would block the implementation of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. This plan was developed over many years, with significant public input, using the best available science, and following a lengthy environmental impact analysis. The Arctic Refuge is an irreplaceable crown jewel of our public lands and more than merits protection as wilderness. The Comprehensive Conservation Plan has been final for over a year and this amendment is a last minute attempt to undermine a lengthy collaborative public process.

91. Young #11: This amendment would block the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) from finalizing a rule to conserve wolves, bears and other iconic carnivores on national wildlife refuges in Alaska and withdraw the National Park Service's (NPS) authority to implement similar protections on Alaska

national preserves. It would bar the agencies from prohibiting the state's scientifically indefensible "predator control" program on our federal public lands, allowing extreme non-subsistence hunting aimed at reducing native carnivore populations through practices including trapping, baiting, aerial gunning, killing at den sites and killing mothers and young. This harmful amendment would prevent FWS and NPS from managing as many as 100 million acres of federal land in Alaska in accordance with bedrock conservation laws.

92. Young #13: This amendment would block the removal of three lease sales in the Arctic Ocean. Shell showed in 2012 that Arctic Ocean drilling cannot be done safely, and the government's own estimate on one lease sale alone is that there is a 75 percent chance of a major spill over the life of the operations. The Arctic Ocean thrives with sea life and is a fragile marine ecosystem. Native communities on Alaska's northern coast depend on Arctic Ocean sea life to sustain their way of life, yet the Chukchi and Beaufort seas have no U.S Coast Guard facilities or infrastructure to support a major oil-spill response. The industry isn't ready to drill safely in the Arctic Ocean, yet this amendment is attempting to force unsafe leases to move forward.

94. Zeldin #41: This amendment would block new marine monuments and undermine the Antiquities Act, the tool that protected nearly half of our national parks, which is particularly egregious during the National Park Service's centennial year. Specifically this amendment would prohibit designation of new marine monuments in the Exclusive Economic Zone – an area of over 4.5 million square miles that represents nearly all U.S. oceans. Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama have each used the Antiquities Act to protect areas of American waters as marine monuments. In order for the U.S. to maintain its role as a global leader in ocean conservation, we must not hamstring our ability to protect critical habitat for marine mammals, seabirds, and other vital resources off our shores.

111. Chaffetz #63: This amendment would eliminate the law enforcement programs of the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service. Law enforcement capabilities are essential to ensure the health and safety of the public, employees, natural resources and property on our federal lands. Funding for BLM and Forest Service law enforcement has been dwindling for years and they are already struggling to meet their objectives; this amendment would completely hamstring the agencies and put visitors, federal employees and our natural resources at considerable risk.

118. Duncan #92: This amendment would prevent the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from removing unsafe structures on Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge as a part of their FY17 Deferred Maintenance Plan. Midway Refuge is home to the world's largest population of albatross, and removing defunct structures would provide essential nesting area for these birds. Lead-based paint on the island's old, decrepit buildings poses a severe threat to the resident Laysan albatross colony, with up to 10,000 chicks perishing from lead poisoning annually. This amendment would prevent basic, yet critical efforts to demolish harmful abandoned structures in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act.

119. Gosar #2: This amendment would threaten wildlife and risk public safety at Havasu National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona. It would obstruct the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and stakeholders from addressing recreational use on the refuge that is creating dangerous conditions for visitors and impairing natural resource conservation, including protection for several endangered migratory bird species. This damaging amendment would circumvent cornerstone laws guiding wildlife conservation on more than 560 refuges across the country, including the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act, setting a dangerous precedent for the entire Refuge System.

120. Weber #66: This amendment would deny all funds to EPA for its entire budget under the spending bill if the agency is found to act at odds with a single provision in the Clean Air Act to evaluate

employment effects. A coal company is suing EPA alleging the agency has failed to conduct such an evaluation. If the company prevails, the court would direct EPA to do the evaluation. This amendment then would prohibit all funds to EPA under the spending bill because the agency was found to have contravened this single Clean Air Act provision. It is irrational and punitive to the American people to defund an entire agency budget over the failure to conduct an evaluation, especially when linked to the active litigation strategy of a company suing the agency. Rather than directing EPA to conduct that evaluation, the amendment instead punishes Americans and rewards polluters by denying EPA the funds to carry out all federally required health and environmental safeguards that Congress adopted to protect Americans.

128. Grothman #151: This amendment would defund the very successful Diesel Emission Reduction Act which protects human health by reducing harmful particulate and NOx emissions from diesel vehicles. The program has bipartisan support, has a record of pollution reductions, especially in areas of poor air quality, and should be continued.

We strongly encourage you to SUPPORT the following amendments:

1. Castor #106: This amendment would match the FY17 budget request for the Refuge Law Enforcement Program. According to the 2015 International Association of Chiefs of Police report, 1,149 Federal Wildlife Officers are needed to adequately ensure safety for refuge visitors, staff, and wildlife across the Refuge System, yet the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has an effective force of only 255. Matching the budget request would allow FWS to hire additional Federal Wildlife Officers to increase its capacity to protect wildlife and the 48 million annual visitors to our national wildlife refuges.

2. Cicilline #162: This amendment would increase NPS Operations by \$2.5 million for additional rangers, maintenance, and/or other operating needs, offset by the Office of the Secretary of Interior, Departmental Operations.

10. Beyer #122: This amendment would strike Sec. 120, which would block the Department of Interior's sorely needed update of the Stream Protection Rule. The rule is vital for protecting the health and environment of communities living near coal mining operations by ensuring that the land and water used by coal mining operations is protected from pollution and degradation.

11. Lujan Grisham et al. #113: This amendment would strike a nefarious provision that would prohibit any funds from this act being used to finalize, implement or enforce the BLM Wasted Gas rule. This rule will limit venting, flaring, leaks and waste of gas from oil and gas sources on public lands.

12. Castor #143: This amendment would strike the rider intended to block the “drilling margins” provisions in the Well Control Rule. This rule, which will strengthen safety in offshore oil and gas operations, was published on April 29, 2016 by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement. The “drilling margins” requirements are more detailed, technical regulations than existing regulations on this topic. These new requirements are necessary to prevent blowouts that would occur if the downhole pressure is less than the fluid pressure into a well. It is standard engineering practice to ensure there is a clear “safety margin” to address unknowns such as variable oil reservoir pressures. The new regulations also require that if a safe drilling margin cannot be maintained, then drilling must be suspended until the situation is remedied. These regulations follow the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences.

13. Huffman #22: This amendment seeks to strike a provision that would delay implementation of BOEM's recently proposed rule to reduce air emissions from offshore drilling sources. This rule is the first update to air quality standards for offshore drilling in more than 30 years.

18. Johnson #54: Seventy five percent of coal ash dams, the largest universe of coal ash dumps, are located in low-income and minority communities. This amendment would promote the protection of some of the nation's most vulnerable communities, requiring that the implementation of the EPA's Final Rule on the disposal of coal ash is consistent with the Executive Order on Environmental Justice (12898). Executive Order 12898 requires the agency to identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high adverse human health or environmental effects of its activities on minority and low-income populations.

21. Lujan #48: The Gold King Mine disaster vividly illustrated the need for water treatment and monitoring funding solutions to acid mine pollution that can last forever. This amendment directs sorely needed resources toward that effort.

22. Dingell #76: This amendment strikes the harmful language that wholly exempts a broad range of potentially damaging logging activities on our National Forest System from public participation and National Environmental Policy Act requirements. Damaging our national forest resources harms both the public and economic benefits our federal forest land provides for all Americans, including clean drinking water, outstanding recreational opportunities, and fish and wildlife habitat, which supports more jobs and economic output than other activities on the National Forest System.

24. Blumenauer #124: This amendment would strike a rider that would prevent the EPA from controlling greenhouse gases from the largest sources of livestock waste – manure management systems. There is no justification for giving a hall pass to an industry responsible for very large quantities of dangerous pollutants, including methane, nitrous oxide, hydrogen sulfide, and ammonia.

25. Cartwright #96: This amendment seeks to strike section 425, which prohibits the EPA from updating the definition of "fill material" under the Clean Water Act, perpetuating a dangerous industry loophole that bars the use of the latest scientific and health research to reduce toxic mining waste that poses serious risks to humans and aquatic life. It also strikes a provision changing the definition the "discharge of fill material," which would allow pollutant discharges that would damage or destroy streams and wetlands without adequate environmental review required under the Clean Water Act.

26. Lawrence, Beyer, Cartwright #40: This amendment seeks to strike Section 427, which blocks funding for EPA and Army Corps of Engineers' Clean Water Rule. The Clean Water Rule restores vital pollution safeguards to a variety of our nation's waterways, including the small streams that feed the drinking water of one in three Americans, and provides clarity and certainty to the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act.

27. Lowey #50: This amendment strikes Section 429 that would block implementation and enforcement of the EPA's Lead Renovation, Repair and Painting Rule that requires the use of lead-safe practices and actions aimed at preventing lead poisoning.

28. Becerra (CA), Pallone (NJ), Lowenthal (CA), Roybal-Allard (CA) #137: This amendment would strike Section 430, which seeks to block EPA from requiring industries with a high probability of causing catastrophic damage by releasing toxics into the environment from carrying insurance to cover environmental damages they cause. Section 430 would allow polluters to evade their financial obligations and skip town on their toxic messes, leaving taxpayers stuck with hefty cleanup bills.

29. Pallone #88: This amendment would strike Sec. 431, a rider that would block implementation of the first-ever carbon pollution standards for new and existing fossil fuel power plants, including any assistance to states that have asked for help developing sensible state policies.

30. Peters #109: This amendment would strike section 434, which seeks to block EPA's ability to limit the use of super-polluting hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) as refrigerants in other uses. HFCs are potent greenhouse gases that have thousands of times more impact on climate change, pound for pound, than carbon dioxide. Companies are making safer alternatives, but the rider would allow unlimited growth in these outmoded and dangerous pollutants. The rider would also damage the United States' international credibility and frustrate efforts – supported by industry – to negotiate a global HFC phase-out under the Montreal Protocol.

31. Peters, Lowenthal, Beyer, Polis, Esty #110: This amendment would strike a provision that would recklessly eliminate any consideration of the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) which is an analysis of the real economic impacts, positive or negative, of the carbon emissions of a project or proposed rule. The Social Cost of Carbon is a critical tool for the public and decision makers to understand the true benefits and costs of a project and the possible ways to mitigate negative impacts. Requiring an environmental review that prohibits the consideration of climate impacts institutionalizes climate denial into all federal permitting and forces ill-informed decisions that put critical infrastructure, taxpayer dollars, and local communities' health at risk.

32. Grijalva #80: This amendment seeks to protect fundamental protections for farmworkers from pesticide poisoning, specifically, their basic right to a designated representative who can request information on their behalf if language barriers, illness, incapacitation or fear prevents them from accessing the information themselves

33. Polis et al. # 81: This amendment seeks to strike a provision that would block EPA from implementing its Methane Pollution Standard, the first-ever limits on methane pollution from the oil and gas sector (the largest emitter of methane) and would block future efforts to regulate existing sources of methane. EPA's standards require proven, low-cost safeguards that will yield net climate benefits of \$170 million in 2025 and will generate significant public health benefits as well by curbing smog- and soot-forming Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) emissions and hazardous air pollutants.

34. Lowenthal #16: This amendment would strike a dangerous provision blocking the Department of the Interior from raising royalty rates for federal coal, oil and gas on public lands and waters, despite the fact that royalty rates in the U.S. remain among the lowest in the world. It would also allow a recently finalized rule from the Office of Natural Resources Revenue to proceed, stopping practices that allow the predatory undervaluing of coal, oil and gas extracted from public lands and the resulting loss of royalties.

35-40. McNerney #173, 174, 175, 176, 177 & 178: These amendments would strike damaging provisions in the underlying bill that permanently override protections for salmon and other native fisheries under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in California's Bay-Delta estuary and threaten the thousands of West Coast fishing jobs that depend on the health of these species. California's ongoing drought – not federal environmental laws protecting salmon and other native fish and wildlife – is the primary reason for low water supplies across the state.

41. Grijalva #75: This amendment would strike Section 453, the “blocking new parks and monuments provision” of the bill. This damaging provision would undermine our nation's most important conservation tool, the Antiquities Act, which originally protected nearly half of our national parks.

Section 453 is neither in line with public input or narrowly tailored. It would prohibit monument designation in 48 counties covering over 160 million acres, and since the Antiquities Act applies only to federal lands and waters, it would block new monuments on over 26% of all federal lands in the continental US. This amendment rectifies this problem and ensures new parks and monuments can continue to be protected into the second century of our national parks.

63. Jolly, Clawson, Graham #17: This amendment would prevent any preparations by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for lease sales in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico in the areas that are currently under a moratorium on oil and gas leasing and any related activity. The moratorium was established in the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act (signed into law in December 2006) and expires on June 30, 2022.

72. Murphy, Jolly #134: This amendment would protect marine resources off the coast of Florida and in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico from seismic airgun blasting, including protecting commercial fish species from displacement. Scientific studies indicate that seismic airgun noise causes endangered sperm whales in the Gulf to change their feeding vocalizations, and in the Atlantic, seismic airgun blasting could tip the highly endangered North Atlantic right whale into extinction.

95. Beyer #71: This amendment would effectively strike three damaging provisions in the underlying bill that attempt to block recovery efforts and Endangered Species Act (ESA) protections for three imperiled American species: the greater sage-grouse, the lesser prairie-chicken, and gray wolf populations in Wyoming and the Great Lakes. Section 114 in the bill would not only block future protections for sage-grouse under the ESA for the bird; it would also block implementation of a historic conservation strategy for the bird and effectively transfer management of as many as 60 million acres of public lands to 11 western states. This amendment would deny funding to these harmful policy riders.

96. Beyer #123: This amendment would make sure that agencies follow existing guidance on climate change preparedness, found in Executive Orders 13653 and 13693. These executive orders provide a framework for the federal government to move toward more sustainable operations and confront the risks from climate change and its own emissions.

97. Beyer #138: This amendment would prohibit the use of geological and geophysical (G&G) surveys for oil, gas, or methane hydrate exploration and production in the Atlantic Ocean. Numerous scientific studies indicate marine resources, including fish, turtles, whales, and invertebrates, could be adversely impacted by the seismic airgun blasting used to conduct these surveys. Atlantic G&G would also take a significant step towards opening the area to oil and gas leasing.

98. Beyer, Cartwright, Lawrence #146: This amendment would strike four dangerous anti-clean water provisions in the underlying bill, including: blocking the Department of the Interior's Stream Protection Rule, preventing the EPA from updating the definition of "fill material," expanding exemptions for dumping pollution into our waterways, and blocking the EPA and the Army Corps' critical Clean Water Rule. Situations like Flint, Michigan demonstrate we need to do more, not less, to protect clean water for our communities and our families.

99. Capps #94: This amendment would prevent the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management from issuing any new permits that would allow companies to use hydraulic fracturing or acid well stimulation treatment in federal waters off the West Coast. Offshore fracking poses serious environmental and public health risks that are not yet fully understood.

100. Grijalva, Huffman #72: This amendment would prevent the elimination of the law enforcement programs of the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service. Law enforcement capabilities

are essential to ensure the health and safety of the public, employees, natural resources and property on our federal lands. Funding for BLM and Forest Service law enforcement has been dwindling for years and they are already struggling to meet their objectives; eliminating these agencies' law enforcement capabilities would completely hamstring the agencies and put visitors, federal employees and our natural resources at considerable risk.

101. Higgins #65: This amendment emphasizes that the Great Lakes are a precious resource, that the Great Lakes Compact needs to be kept strong, and that any further diversions to the Compact are not egregious and come with the proper conditions. The amendment is designed to serve as a cautionary message to anyone who might view the ruling on behalf of Waukesha, WI, as an opportunity to apply for a withdrawal that's outside the bounds of the Compact.

102. Lowenthal #73: This amendment would ensure that the Department of Interior broadly adheres to Secretarial Order No. 3289, which establishes a Department-wide approach for better understanding the impacts of climate change to public lands and helps coordinate responses to those impacts.

103. Pocan #128: This amendment would make sure that agencies follow existing guidance on sustainable operations, found in Executive Order 13693. This executive order provides a framework for the federal government to move toward more sustainable operations, improving environmental performance while saving taxpayer dollars through increased efficiency.

104. Polis, Grijalva #83: This amendment would prevent attempts to dispose of federal public lands outside of the established land use planning process outlined by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. Americans treasure our shared public lands and have roundly rejected attempts to sell-off or transfer ownership of the federal estate.

106. Tsongas #74: This amendment attempts to remedy some of the damage done by Section 114 in the underlying bill, which delays a potential Endangered Species Act (ESA) listing for the greater sage-grouse, blocks implementation of a historic conservation strategy for the species and effectively transfers management of as many as 60 million acres of federal public lands to 11 western states. The Tsongas amendment would prevent funds from being used to carry out any part of the bill that would limit the Bureau of Land Management from meeting its multiple use obligations under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, including the provision in Section 114 that prevents the agency from implementing its historic resource management plan amendments to conserve sage-grouse and other natural resources.

112. Kildee #115: This amendment provides funding for supplying water to communities with high levels of lead in water.

115. Kildee #114: This amendments allows a state to direct more of its State Revolving Fund to lead issues to assist communities where a federal or state emergency has been declared due to lead in drinking water.

122. Gallego #118: This amendment—which passed by voice vote and with no one speaking in opposition during last year's appropriations bill—aims to address illegal grazing on public lands. It confirms that no grazing permits or leases should be issued to anyone who violates Bureau of Land Management (BLM) regulations. This amendment demands respect for our public lands and the laws that govern them. And, it ensures that the American taxpayer does not foot the bill for ranchers who violate the law by not paying grazing fees owed for their commercial use of public lands.

124. Jackson Lee #153: This amendment reaffirms the importance of national policy to preserve historic sites for public use and the inspiration and benefit of Americans.

125. Jackson Lee #154: This amendment would prevent elimination of the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership, a visionary program that encourages urban constituencies to discover, appreciate and care for wildlife and nature in their communities. With 80 percent of Americans living in cities, the collaborative initiative between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and local partners helps connect urban residents to our national wildlife refuges and other wild places. This amendment would help ensure that this important program will continue.

131. Cartwright, Beyer, Lawrence #172: This amendment strikes a provision that expands existing exemptions for "normal farming, silviculture, and ranching activities, and construction or maintenance of farm or stock ponds and irrigation and drainage ditches" from Clean Water Act permitting requirements. The Congressionally-established limitation on these exemptions is known as the "recapture provision," and it prevents discharges that would impair the receiving water, ensuring our waterways are protected from dangerous pollution.